Bernard J. Armada

"An Important Piece of American History:" Memory, *Malcolm X*, and African American Collective Identity

Text reviewed:

Malcolm X.
Warner Brothers,
1993.

"History is always written wrong, and so always needs to be rewritten" (1932, p. 45), claimed the philosopher George Santayana in the early 1900s. Building upon this claim scholars Robert O'Meally and Genevieve Fabre inform us that "blacks and whites—historians as well as other professionals, along with front-porch observers—have been engaged in a struggle over what to say about America's past and how to say it" (1994, p. 3). But the struggle over "what to say and how to say it" reflects much more than a mere commitment to telling the "true" story, if there is such a thing. History, as a reconstruction of what is no longer, invites us to both remember and forget insofar as it emphasizes certain dimensions of the past while at the same time trivializing, or even ignoring, others. These emphases and simultaneous de-emphases may have profound effects on the ways in which individual, group, and national memories and identities are formed.

For African Americans the shaping and reshaping of memory is of particular significance, since their experiences and contributions were, for years, conspicuously absent from the discourse regarding American history. It appears as though the long record of slavery and oppression which blacks have been subjected to is something that white America would prefer to forget. Historian Benjamin Quarles adds that "(a)long with many other denials since he arrived on these shores, the black American has until recently been denied a past. The consequent damage to his psyche can hardly be imagined" (1988, p. 217). Thus, the flawed sense of personal

and collective identity resulting from the omission of African Americans from public memory is but one example of the debilitating effects of institutionalized racism.

In recent decades, however, especially since the Black Power and Black Arts movements of the 1960s, there has been an increasing interest in illuminating the experiences and contributions of African Americans and their long struggle for freedom, dignity, and fulfillment in the United States. What is at issue here is not merely an attempt to "set the record straight" by placing a few famous African Americans like Frederick Douglass and Harriet Tubman alongside George Washington and Abraham Lincoln in the pantheon of "Great American Heroes." More importantly, as Pierre Nora states, "[t]he quest for memory is the search for one's history" (1989, p. 13). Closely related to the African American quest for memory and history is an attempt to strengthen a collective sense of selfhood that has been ignored, belittled, and damaged by white America since colonial times through to the present. Through the shaping and reshaping of history, then, there follows a shaping and reshaping of collective memory and, consequently, a shaping and reshaping of individual and collective identity.

One recent instance in which the shaping of collective memory and identity was called into question had to do with the controversial debates that preceded Warner Brothers' 1992 release of Spike Lee's biographical epic film, *Malcolm X*, which Michael Eric Dyson referred to as "the most important cultural representation of the black hero yet created" (1995, p. 128). Since his assassination in 1963, Malcolm X has been regarded by many African Americans as the epitome of black resistance to white oppression. After his release from prison in 1952, Malcolm became a minister and main spokesman for the Nation of Islam—a Muslim, black separatist organization headed by Elijah Muhammad, who preached that the white man was the devil. Malcolm, in speaking out defiantly and decisively against racist white America and its exploitation of black people, expressed the feelings of many African Americans who had grown increasingly frustrated with race relations in the United States. In addition, the legacy of Malcolm's dramatic transformation from street hustler to ascetic minister continues to inspire present generations of young African Americans to view him as a model of black humanity. "He is the perfect hero," says Arnold Rampersad (1994), "his wisdom is surpassing, his courage definitive, his sacrifice messianic" (p. 119). Therefore, it is understandable that, along with the anticipation of Warner Brother's *Malcolm X*, there arose an intensely heated debate over who had the authority to memorialize Malcolm and whether his image as an African American cultural hero would be sufficiently characterized in the public sphere of popular culture.

The controversy over *Malcolm X* began when Spike Lee spoke out publicly against Warner Brothers' choice of Norman Jewison to direct the film, arguing that a white director was not capable of adequately portraying the life of a black man and, therefore, should not be given the opportunity to do so. Soon after, Jewison resigned from the project and Lee took over as

director of the film, which then sparked a new wave of oppositional rhetoric from those African Americans who became concerned that Lee would emphasize the "wrong" aspects of Malcolm's life. Prominent leaders in the African American community such as poet/activist Amiri Baraka (formerly LeRoi Jones) and Nation of Islam minister Louis Farrakhan voiced their concerns about Lee's capabilities and/or artistic intentions in making *Malcolm X*. Moreover, as production progressed, Lee came into conflict with Warner Brothers executives over the cost and length of the film. Lee, who argued for a larger budget and a longer running time, attributed the conflict to powerful white racists' refusal to acknowledge the importance of Malcolm X's legacy to African American audiences.

As Dyson correctly notes, "[s]atisfying the varying constituencies that have a stake in shaping the future's memory of Malcolm is no small task, and it is the sort that few directors have faced" (1992, p. 1187). At the core of the conflict surrounding the memory of Malcolm is the notion of African American collective identity. Therefore, in this essay I argue that the jumble of voices mixing and clashing over the production of *Malcolm X* reflects a concern over collective memory and, more importantly, African American collective identity. At the core of the issue is a debate over how Malcolm will be appropriated in film to serve the collective identity concerns of African Americans in the present and future. Before examining this debate more closely it will first be helpful to discuss in greater detail the phenomenon of collective memory and how it relates specifically to African American identity.

COLLECTIVE MEMORY AND COLLECTIVE IDENTITY

Although many scholars differ in their use of the term "collective memory," some offer conceptualizations that are especially helpful for exploring the *Malcolm X* debates from a critical perspective. Sociologist Barry Schwartz, for example, describes collective memory as "society's retention and loss of information about its past" (1991, p. 302). He goes on to argue that

> [e]very member of society, even the oldest, learns most of what he knows about the past through social institutions—through oral chronicles preserved by tradition, written chronicles stored in archives, and commemorative activities (making portraits, statues, and shrines, collecting relics, naming places, observing holidays and anniversaries) that enable institutions to distinguish significant events and people from the mundane, and so infuse the past with moral meaning. (p. 302)[1]

Because most of what a person knows of society's past is acquired through artifacts which document or commemorate, rather than through direct experiences with historical events or figures, the choosing and shaping of these artifacts by those with the power to do so (such as historians, politicians, and other cultural elites) must certainly have profound implications for our way of knowing and being in the world. The shaping of collective memory is not merely a method of restoring an "objective" sense of the past, for "the past," in an objective, factual sense, is still perhaps as varied

as there are people in the world to remember and interpret it. More importantly, what and who is remembered and passed on, as well as what and who is forgotten and left behind, may have "a necessary or intrinsic relevance to ethical and political action in the present" (Knapp, 1989, p. 124).

The artifacts of remembrance—museums, archives, cemeteries, festivals, anniversaries, treaties, depositions, monuments, sanctuaries, fraternal orders—are what Pierre Nora refers to as *lieux de memoire* or, roughly, sites of memory. According to Nora, *lieux de memoire*—artificial sites of memory—exist because there are no longer *milieux de memoire*—real environments of memory. *Lieux de memoire* are "places" where memories "converge, condense, conflict, and define relationships between past, present, and future... [they exist] because we no longer live in a world suffused with memory or fully committed to overarching ideological narratives...defining what is supposed to be memorable" (Davis and Starn, 1989, p. 3). Because we live in a world which no longer encourages spontaneous, naturally occurring commemorative activities like traditions and rituals, we must deliberately create archives, cemeteries, and monuments which, Nora argues, "are the boundary stones of another age, illusions of eternity.. they mark the rituals of a society without rituals"(1989, p. 12).

Lieux de memoire are also places in which the shaping and reshaping of individual and collective identity occurs. That is, the choice and creation of a commemorative artifact functions to constitute, in particular ways, the identities of those for whom it speaks. As John R.Gillis states, "[t]he core meaning of any individual or group identity, namely, a sense of sameness over time and space, is sustained by remembering; and what is remembered is defined by the assumed identity" (1994, p. 3). Memories and identities are social constructions of reality. Therefore, as such, when a commemorative artifact is created we should ask: By whom? For whom? Under what circumstances? And, as O'Meally and Fabre ask: "In what sense is what is remembered a crucial part of what is to be passed on to future generations" (1994, p. 6)? Conversely, in what sense is what is *forgotten* a crucial part of what is to be passed on to future generations? These questions are particularly important for marginalized groups like African Americans and Native Americans, whose experiences and contributions have typically been written out of United States history.

In his essay, "Identity, Heritage, and History," David Lowenthal explains how groups cling to their respective heritages as a way of distinguishing themselves from others:

> We confront one another armored in identities whose likenesses we ignore or disown and whose differences we distort or invent to emphasize our own superior worth. Lauding our own legacies and excluding or discrediting those of others, we commit ourselves to endemic rivalry and conflict. (1994, p. 41).

Lieux de memoire, then, are often the end-products of struggles over the construction of collective memory and identity. So, for example, Nathan Rapoport's Warsaw Ghetto Monument, which memorializes both the hero-

ism of Jewish resistance to the Nazis and the complete annihilation of the Jews in Warsaw, was the end result of struggles regarding whether the Warsaw ghetto uprising was worthy of remembrance, who would be qualified to create a satisfactory monument, where the monument would be situated, and from whom would the money come to fund such a memorial.[2] Also, it should be remembered that *lieux de memoire* are rarely, if ever, static remains of the conflicts that bore them into existence. On the contrary, commemorative artifacts continue to be rhetorical sites of struggle as future generations, different groups of people, and new historical circumstances enter the dialogue with fresh perspectives and identities to uphold. Sites of memory, then, are always subject to change according to ever-evolving situational, ideological, and political circumstances.

We now turn to Spike Lee's movie to contemplate how the *Malcolm X* debates are sites of struggle over African American collective identity. As a *lieu de memoire*, the film has important implications for how Malcolm X will be celebrated as well as how the appropriation of his image functions to shape African American identity. Nora insightfully acknowledges that

> [t]he defense, by certain minorities, of a privileged memory that has retreated to jealously protected enclaves in this sense intensely illuminates the truth of *lieux de memoire*—that without commemorative vigilance, history would soon sweep them away. We buttress our identities upon such bastions, but if what they defended were not threatened, there would be no need to build them. (p. 12)

The *Malcolm X* debates reflect how certain dimensions of history may be emphasized and embellished while others are downplayed and even ignored in order to reshape contemporary African American collective identity. Spike Lee's resurrection of *Malcolm X* demonstrates the ways in which figures from the past may be appropriated to serve the identity needs and ego concerns of those in the present and future.

THE STRUGGLE OVER THE RECONSTRUCTION OF *Malcolm X*

The earliest conflict over the cinematic reconstruction of *Malcolm X* arose in 1990, when Spike Lee publicly protested Warner Brothers' choice of Norman Jewison, a white Canadian, to direct the film.[3] Lee expressed "serious reservations about a Caucasian directing a film this important to our [black peoples'] existence in this country" (1992, p. 9). He was quoted in the *Washington Post* as saying, "I have a big problem with Norman Jewison directing *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*...That disturbs me deeply. It's wrong with a capital W. Blacks have to control these films" (Trescott, 1991, p. G9). This reinsertion of Malcolm X into the public sphere was but the beginning of a long, heated debate over who deserved the right to shape his memory.

In effect, Lee's protests are a claim to cultural authority and African American identity. In her book, *Covering the Body: The Kennedy Assassination, the Media, and the Shaping of Collective Memory*, Barbie Zelizer explains that "[p]atterns of authority are worked out in collective memory,

where they take on specific preferred forms that are determined by their retellers" (1992, p. 3). With this in mind, Lee implies that any white director would be unqualified to retell Malcolm's story (for numerous reasons, such as not living the so-called "black" experience, for coming from a privileged racial class, for possessing racist attitudes) and, consequently, would distort and irresponsibly shape society's collective memory of him. Ironically, Lee underscores his status as a member of an underprivileged, historically powerless race specifically as a means of empowering himself, that is, as a means of claiming his right to cultural authority over Malcolm's memory.

On another level, a political/symbolic one, Lee also argues that a white person simply should not (or in other words, does not deserve the right to) have the authority to speak for *Malcolm X* and, by extension, the African American community. He implies that if Norman Jewison was to direct *Malcolm X*, it would be just another instance in which black identity was misshaped, distorted, and exploited by powerful whites. Lowenthal states that "[t]o forge identity and buttress self-esteem, each people vaunts or invents a distinctive legacy...many..claim exclusive rights to heritage traits and emblems they consider crucial to their identity" (1994, p. 46). Spike Lee, alluding to the importance of African American identity, implies that it would be sacrilegious to allow *Malcolm X*—the voice of black rage, the embodiment of black resistance, the man viewed by many as an African American cultural hero for his very refusal to allow himself or his people to be co-opted by whites—to ultimately be spoken for and appropriated by a white director. According to Lee, to allow Malcolm's legacy to be shaped (or misshaped) by whites would be the ultimate insult to his struggles and achievements. Such arguments highlight the dynamics of race, class, and identity which Lee used in order to claim cultural and artistic authority over the reshaping of Malcolm X's legacy and our memory of him in the present.

Ironically, shortly after he was hired by Warner Brothers to direct *Malcolm X* (after Norman Jewison relinquished the assignment), Spike Lee found himself coming under similar attacks by leaders in the African American community. For example, black nationalist poet Amiri Baraka and other black community leaders formed The United Front to Preserve the Legacy of Malcolm X, an organization designed specifically to protest what was in their view Spike Lee's inevitable distortion of Malcolm on film. On 3 August 1991, before filming began, Baraka led a protest rally in Harlem, during which he was quoted as saying: "We will not let Malcolm X's life be trashed to make middle class Negroes sleep easier... Mr.Lee was never a part of the struggle of inner city blacks and... made films that perpetuated negative stereotypes" (Nieves, 1991, p. B1). Baraka and his fellow protestors dreaded the possibility that, because of Lee's bourgeois upbringing and stereotypical characterization of black men in previous film, Malcolm's image would be sanitized and distorted. In particular, Baraka feared that Lee would overemphasize Malcolm's experiences as a street hustler in Harlem

and misrepresent both his break with Elijah Muhammad and assassination at the Audubon Ballroom in February of 1965.[4]

Similar to Lee's protestation over Jewison, Baraka's dispute with Lee represents a struggle over claims to cultural authority over Malcolm's legacy. What is interesting about Baraka's complaint is his rhetorical positioning of Lee as a bourgeois black filmmaker who lacks the necessary class "qualifications" to sufficiently shape Malcolm's memory; hence, Baraka's charges that Lee "was never a part of the struggle of inner city blacks" and came from an upper-middle class family. Baraka even goes so far as to characterize Lee as being complicitous with black conservatives, whom many African Americans view as traitors, Uncle Toms, or what *Malcolm X* would have referred to as "House Negroes." In commenting on Lee's work, he identified the filmmaker as participating in a "retrograde" movement that would ultimately harm the African American community: "To me he represents the same trend of Tom Sowell, Clarence Thomas, and Walter Williams" (Trescott, 1991, p. G8). By situating Lee among black conservatives infamous for their reputation as turncoats to the masses of African Americans, Baraka characterizes him as equal to or even worse than white racists who would pervert Malcolm's image for personal gain.

Another voice of concern over the reconstruction of Malcolm X came from Minister Louis Farrakhan, spiritual disciple of Elijah Muhammad and national representative of the Nation of Islam. Spike Lee interviewed Farrakhan on 25 July 1991 in order to, as he claimed, "find out the essence of the man [Malcolm X]" (Lee, 1992, p. 33). It seems likely, however, that Lee was more concerned about offending members of the Nation of Islam and wanted to learn Farrakhan's opinion of a film designed to retell Malcolm X's story. When Malcolm was assassinated in 1965, three members (or former members) of the Nation of Islam were convicted of the murder. Since that time, there have been substantial, though unproven, allegations that Elijah Muhammad, Farrakhan, and the Nation of Islam played a part in Malcolm's assassination. The reconstruction of Malcolm's murder in the movie was obviously a tender area for both Farrakhan and Lee. In the July 1991 interview, Farrakhan said:

> as important as the movie could be, the consequences of the mishandling of this film could be very, very grave for all concerned...there...exists the possibility of this film being used in a very ugly and sinister way...The enemy of all of us in this room, all our people, in my humble judgment, would like to see this film used to make deep schisms, deeper schisms in our community. The film has the great possibility of healing wounds that prior schisms have made. (Lee, 1992, p. 50)

Farrakhan's statements reflect a concern over the potentially negative pedagogical functions of the shaping of Malcolm X and the Nation of Islam. As a *lieu de memoire*, what could the film teach audiences if it was to portray Malcolm as the victim of a jealous vindictive attack by the Nation of Islam? Imagine Lee's power to alter public memory and African American identity if he was to have the order for Malcolm's assassination pass through the lips of Elijah Muhammad's character!

Reflecting upon this, one is reminded of Maurice Halbwachs, who described memories as photographs people take to remind them of the past. Historian David Thelen recounts Halbwachs's metaphor of the photograph, stating that people selectively choose what they wish to retain from the past: "In discussing which pictures to frame or place in albums, people literally decide what image of their pasts they want to show others... In the course of taking a picture or creating an album they decide what they want to remember and how they want to remember it" (1989, p. 1122). The concerns of both Amiri Baraka and Louis Farrakhan (among others) reflect the importance and complexity of *Malcolm X* as a *lieu de memoire* that has enormous potential to shape national memory and African American collective identity in the present and future. As Thelen states, "[s]ince people's memories provide security, authority, legitimacy, and finally identity in the present, struggles over the possession and interpretation of memories are deep, frequent, and bitter" (1989, p. 1126). The struggle over the ultimate form which Malcolm was to take onscreen, to a significant degree, slights the issue of historical accuracy in favor of an emphasis on the film's pedagogical importance for directing positive action in the future and affirming/elevating the identities of those who will benefit the most from such affirmations.

The final publicized struggle over the production of *Malcolm X* occurred between Spike Lee and Warner Brothers executives, who clashed over the length and budget of the film. Lee, who insisted that he needed at least $33 million to make the film, accused the white executives at Warner Brothers of being ignorant racists for their refusal to go beyond their initial $20 million proposal: "let's be honest, Hollywood is predominantly male and Jewish, and all they think is that Malcolm X was anti-Semitic and hated white people and advocated violence" (Lee, 1992, p. 29).[5] According to Lee, Warner Brothers did not want to invest more than $20 million because the film would have difficulty attracting white audiences:

> I think it's a racist assumption that white America will not go to see a black film that's not a comedy, or that doesn't have singing and dancing, or that doesn't star Eddie Murphy. I think there are racist tendencies that keep this glass ceiling on the amount of money that is spent on black films, to produce them or to market and promote them. (Crowdus and Georgakas, 1993, p. 24).

Lee's claims reveal that, while the white executives viewed *Malcolm X* as primarily a money-making venture, he appreciated more deeply its importance as a *lieu de memoire* (as well as a project that could either make or break his career). Lee appeared to be more concerned with securing enough money and screen time to do justice to the complexity of Malcolm's life than he was with ticket sales. However, unfortunately, as Jesse Rhines posits, in order to compromise with Warner Brothers, "Lee dampened every controversial aspect of Malcolm's life, not least the pan-Africanism and proto-socialism of his final year" (1993, p. 18). Therefore, the conflict between black and white over the filming of *Malcolm X* is a testimonial to

the fact that *lieux de memoire* are sites of struggle in which the politics of power and domination almost always infuse the shaping of collective memory and identity.

CONCLUSION

I have argued in this essay that the debates surrounding the production of Spike Lee's *Malcolm X* illustrate a struggle over cultural authority and the shaping of African American collective identity insofar as the film is viewed as a *lieu de memoire*. Pedagogically, the debates reflect a concern over the power of film as a means of reconstructing the past in such a way as to have significant rhetorical effects on contemporary audiences. Thelen states that "[t]he struggle for possession and interpretation of memory is rooted in the conflict and interplay among social, political, and cultural interests and values in the present" (1989, p. 1127). Each voice in the debate, then,— including Warner Brothers executives' seemingly apathetic stance toward African American concerns—reflects the politics involved in reconstructing a figure from the past who, because of who he was, also functions to shape identity and direct action in the future.

But, we may ask, are not all films pedagogical? Does not every film and every newspaper and every magazine function pedagogically in some way or another? The answer is, of course, yes. Absolutely. However, as the first blockbuster motion picture directed by a black man and *about* a controversial black man, *Malcolm X* is special. As a representation of a part of history which many white Americans and some black Americans would like to forget, or erase, or shape differently, *Malcolm X* is special. Spike Lee knew this too, which is one of the reasons why he shamelessly promoted the film with "X" items such as baseball caps, T-Shirts, and jackets, and said in an interview: "We feel this is an important piece of American history and people, especially young kids, need to see this film. A whole generation of young people are being introduced to Malcolm X" (Crowdus and Georgakas, 1993, p. 24). Thus, the controversies and struggles surrounding the making of *Malcolm X* are just as interesting, illuminating, and important as the film itself. And, regardless of whether each of the clashing voices has been pacified at the film's conclusion, it is important that *Malcolm X* does exist, if not for any other reason than for its inadvertent pedagogical function—its potential to arouse critical thought, to raise questions, and encourage further inquiry into the life of a man whom so many regard as the spokesman of African American strength and pride.

Notes

1. Schwartz also describes collective memory as "a metaphor that formulates society's retention and loss of information about its past in the familiar terms of individual remembering and forgetting. Part of the collective memory is, in fact, defined by shared individual memories, but only a small fraction of society's past is experienced in this way" (1991, p. 302).

2. For more insight into the Warsaw Ghetto Monument and other Holocaust Memorials, see James E.Young's excellent book, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*.
3. According to Jacqueline Trescott, a writer for the *Washington Post*. "efforts to make a *Malcolm X* movie have been stalled for twenty-four years. James Baldwin, Arnold Perl, David Bradley, Charles Fuller, David Mamet, and Calder Willingham all worked on scripts" (p. G8). The Warner Brothers version of *Malcolm X* was Spike Lee's rewrite of a script originally written by James Baldwin and Arnold Perl over twenty years earlier, which was based on Malcolm X and Alex Haley's *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*.
4. In an editorial written after the film's release, Baraka stated that "what I feared he would do to Malcolm's life has been shown very clearly. If anything, Spike has done even more damage than I expected." In particular, Baraka stated that "[a]mong the most damning aspects of the film is its willingness to blame the Nation of Islam for murdering Malcolm X, thereby absolving the government (the CIA and FBI)" (1992, p. G5).
5. In order to make up the difference between his allotted $20 million budget and his required $33 million budget, Lee sold the film's foreign rights for $8.5 million, invested a sizable portion of his $3 million salary into the film, and received donations from prominent African Americans such as Oprah Winfrey, Bill Cosby, Magic Johnson, and Michael Jordan (Crowdus and Georgakas, 1993, p. 24; Simpson, 1992, p. 71)

Works Cited

Baraka, A. "Selling Out Malcolm and His Memory." *Washington Post* 22 Nov. 1992: G1+.

Crowdus, G. and Georgakas, D. "Our Film is Only a Starting Point: An Interview with Spike Lee." *Cineaste* 19 (1993): 20–24.

Davis, N. Z. and Starn, R. "Introduction." *Representations* 26 (1989): 1–6.

Dyson, M. E. *Making Malcolm: The Myth and Meaning of Malcolm X*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

—— "Malcolm X: The man, the myth, the movie." *Christian Century* 109 (1992): 1186–1195.

Gillis, J. R. Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship." *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Ed. J. R. Gillis. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994. 3–24.

Knapp, S. "Collective Memory and the Actual Past." *Representations* 26 (1989): 123–149.

Lee, S. with Wiley, R. *By Any Means Necessary: The Trials and Tribulations of the Making of Malcolm X*. New York: Hyperion, 1992.

Lowenthal, D. "Identity, Heritage, and History." *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Ed. J. R. Gillis. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994. 41–57.

Nieves, E. "Malcolm X: Firestorm Over a Film Script." *New York Times* 9 Aug. 1991, late ed.: B1+.

Nora, P. "Between Memory and History: Lee *Lieux de Memoire*." *Representations* 26 (1989): 7–25.

O' Meally, R. and Fabre, G. "Introduction." *History and Memory in African–American Culture*. Ed. G. Fabre and R. O' Meally. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. 3–17.

Quarles, B. "Black History's Diversified Clientele." *Historical Judgements Reconsidered: Selected Howard University Lectures in Honor of Rayford W.Logan*. Ed. G. R. McNeil and M. R. Winston. Washington: Howard University Press, 1988. 217–229.

Rampersad, A. "The Color of His Eyes: Bruce Perry's *Malcolm* and Malcolm's Malcolm." Ed. J. Wood. *Malcolm X: In Our Own Image*. New York: Doubleday, 1994, 117–134

Rhines, J. "Spike Lee, Malcolm X, and the Money Game: The Compromises of Crossover Marketing." *Cineaste* 19 (1993): 17–18.

Santayana, G. *The Life of Reason, Reason in Science*. New York: Scribener's, 1932.

Schwartz, B. "Iconography and Collective Memory: Lincoln's Image in the American Mind." *Sociological Quarterly* 32 (1991): 302.

Simpson, J. C. "The Battle to Film Malcolm X." *Time* 16 Mar. 1992: 71

Thelen, D. "Memory and American History." *Journal of American History* 75 (1989): 1117–1129.

Trescott, J. "The Battle Over Malcolm X." *Washington Post* 18 Aug. 1991: G1+.

Young, J. E. *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Zelizer, B. *Covering the Body: The Kennedy Assassination, the Media, and the Shaping of Collective Memory.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.