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 criticized 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 Roy Simon Bryce-Laporte’s article (previously unpublished) uses Goffman’s concept of a total institution in his examination of slavery and believes the impact of the slave plantation is “more appropriately understood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


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
Register, who is better remembered for fathering Frederick Jackson Turner. Editor Turner rejected it as being too long.

Apparently Harvey Haskell took the manuscript to Pennsylvania where it remains as a part of the collections of the Pennsylvania Bureau of Archives and History, Harrisburg. About 1881 Harvey published an edited limited edition for private distribution. Daniel Hall, one of Frank’s Dartmouth classmates (1854), after eliminating some of the critical passages, included the letter in a history of the Class of 1854 published in 1898. The Massachusetts Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion reprinted the Dartmouth version in 1908. In the same year the Wisconsin History Commission, which numbered among its members historian Frederick Jackson Turner, issued the unabridged text in an edition of 2,500 copies. A second printing of 2,500 copies was issued by the commission in 1910, and it was included in that year in volume 43 of the Harvard Classics.

The Titusville (Pennsylvania) Herald did a limited printing based on the Wisconsin History Commission’s edition in 1937. The work again appeared under the editorship of Bruce Catton in 1957. It was reprinted from the original Haskell manuscript at Harrisburg by the Titusville Herald in 1963. A paperback reprint of the Catton edition was released in 1969. And now this long publishing history perhaps comes to a conclusion with the Byrne and Weaver biography which includes the original Haskell letter of July 16, 1863.

As a trusted member of the staff of General John Gibbon, commander of the Second Division at Gettysburg, Haskell was in a strategic position to observe and participate in the defense of Cemetery Ridge on the third day. According to Haskell’s account he rallied General Alexander Webb’s Pennsylvania brigade at the crucial point of Major General George E. Pickett’s charge. “Acting General” Haskell also secured support from the brigades commanded by Norman J. Hall and William Harrow.

Members of Webb’s Second Brigade reacted bitterly to Haskell’s account of their retreat at Cemetery Ridge. Admirers of General Daniel E. Sickles also resented Haskell’s strictures. Some critics thought he magnified his own role. Yet, General Gibbon, who was in a position to have an informed opinion, praised “his conspicuous coolness and bravery” in his report and afterwards testified: “I have always thought that to him, more than to any one man, are we indebted for the repulse of Lee’s assault. His personal gallantry in aiding the officers in reforming their overpowered troops was seen and commented upon by many, whilst his quick judgment in using his authority as a staff officer of his absent general in moving assistance to the critical point was admirable” (John Gibbon, Personal Recollections, 153).
Major General Winfield Scott, commander of the Second Corps, joined in Gibbon's commendation of Haskell. And, the final pragmatic judgment in military matters, Haskell was shortly given a jump promotion to the colonelcy of a newly formed Wisconsin regiment.

Haskell provided a detailed contemporary account of what was probably the greatest military engagement ever fought in North America. It will remain a basic document in any appraisal of Gettysburg. The editors have provided an excellent biographical setting which enables the reader to see the man, the soldier, and the chronicler in perspective.

Indiana Historical Bureau, Indianapolis

Hubert H. Hawkins


Outcasts from Evolution is a study of nineteenth century scientific racism in the United States. In this slim volume John S. Haller of Indiana University Northwest discusses the anthropometric research done during the Civil War on black and white soldiers (some deceased) which "proved" black inferiority, the "proofs" of physical and mental inferiority of black people provided by white southern physicians and northern insurance company analysts, and racial views and studies of some leading American natural and social scientists during the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Haller's expressed intent is to show the manner in which scientific opinion "provided a vocabulary and a set of concepts which rationalized and helped to justify the value system upon which the idea of race rested in American thought" (p. x). Unfortunately, he is often unclear in distinguishing "scientific" findings from opinions on race. And one can question his decision to describe as scientists individuals whose opinions were backed by virtually no scientific content. The statistical proofs of the physical and moral inferiority which would lead to the eventual extinction of black people provided by insurance company analyst Frederick Hoffman, for instance, is about as scientific (his major source was the 1890 census) as the evidence marshaled by Hinton R. Helper for his well known racist monograph, Nojoque (1867).

The author is also unclear about what he means by race, for many of his scientists are shown to have held strong views on the inferiority of Irishmen and southeastern Europeans as well. His