

Shuffle and Strut:
An Overview of the African American
Images in Civil War Cinema

Jim Graham

The device was called a pantoptikon. Its developer was one Major Woodville Latham, a Virginian and a Confederate veteran. When the Major demonstrated this clumsy contraption at a New York press exhibition on 22 February 1895, the French patent on the Lumière Brothers' cinematographe was already nine days old.⁽¹⁾ In this centennial year of the motion picture few may know or value the modest contribution of Latham to the development of one of the modern era's greatest popular entertainments. Indeed, Latham himself may not have fully comprehended the moving picture's potential as an instrument in promoting the mythologies and prejudices of the 'Lost Cause' he had fought for over three decades earlier. Whether pantoptikon or cinematographe, the moving picture projection apparatus helped forge yet another link in the invisible chain of black subjugation.

Surely of all fancied notions held dear by those who fought for secession, and some would argue slavery as well, none was more fervently embraced than that of white supremacy. The following discussion will describe how this twisted sentiment and others manifested themselves in African American stereotypes on film — from the 'picturesque' portrayal of the happy singing darkey to the grotesque interplay of whips, chains and steamy orgiastic lust.

I will contend that with few exceptions the African American image in this special genre of mainstream cinema is woefully prisoner to racial stereotyping, regardless of the decade in question or the specific socio-political agenda being served.

The beginning of entertainment with a Civil War theme naturally can be traced back to the war itself. The most influential showcase for the African American stereotype was, of course, the minstrel show, a Northern working-class entertainment which supported the Union cause but condemned abolitionists and those notions "de debbel (put) in de nigger's head." White performers in blackface sang of their longing for the good old days and how eager they were to put the war behind them. Immigrants were particularly receptive to these chords of nostalgia, but even more receptive to free Negroes staying out of the Northern job market. Therefore, where emancipation of the slaves was concerned, there was support from minstrelsy only to the degree that it was militarily expedient. In war there was little sober recognition of the great race issue at hand; content about the black man's deliverance from chains was a perverse and self-serving admixture of noble intentions and party hat farce.

Stereotypes in this early stage served several purposes. To assuage Northern fears of Negro formidability, the slave-cum-soldier was depicted as oafish and cowardly. The song "Raw Recruits" (1862) launched a series of stage performances that presaged The Three Stooges in silliness, its skit emphasizing the Negro's lack of coordination, the inability to understand drill commands and a

ready willingness to flee from battle. Another feature of minstrel portrayals was the dandy who blindly imitated the white man's ways by craving the white exterior. In the mind of the dominating power, of course, such incongruity could never conceal the true nature of the black man as a cultivator of the soil, preferably Southern soil.⁽²⁾

Thus it was the minstrel show that served as the original fabric from which were woven and cut all the African American stereotypes that polite white society in both North and South would require: the Negro as the happy slave, the devoted servant, the irresponsible citizen, the social delinquent, the natural-born cook, the perfect entertainer, the wily trickster, the chuckling drone, the goggle-eyed coward.⁽³⁾

With the war over, there developed in the North a demand for "genuine negro" entertainments in which to more 'intelligently' appreciate the native inhabitant of a South that was being romanticized more and more for its exoticism and gentility. The North's rediscovery of the Old South was part of the national healing that took place after Reconstruction—a process that included a growing admiration for Southern race relations as a mounting and tumultuous new tide of immigrants swept Northern shores. In addition, the fashionability of Social Darwinism introduced a patina of scientific legitimacy to the how-and-why of minstrel show rollick. By the time historian Frederick Jackson Turner had declared slavery to have been "an incident" in 1890, it was clear that the white popular imagination was quite unwilling to accept African American as having a capacity for humanity socially equal to Americans of European descent.⁽⁴⁾

North and South may have been reconciled by the turn of the century, but the African American remained ever the exile in his own land. The new technology of motion picture projection offered yet another dimension in which popular entertainment could conspire with white racism to keep African Americans shackled in de facto slavery.

The most notable of the early silent movies dealing with the South and the Negro were numerous versions of Harriet Beecher Stowe's 1852 moral tale *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. In his book *The Celluloid South*, Edward D. C. Campbell, Jr. lists six different versions of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* produced in the pre-Depression years. The first was Edwin S. Porter's 1903 rendering which, rather than raise righteous indignation about slavery as Stowe had done, sought to enchant and charm the audience into romantic reverence for the South's lost world of bucolic bliss. There is no indictment of slavery or suggestion of dire poverty, but rather an exaggerated caricaturing of Simon Legree as a single misguided and evil element. Only where John Brown appears in a vision to a dying Uncle Tom who has been brutally beaten by Legree's orders do we find some common ground with the book. Despite this, the film is a congratulatory celebration of the Southern white's moral duty to care for the black race.

Those versions which followed tended to adhere to the implied premise that slavery was bad because of a few disruptive and eccentric individuals who failed to comprehend the gravity of their role in the 'system.' If only they had behaved properly as their social duties demanded, slavery would have been far less the tragedy that it was. Left in the hands of responsible whites, the old world

of the South on screen is an enormously happy land of dancing darkeys and toothy broom-wielding mammies cheerfully sweeping away the white man's guilt.⁽⁵⁾

But the new medium of cinema did more than frolic with the white audience's sense of racial and moral superiority as the minstrel show had done. Movies enabled directors to dramatize more poignantly the presumed loyalty of slave to master as in D. W. Griffith's 1910 short *His Trust* which reemphasized the old theme of slave contentment by underscoring it with an otherwise unlikely dramatic ploy. Old George swears that should his kind master fall in battle he will devote his all to the protection of his master's family. Predictably, no sooner is the master killed defending The Cause, than his home is looted and burned by a band of Yankee ruffians. Heroically, Old George saves the master's small child and sword from the conflagration. The final scene shows Old George sacrificing his personal comfort by letting his master's family enjoy the shelter of his humble shack as he curls up outside it like a faithful dog.⁽⁶⁾

Like Latham, Kentuckian D. W. Griffith was a deep sympathizer of the Southern cause who also had a role to play in the development of the American motion picture. Unlike Latham, however, Griffith's artistic innovation and directorial attentions to racist ideology brought him both fame and notoriety. By far the best known of Griffith's works is his masterpiece *Birth of a Nation* (1915). Based on Reverend Thomas Dixon, Jr.'s novels *The Leopard's Spots* and *The Clansman*, *Birth of a Nation* revealed a meticulous and artful justification for white supremacy in the South. Audiences were enchanted by the 'picturesque' splendor of a vanished antebellum

way of life and thrilled by the brilliantly constructed scenes of suspense. This was Hollywood's first blockbuster, a 12-reel epic costing an eye-popping \$ 110,000 to make. Astonishingly, in its first run it made over twenty times that figure, thanks in large part to the extravagant two-dollar ticket price for the time and an exceptional public relations campaign that made opening nights gala events across the country.

Campbell points out that *Birth of a Nation* was intended for an elite, but in effect enhanced the appeal of the motion picture across class lines. As a vehicle for promoting a social agenda, no movie has had a greater impact than *Birth of a Nation*. While its novelty factor must also be taken into consideration, much of the movie's effectiveness lay in the careful attention to historical detail. Even President Wilson, who permitted a special screening at the White House, sang praises to the illusion. "It is like writing history with lightning," he said. "And one of my regrets is that it is so horribly true."

What was also 'horribly true' was Griffith's epoch-making use of the old stereotypes, now set in cinematographic granite for future reference. The South, according to Griffith, basically had two types of Negroes: good ones and bad ones. The 'good' black knows his place and gladly serves his master even in emancipation. The 'bad' schemes to be the white man's equal by craving his public offices which he is neither morally nor intellectually capable of filling due to inbred proclivities toward excessive drinking and shiftlessness. But the singularly unpardonable taboo the 'bad nigger' will willfully break is open coveting of the white woman's body. Griffith hones his skills in suspense by skillfully exploiting this

racist paranoia in the movie's climax where the 'liberal' Congressman Stoneman's daughter is about to be ravished by the mulatto fiend Silas Lynch, political protégé of his prospective victim's father. The spine-tingling rescue scene is an unabashed salute to the chivalrous nobility of the Ku Klux Klan. Better late than never, Congressman Stoneman realizes the folly of his socially progressive goals and concedes at last that the African American can never be the white man's equal.

Obviously, not everyone was happy with Griffith's masterwork about race. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People attempted to have it banned. For all the extensive and expensive advertising, it was controversy stirred by *Birth of a Nation* that really boosted ticket sales. Many intellectuals condemned it outright, but in several noteworthy instances the protests took the lowbrow approach. In Boston two hundred police had to be called in to the Tremont Theatre in order to disperse a crowd of angry blacks who had begun rioting when someone threw an egg at the screen. In Philadelphia an even greater scuffle broke out between police and blacks. Clearly, Griffith had not only made a movie about history, but had made history with his movie. Gifted genius that he was, the socially naive Griffith could not comprehend what the fuss was all about. He believed profoundly in the integrity of his creation and claimed he had not intended to offend any Negroes with his black-face characterizations.⁽⁷⁾

Indeed, defense of *Birth of a Nation* became an obsession with Griffith. Feeling victimized by the criticisms and eager to vindicate himself from any charge of bigotry, Griffith produced *Intolerance* at even greater expense in an effort to dissuade his detractors from

further hurtful accusations. Dixon joined Griffith in a letter-writing campaign to the nation's newspapers in which they justified on-screen vilification of the Negro. It was acceptable to do so with whites, they contended. Why should blacks be different? Arguments that real Negro actors should have been used instead of those in blackface were answered in simple economic terms. It was too expensive to transport the few experienced black actors there were from New York to Hollywood. But neither Griffith nor Dixon had to do much soul-searching when the vast majority of the movie-going public was helping make *Birth of a Nation* the tremendous commercial success that it was. ⁽⁸⁾

The bottom line in Griffith's cinematic message was that the Negro who tried to change his lot through the political process and those non-Negroes who assisted him were, in effect, as subversive and undesirable as their contemporary clique of shadowy anarchists, communists, Jews and other foreign stereotypes who haunted the xenophobic White Angle-Saxon Protestant mind.

It is a curious fact that two of the greatest landmark movies in the history of American cinema both dealt with the tragedy of 'The War between the States.' Nearly a quarter century after *Birth of a Nation* came *Gone with the Wind*, a Civil War era spectacle based on Margaret Mitchell's far less spectacular novel of the same name. In the historical context of 1939, the year it premiered, *Gone with the Wind* offered Americans a cathartic release from the despair and stress accumulated in the national psyche over the Depression years. Consequently, never before in the decades after the Civil War were Americans of all regions able to more readily identify with the hardships and humiliations of the fallen Confederacy. It is

true that this alone did not guarantee *Gone with the Wind* would become one of the greatest box office smashes of all time—but it helped. As Hattie McDaniel's Oscar for her role as Mammy testifies, *Gone with the Wind* also helped to bestow mainstream recognition of stereotypes as something histrionically challenging rather than the ancillary two-dimensional roles of earlier movies. Yet this act of commendation only added insult to injury in the eyes of indignant African American intellectuals with a view to genuine progress in race relations.

Like Griffith, Margaret Mitchell was plagued by a chorus of angry black voices. One of them belonged to Carlton Moss, a young African American dramatist employed as a radio script writer for the National Broadcasting Company. In an open letter to producer David Selznick published in the *Daily Worker*, Moss attacked the movie's distorted and biased view of the Civil War on a number of fronts, among them the racist representation of the Negro as an agreeable party to the peculiar institution:

As to the principal Negro characters, they follow the time-worn stereotype pattern laid down by Hollywood. There is the shiftless and dull-witted Pork, Young Prissy, indolent and thoroughly irresponsible. "Big" Sam with his radiant acceptance of slavery and Mammy with her constant haranguing and doting on every wish of Scarlett. It is made to appear that she loves this degrading position in the service of a family that has helped to keep her people enchained for centuries. This false collection of two-dimensional Negro characters is insulting to the Negro people.⁽⁹⁾

Moss's letter emphasizes that after the war "black men played leading roles in the state and local governments" whose legacy included "a free public school system for (all) people of the South." Moss bitterly asserts that *Gone with the Wind* has unfairly portrayed the Reconstruction Negro as an idle, worthless character, interested more in fine clothes and good cigars than civic responsibilities. While he describes *Birth of a Nation* as a "frontal attack on American history and the Negro people," *Gone with the Wind's* subtle justification of the Ku Klux Klan qualifies it as "a rear attack on the same." Again the audience is encouraged to find moral repugnance in a Negro's attempt to rape a white woman, Scarlett O'Hara, and though the actual act of retribution is not shown, it is plainly suggested that the Klan again has saved the day.⁽¹⁰⁾

The most gaping hypocrisy of all in the making of *Gone with the Wind* was the extraordinary concentration on keeping the tiniest details consistent or historically authentic, while remaining perfectly content to evoke black life in the framework of Hollywood's "time-worn stereotype pattern." Campbell notes that a calico dress worn by Scarlett through a third of the film was actually twenty-three separate dresses of the same pattern in increasingly deteriorated states. A great deal of bother was made about whether oral thermometers were in use at the time, how a particular waltz was actually danced, what certain army uniforms really looked like or how 'you all' was used. Moss's open letter reminds us that Selznick had promised that no scenes "offensive to the Negro people" would be included in the film, but the disappointing result proved otherwise, with blacks represented as jovial chicken-chasers who cannot stand to be away from their beloved masters.⁽¹¹⁾

The economic facts of life in movie-making had always dictated that a motion picture had to at least break even to be worthwhile. During times of uncertainty such as the Thirties, few audiences were in the mood to see their cherished impressions of the Old South warped by ideologues. Black directors outside the mainstream like Oscar Micheaux helped to address on screen the vital issues of racial discrimination for a decidedly non-white audience, but if stereotypes were to be recognized as something pernicious and therefore unwanted, efforts to get rid of them would have to come from the Establishment.⁽¹²⁾

The old stereotypes rooted in the plantation myth survived the Second World War unscathed, with the feisty Hattie McDaniel again relishing her professional mammy role in Disney's 1946 *Song of the South*. This, too, was panned by activists as a "dangerously glorified picture of slavery" even though the story, based on Joel Chandler Harris's collected Negro folk tales, took place after the Civil War and did have a legitimate claim to some semblance of authenticity. Nevertheless, changing social and political agendas promised new uses of the Civil War era Negro on the silver screen, uses that were as propagandistic as they were titillating.⁽¹³⁾

It was a matter of time before the trauma of the Second World War would manifest itself in a rethinking of stereotypes. African Americans had become even more intolerant of racial discrimination after over a million of them had worn a military uniform in the name of democratic principles they had been historically denied. One black veteran was Oliver Brown of Topeka, Kansas, whose Supreme Court fight on behalf of his daughter in 1954 led to the end of constitutionally sanctioned racial segregation in

public schools.⁽¹⁴⁾ In the 1960s the American South's ugliest face was broadcast on the terrifying new medium of television when civil rights marchers were beaten and hosed by racist police. Internationally, America was spearheading a world crusade against Communist aggression by engaging in an ideological battle with the Soviet Union that borrowed heavily from the cherished rhetoric of freedom for all, equality and democracy. Hollywood did its patriotic duty by brushing off Griffith's dusty old slave and setting him free with grandiloquent paeans to the supremacy of the American way.

There is no more excellent example of this than John Wayne's *The Alamo* (1960), a Cold War propaganda movie presented as a history lesson about the Texan War for Independence. Although not about the Civil War, *The Alamo* supplied a rare moment in the history of westerns by directly addressing that war's central issue: slavery. Realizing there is little hope of escaping death at the hands of a superior Mexican army, Jim Bowie sets his slave free. This magnanimous gesture is received with profound gratitude and the studious acknowledgement that freedom could only be had after a fight. Wayne does not bother with the historical fact that one of the only survivors of the legendary struggle was a black slave, nor does he wish to emphasize that Texas would be admitted to the Union as a slave state (Mexico had legislated against slavery, thus brewing a resistance movement among Texans). Hoping his audience would be as simpleminded as this production, Wayne substitutes hypocrisy for history in enlisting the silver screen's potentials as a forum for summoning the vigilant against the Red Menace.⁽¹⁵⁾

In the growing impatience and rage harbored against racism with a Southern accent came a larger demand for movies approaching slavery from the viewpoint of the slave. This offered the opportunity for greater intimacy with the slave victim (usually a male) and liberated the long forbidden sexual stereotype for audience consumption in the movie theaters. The so-called *blaxploitation* allowed viewers to 'learn' the cruelties of the slave system while simultaneously indulging their prurient curiosity about interracial sex. Consciousness was not all that was raised by *Mandingo*, for example, a critic's turkey released in 1975. Based on the novel by Kyle Onstott, *Mandingo* was in every way the converse of Griffith's portrayals, casting the plantation South in the most tawdry and sordid guise conceivable. *Mandingo* set the pace for future 'serious' inquiries into the barbarity of chattel slavery, emphasizing the dehumanization element of the black man as livestock—a creature to be perfected through genetic breeding. The logic inherited from past movies of the Old South would strongly suggest that where human reproduction played such a central role in a plantation's economy, a pristine and delicate Southern belle would be nowhere in sight. But no, Falconhurst has pretty Blanche Woodford who predictably cannot compete with a particular slave for her husband's attention. She eventually surrenders to temptation and blackmails Mede, a strapping stud '*Mandingo*,' into sleeping with her. She conceives and the horrifying spectacle of a black baby on the day of birth fills the husband with rage. He poisons the wayward Blanche and forces Mede into a boiling cauldron. The gracious and genteel South has now been transformed into an embodiment of evil, glistening with animal passion and scandalous sex.

Where *Mandingo* 'succeeded' was in arousing new emotions on an old theme, yet these emotions did not coincide with the lofty-sounding promises of historical integrity in its promotional literature. *Mandingo* had all the "uncompromising honesty" of a Playboy photographer's airbrush.⁽¹⁶⁾

Historically popular *Birth of a Nation* and *Gone with the Wind* notwithstanding, the Civil War has not been a guaranteed subject for box office success despite the enduring interest level in this chapter of American history. Television enjoyed a smashing success with Alex Haley's *Roots* and followed with a series of productions on the plantation theme which fell far from pleasing everyone, either by being heavy-handed and preachy (e.g., *Freedom Road*, 1979), or serving to honor the tired moonlight-and-magnolias slant that slavery was maybe not so bad after all (e.g., *Beulah Land*, 1980). As we have seen, however, productions specifically aimed toward cinema audiences switched from attempting to justify Southern racism to exploiting it for its perceived 'mondo' qualities. Also, a Western setting for Civil War subject matter was a convenient escape from the old plantation, substituting restless Indians and high adventure for focused and polarizing appeals to an audience's sense of guilt or victimization. Still, the expense of producing any kind of Civil War era entertainment necessarily made the undertaking a considerable risk. The formula for success in the movie business, as in all enterprises, is to maximize the product appeal through assessing what the greatest number of people demand.

Happily, the latest significant mainstream motion picture about the Civil War has given it a new historical context which handily disposes of the classic African American image as loyal slave,

scoundrel or sex symbol. *Glory* (1989) is a lesson in African American history which honors the bravery and humanity of those blacks who served the Union cause. It also cashes in on a long ignored black audience starving for wholesome feel-good entertainment. *Glory* is directed by Edward Zwick and tells the story of young Col. Robert Gould Shaw and his heroic efforts recruit and train the Federal Army's first black regiment—the 54th Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry. Granted that its premise is a spotless study in political correctness, *Glory* needs to parade the old stereotypes before the audience so that it might be able to convincingly destroy them.

An example is the scene where the shipment of .57 caliber Enfield rifle muskets has finally arrived at the training camp. The excitement and pleasure of getting a gun trigger a burst of levity reminiscent of the farcical minstrel era “Raw Recruits.” Still without their uniforms, slap-happy Negroes shuffle and strut the compound playing soldier, aiming their unloaded weapons recklessly at each other and feigning death as they chuckle and guffaw. Col. Shaw, played by Matthew Broderick, wears a studied look of reserved apprehension as he watches the mischief, hinting that task of making fighting men out of Negroes may be more grueling than he had expected.

Glory's stereotypes are also aimed at illustrating intraracial relations. The cultural diversity of African Americans is highlighted in a scene where the bespectacled and bookish Thomas Searles, an educated Northerner, is unable to understand the dialect of his rural Southern ‘brothers.’ Searles also earns the contempt of the defiant and unmanageable Trip. Played by Denzel Washington,

Trip spares little venom in revealing that suspicion of 'uppity niggers' was not just the white man's passion. Posturing for a fight with Searles, he admonishes: "Let me tell you somethin', boy. You can march like the white man. You can talk like him. You can learn his songs. You can even wear his suits. But you ain't nothing to him but an ugly-assed chimp in a blue suit." Such an utterance would have translated beautifully into minstrel parlance. ⁽¹⁹⁾

In a sense, *Glory* is the black American's Alamo movie. It dramatizes a true historical incident in laying claim to the same triumphant heritage of freedom and equality which Wayne rhapsodized as Davy Crockett. And just as the fight at the Alamo supposedly ended when the last man fell, the charge on Fort Wagner led by Col. Shaw was a military disaster that succeeded in glorifying the worthiness, honor, courage and determination of his men. From the point of view of black performers, Denzel Washington's Oscar for his role as Trip, the 'bad nigger' turned freedom fighter, symbolized the advances made since Hattie McDaniel won Hollywood's heart for her convincing devotion to Miss Scarlett—and not to the Underground Railroad.

As a movie rapturously sympathetic to African Americans, *Glory* relied on racial stereotypes in order to index the development of characters who must rise above them in the noble fight for freedom. What would the dramatic impact have been without the initial child-like responses to being issued a gun? How convincing would Trip have been had he displayed envy for or indifference to Thomas Searles's 'white' ways? Stereotypes die hard as they are useful to scriptwriters in making a story believable, not necessarily because they are racist, but because they offer a base upon which

to develop the individual and, in so doing, smother the stereotype. It is when this process does not take place—and individuality is forced to conform to a particular formulaic expectation that stereotypes become offensively racist.

Surely, the history of the Civil War on screen has been a quid pro quo trade-off between slave and master, with each bearing the burdens of the exaggerated benevolent and malevolent according to the dictates of the masses. Those looking for more sinister sources of racial stereotyping will trace them to the arrogance of Establishment Power (i.e., Hollywood boardrooms) which manipulates popular tastes against the Other to serve its particular ideological whims. But I will contend that no institution is so simple and single-minded as to deceive its public into devouring such images wholesale. Racial stereotyping would exist in the nation's folklore even without the self-important media to put it there. Conversely, the media can do much to expose and negate stereotypes as was done in *Glory*.

What is the ideal in making movies on historical themes? How close can a director come to telling the truth? Who is capable of discerning what truth is? In creating the African American's image in 19th-century historical period movies, we have seen shallow cut-outs fill in the cracks of whatever particular truth was being addressed—a political or romanticized vision shared only by the dominating powers. Yet these powers have clearly shifted due to war, social mobility and redistributions of wealth which alter attitudes toward race and history even as there are those who ardently continue to embrace the 'truths' of *Birth of a Nation*. Hollywood, therefore, cannot be accused of assuming a dictator role over

popular culture as it does not invent—only imitate. The customers rule the marketplace. It is they who create and consume the Sambos and Mandingos. It is they who ultimately decide the efficacy of the motion picture as an interpretive tool in examining this fascinating and dreadful epoch of the American past.

NOTES

- (1) Terry Ramsaye, "Motion Picture," *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1951 ed., p. 856.
- (2) Robert C. Toll, *Blacking Up: The Minstrel Show in Nineteenth-Century America*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), pp. 113-128.
- (3) Marilyn Kern-Foxworth, *Aunt Jemima, Uncle Ben and Rastus: Blacks in Advertising, Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow*, (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 1994), p. 79. The first six stereotypes listed are selected from 19 specified by Lawrence Reddick (1994).
- (4) Nina Silber, *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865-1900*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press) . pp. 135-36, 188.
- (5) Edward D.C. Campbell, Jr., *The Celluloid South: Hollywood and the Southern Myth*, (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1981), pp. 37-39.
- (6) David Wark Griffith, dir., *His Trust: The Faithful Devotion and Self-Sacrifice of An Old Negro Servant*, with Dell Henderson and Claire McDowell, Biograph, 1911.
- (7) Campbell, pp. 46-58; Joan L. Silverman, "Birth of a Nation," *Encyclopedia of Southern Culture*, (Chapel Hill: University of

- Nouth Carolina Press, 1989 ed.) p. 947.
- (8) Campbell, p. 62; John M. Cassidy, *Civil War Cinema: A Pictorial History of Hollywood and the War between the States*, (Missoula: Pictorial Histories, 1993) p. 13.
- (9) Carlton Moss, "An Open Letter to Mr. Selznick," *Gone with the Wind-as Book and Film*, ed. Richard Harwell, (New York: Paragon House, 1987), p. 159.
- (10) Moss, pp. 157-58.
- (11) Moss, p. 159; Campbell, p. 124.
- (12) Thomas Cripps, "Black Film Images," *Encyclopedia of Southern Culture*, pp. 155-56.
- (13) Campbell, pp. 149-53.
- (14) Morton Sosna, "World War" *Encyclopedia of Southern Culture*, p. 675.
- (15) John Wayne, dir., *The Alamo*, with John Wayne and Richard Widmark, United Artists, 1960.
- (16) Earl Picard, "Blaxploitation," *Encyclopedia of Southern Culture*, p. 916. Christopher D. Geist, "Mandingo," *Encyclopedia of Southern Culture*, p. 965-66. Campbell, p. 194.
- (17) Edward Zwick, dir., *Glory*, with Matthew Broderick and Denzel Washington, Tri-Star Pictures, 1989.