

viso, that William Lowndes Yancey introduced his Alabama Platform in February of 1848, not, as Rayback would have it, a year earlier when these doctrines were undeveloped and posed no danger to the South. In his final chapter Rayback describes the disintegration of the major parties which began in 1848, but one must look elsewhere than in *Free Soil* for a complete explanation of this process.

Waterloo Lutheran University,
Waterloo, Ontario

Chaplain W. Morrison

The Debate over Slavery: Stanley Elkins and His Critics. Edited by Ann J. Lane. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971. Pp. vi, 378. Notes. Clothbound, \$8.95; paperbound, \$2.95.)

Stanley Elkins' *Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life* (1959) without question extended the examination of slavery into new areas, and, as Charles Pinderhughes says, Elkins provided a "meaningful involvement of the reader in an intellectual and emotional process which has obviously carried many readers far beyond the content he makes explicit" (p. 104). But Elkins' view that slavery was a closed society, his use of the concentration camp as an analogy for understanding the effects of slavery on the personality of the enslaved, and his assertion that "Sambo" was peculiar to the United States have found several critics. Only Aileen Kraditor has challenged his attribution of an anti-institutional bias to the abolitionists.

The editor in her introduction adequately summarizes the major points Elkins made in his study and briefly states the positions taken by most of the authors included in this volume. She also draws attention to some works, not included, that would be helpful in assessing the total impact of Elkins' ideas. Eleven of the fourteen selections in this work have previously been published.

All the articles contain useful commentary and insight, but the volume contains little in direct support of Elkins. A number of the authors convincingly contend that slavery was a much more open society than Elkins states, some question the appropriateness of the concentration camp analogy, and others present quite different points of view on the Sambo personality. Eugene Genovese says the Sambo—or as he calls it, the slavish—personality existed wherever slavery did, while Earl E. Thorpe thinks the Sambo personality was not the real slave personality. There was much room, he says, for the development of a more complex, better rounded personality, and he feels Elkins gives no real consideration to the great differences that result from being born slave and being born free. Sterling Stuckey

maintains that, on balance, folklore "decisively repudiates the thesis that Negroes *as a group* had internalized Sambo traits . . ." (p. 266). The supporters of Stuckey's assertion that a large number of slaves were able to maintain their essential humanity may well be more numerous than those who subscribe to Elkins' thesis that slavery destroyed the adult personality. It is probably safe to say that Elkins would not have been so sharply criticised if he had contended that slavery *prevented* the development of the adult personality in many blacks.

George Frederickson and Christopher Lasch believe that prisons would have been a better analogy than concentration camps and suggest the utility of Erving Goffman's various strategies of accommodation that are possible in total institutions—but not in concentration camps—in explaining responses of the slaves. These authors, however, quibble unnecessarily over the meaning of "resistance," which to them is a political concept. Roy Simon Bryce-Laporte's article (previously unpublished) uses Goffman's concept of a total institution in his examination of slavery and believes the impact of the slave plantation is "more appropriately understood in terms of alternative and varied behavioral mechanisms used by slaves rather than [by the] prevalence of a fixed personality type derived from the contrived dichotomy of choices between killing or being killed" (p. 270).

These few remarks by no means do justice to this valuable collection which in many ways is more illuminating than the work under discussion. Even so, Elkins should get reflected credit: it was he who served as catalyst for these pieces. A new essay by Elkins concedes little to his critics. He thinks the debate on slavery has taken on qualities similar to the one before his book, and he hopes it may again be reoriented, this time along ideological lines.

Indiana University, Bloomington

Chase C. Mooney

Haskell of Gettysburg: His Life and Civil War Papers. Edited by Frank L. Byrne and Andrew T. Weaver. (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1970. Pp. vii, 258. Map, notes, illustrations, index. \$6.95.)

Lieutenant Franklin A. Haskell's classic account of the Battle of Gettysburg was written as a letter to his brother under date of July 16, 1863. This long "letter," approximately 40,000 words, was obviously intended for publication. After Haskell's death (Cold Harbor, June 3, 1864) his brother submitted the manuscript to Andrew Jackson Turner, editor of the *Portage Wisconsin State*