

August 2008

# AFRO-AMERICAN SLAVERY: NOTES ON NEW TRENDS IN THEORY & RESEARCH

William E. Perkins  
*Temple University*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.umass.edu/cibs>

---

## Recommended Citation

Perkins, William E. (2008) "AFRO-AMERICAN SLAVERY: NOTES ON NEW TRENDS IN THEORY & RESEARCH,"  
*Contributions in Black Studies*: Vol. 3 , Article 3.  
Available at: <http://scholarworks.umass.edu/cibs/vol3/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Afro-American Studies at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Contributions in Black Studies by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@library.umass.edu](mailto:scholarworks@library.umass.edu).

*William E. Perkins*

## AFRO-AMERICAN SLAVERY: NOTES ON NEW TRENDS IN THEORY AND RESEARCH

THE HISTORIOGRAPHY of Afro-American slavery has been filled with controversy paralleled in American intellectual history. From the earliest work of racists like Phillip Bruce and U. B. Phillips to revisionists like Stamp, Elkins and Genovese, the study of the Afro-American slave experience has been bitten by the ideological and polemical bug. Unravelling this controversy seems more complicated than undertaking the serious research and investigation needed to understand the slave experience. To understand the nature of the “new trends in theory and research” we must examine some of the “models” of Afro-American enslavement and the process of culture building and cultural change. Such an examination will allow us to formulate certain questions and problems which inform much of the current research.

Any discussion of “models” of Afro-American slavery must begin with the work of the infamous Georgian, U. B. Phillips. His *magnum opus*, *American Negro Slavery* and his sharply researched essays on the problems of slave labor and the plantation economy have set the tone for much of the “slavery debate,” and have established the kind of theoretical models which have been at the bottom of many studies of Afro-American slavery. American historians have either extended and developed Phillips’ arguments as Eugene Genovese has been doing; or they have challenged them outright as in Kenneth Stamp’s *The Peculiar Institution*. The Phillips’ model of enslavement can be gathered from this representative passage:

The planters had a saying, always of course with an implicit reservation as to limits, that a negro was what a white man made him. The purposes and policies of the masters were fairly uniform, and in consequence the negroes, though with many variants, became largely standardized into the predominate plantation type. The traits which prevailed here were an eagerness for society, music and

merriment, a fondness for display whether of person, dress, vocabulary or emotion, a not flagrant sensuality, a receptiveness toward any religion whose exercises were exhilarating, a proneness to superstition, a courteous acceptance of subordination, an avidity for praise, a readiness for loyalty of a feudal sort, and last but not least, a healthy human repugnance to overwork. "It don't do no good to hurry," was a Negro saying, "'caz you're liable to run by mo'n you overtake." <sup>1</sup>

Phillips here is not being cute, but sees these racial traits as characteristic of Afro-American slave labor. This "healthy human repugnance to overwork" was seen as an innate racial trait to be corrected by the enlightened white planters' leadership and paternalism. His remarks, unsupported by evidence, of course, on the Afro-Americans' emotionalism and superstition are blatantly racist in their refusal to come to grips with different cultural forms. Most importantly, though, for our analysis is his statement that "... a negro was what a white man made him," indicating that Afro-Americans were culturally blank and that they were forced to exercise what Phillips called their "imitative genius." Afro-Americans did not make themselves, but were made and "standardized into the predominate plantation type." Afro-Americans then accepted the authority of the planters with "loyalty of a feudal sort," because they were without a normative order of their own. This theme, though not as grossly stated, continued to inform much of the work on slavery, and though future generations of historians attempted to refute many of Phillips' assertions, they merely ended up supporting them and giving them a new foundation. Nowhere is this more evident than in the work of the revisionists of the last two decades.

The work of Kenneth Stampp, Stanley Elkins and Eugene Genovese reopened the debate on slavery with new vigor and new questions, but their model of Afro-American slavery continued to conform to an analysis of slave culture which was passive, in which slave culture was made by the planters or a kind of shoddy imitation of it. The revisionists' literature began appearing during the era of Civil Rights and then Black Power, an era when Afro-Americans began re-defining themselves in relation to the larger society. Much of the work had a moral, even ideological flavor, as it helped dismantle many of the assumptions held about Afro-Americans in the larger society. This is evident in all of the work under consideration. Let us examine the models of Afro-American slavery contained in Professor Stampp's *The Peculiar Institution*, Elkins' *Slavery*, and Eugene Genovese's *The Political Economy of*

*Slavery.* We are particularly concerned with their respective analyses of slave culture and cultural change. These works continue to stimulate controversy and challenge, evidence of their important impact on American historiography, and much of the newest work may be seen as a response to the “models” outlined below.

Kenneth Stampp’s *The Peculiar Institution* demolished Phillips’ theses on the benign character of Afro-American slavery. In chapters on slave treatment and labor discipline, the law and plantation relations, and an important analysis of slave resistance to the degrading work and working conditions, Stampp pointed out the severe limitations of Phillips’ work, the paucity of evidence to support some of his bold arguments, and his racial bias. The result was a magnificent analysis of the “interior” of the plantation world. But when we come to Stampp’s analysis of Afro-American slave culture, the book reveals serious flaws and deficiencies. Borrowing heavily from the sociologist Robert Park’s analysis of the marginal man and Gunnar Myrdal’s theory of Afro-American pathology, Stampp constructs his model of slave society and slave culture. In the opening pages of the book, Stampp states with minor qualifications, “. . . that innately Negroes are, after all, white men with black skins, nothing more, nothing less.”<sup>2</sup> His analysis of slave culture sees the slaves as passive recipients of planter whims and impressions. Here is a passage from the argument, which criticizes Phillips, but only stands him upside down. It does little to demolish the Phillips model.

So far from slavery acting as a civilizing force, it merely took away from the African his native culture and gave him, in exchange, little more than vocational training. So far from the plantation serving as a school to educate a backward people, its prime function in this respect was to train each new generation of slaves. In slavery the Negro existed in a kind of cultural void. He lived in a twilight zone between two ways of life and was unable to obtain from either many of the attributes which distinguish man from beast. What then filled the leisure hours of the slaves? The answer, in part, is that these *culturally rootless* people devoted much of this time to the sheer pleasure of being idle. Such activities as they did engage in were the simple diversions of a poor untutored folk—activities that gave them physical pleasure or emotional release.<sup>3</sup>

Needless to say we find many similarities between this passage and the conservative racism of Phillips. Both view the Afro-American slave as a kind of *tabula rasa*—a blank mind to receive the impression of the

planters. Afro-Americans, both seem to state, were people without history, with no foundation in the historical process. Though the language has changed considerably, the content remains the same.

Stampp's analysis of the Afro-American family particularly warrants criticism. Much of social history and sociology has depicted the slave family and the modern Afro-American family as disorganized and pathological. With no foundation in law, with paternal authority undercut, and with pervasive promiscuity and illegitimacy, the Afro-American kinship system—the agency of cultural transmission and socialization—was fragile and weak. The consequences of such instability and lack of strength were incalculable and now are part of the ammunition of the social engineers who proclaim that poverty is a result of such cultural disorganization. Stampp's arguments on Afro-American familial organization, echo the sociology of E. Franklin Frazier and Gunnar Myrdal, and support the conclusions reached in Daniel Moynihan's *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*. Afro-Americans again were objects to be created.

Professor Elkins' own work, *Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life*, published in 1959, stirred such a debate that much of the new work in slavery may be seen as a response to many of its arguments and conclusions. His theses on Protestant capitalism, unrestricted by personal morality, initiated an injection of the comparative approach associated with Frank Tannenbaum. He added the insights of psychology, particularly theories of personality development to formulate his theory of the Southern plantation as a "closed system," leaving little room for independent behavior. The "shock" and trauma of the slave trade detached the African from his world, leaving him to be molded into "Sambo," "the predominate plantation type." The adaptation to the "closed system" of the plantation induced in the Afro-Americans infantilization and complete submission to authority.<sup>4</sup> In a recent essay, Professor Elkins has surveyed much of the literature being considered here today agreeing with its emphasis on the process of cultural formation and cultural change, but he concludes that there was damage.

Culture, under such conditions as those of slavery, is not acquired without a price; the social and individual experience of any group with as little power, and enduring such insistent assaults (of cruelty, contempt, and not least, uncertainty), is bound to contain more than the normal residue of pathology. Any theory that is worth anything must allow for this. It must allow, that is, for damage.<sup>5</sup>

Eugene D. Genovese is the last of the revisionists whose theories of slave society we will consider. *The Political Economy of Slavery*, published in 1966, inaugurated a new phase in the controversy over slavery. Genovese, too, brought new theoretical insights to the study of the ante-bellum South, especially those of a Marxist analysis of class and ideology refined by Antonio Gramsci. Like Elkins, he rejected the moralism present in much of the literature and showed an appreciation for the comparative approach. In his work, he was concerned with showing that the uniqueness of the South—its pre-capitalist quality—was attributed to the unchallenged rule of the planter class—who through its control of the economic and political system, the organs of public opinion and the pulpit, as well as their authority over slaves—controlled the destiny of the South. He extended and refined many of Phillips' ideas on the nature of the plantation economy and its effects on Southern agriculture. The lack of a home market and urbanization, technological retardation, soil exhaustion, unproductive labor, and the inherent tendency toward expansion were all keystones of Phillips' analysis. But Genovese's real contribution was his defense of paternalism and his sophisticated revision of it by introducing Gramsci's concepts of hegemony and the organic society. In works which followed *The Political Economy of Slavery*, Genovese continued to build on his model of Phillips, the culmination of which is contained in his recent history of Slave culture, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*.<sup>6</sup> These are works which are central to the newest work on slavery which we will now consider.

Much of the new literature takes issue with what Professor Elkins calls "the damage school" of historians, or those who saw the slavery experience as one of cultural deprivation or disorganization. There is also the ideological or mythological element added to the new emphasis in Afro-American history. Prompted by the urban rebellions of the 1960's and the re-emergence of black nationalism, much of the work focuses on the historical precursors of such trends. Slave heroes were re-awakened to conjure up the legacy of the rebellious slave, of Sambo turned into Nat Turner, who carried the flame of liberation through hundreds of years of oppression. Together, these two tendencies intersect in the latest literature. The emphasis is on the development and flowering of slave culture, of the oppositional element in this slave culture, and of the American adaptation to enslavement. Many historians in the past have viewed the "Peculiar Institution" statically.

As Herbert Gutman remarks,

They all start their histories when the blacks have absorbed the slave experience and been transformed by it. They did not study the period of shock to African norms and the process of transformation.<sup>7</sup>

Much of the history of slavery is written solely from the ante-bellum perspective. The African slave trade, and its specific quality in America, the adaptation of a heterogeneous African population to an Afro-American population are ignored in the past work on slavery. Our views of this have been dramatically changed by Phillip Curtin's *The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census*, a demographic study of the slave trade. His conclusions on the trade to British North America open up a whole set of questions and problems in Afro-American history which are only now receiving attention.<sup>8</sup> He argues that British North America imported the fewest slaves to the New World—about 400,000—and this number would soon grow into the largest slave population, as the slaves reproduced. A whole host of questions arise: what factors accounted for the healthy reproduction of the slave population in the United States; what kind of social organization did the slave population reconstruct to facilitate their reproduction; and what were the differences between the development of the plantation regime in the Southern United States, and other New World colonies like Brazil, Barbados and Jamaica, and Haiti? The publication of Peter Wood's *Black Majority* and Edmund Morgan's *American Slavery, American Freedom* certainly fill a void in this respect, in uncovering some of the early social and institutional history of plantation slavery.

Let us examine these works briefly. Both focus on perhaps the two most important plantation states in pre-revolutionary America, Wood on early South Carolina and Morgan on early Virginia. Both go through great lengths to show how slavery entered these colonies. Both increase our understanding of the forces which shaped America, but they differ in certain emphases. Wood is particularly instructive on certain aspects of the early cultural experience of the first Africans. South Carolina was an extension of the collapsing settlement in Barbados. The greed of the large sugar planters forced the more middling elements to seek new land which the Crown gave them in the 1680's. Packing up their belongings and their slaves, they migrated to the territory immediately south of Virginia where they quickly developed a

new export economy built on the cultivation of rice and the exploitation of slave labor. Africans as slaves were quickly introduced as they proved to be superior to either the unruly white labor or a more resistant Indian population. Though Wood tells us little of how the plantation economy evolved in South Carolina, he does show us how slavery nested in, and became the determining factor in the colony's history. His chapter on the epidemiological factors which led to enslavement are particularly revealing of how historians might go about using the methodologies of cultural biology to understand the effects of disease on the oppressed population. Wood then goes on to show how slaves enjoyed a "tenuous equality" in the early years of the colony's development. Wood finds evidence of widespread inter-racial contact: African and Creole slaves and freedmen, Indians, and low class Europeans appeared to mix freely, both sexually and socially, unrestrained by either law or custom.

Survival on the frontier demanded this kind of free associating, as Nature and the indigenous population were not favorable to the colonists. Such behavior is important, because it indicates that Africans acquired their knowledge of European culture and mores from lower class whites and oppressed Indians, factors which would have an important influence in the shaping of Afro-American culture. Slaves worked in all aspects of the early colonial economy: in the livestock industry, the naval stores industry, as fishermen and Indian traders. Their knowledge of South Carolina fauna and herbs, because of its ecological similarity to their former habitats, allowed these Africans to retain many of their Old World medical practices a still uninvestigated area of research. It shows us the kind of milieu in which cultural exchange and borrowing took place. The retention of these medical practices reveals to us how a small part of the Old World, came to the new World, reminding us of Roger Bastide's point that "the slave ships carried not only men, women and children, but also their gods, beliefs and traditional folklore."<sup>9</sup>

In becoming Afro-Americans, these first Africans had to develop a social and cultural framework capable of holding their beliefs and values, as well as providing the normative foundation for their everyday behavior. This framework was established in the eighteenth century and is only now beginning to receive the attention that it warrants. Wood's analysis of early demographic patterns, when scrutinized more carefully, shows a high rate of natural increase among South Carolina's

early slave population.<sup>10</sup> Such a startling fact that the new Africans were already entering a developing Afro-American slave culture which provided the kind of emotional and psychological security in which normal reproduction could take place. His analysis of the "Gullah dialect" compliments beautifully the brilliant technical study of the language by the Afro-American anthropologist, Lorenzo Turner.<sup>11</sup> It reveals how the early "pidgin" tongues of the slaves were vehicles for the transmission of the culture they brought with them. Wood completes his analysis with an analysis of conditions which led up to the Stono insurrection of 1739, a large uprising led by Angolan slaves. This book is a breakthrough in the literature on slavery and a model study.

Edmund Morgan's study, though very recent, is still a sleeper. One hopes that historians will discover its radical anatomy of early Virginia society and Marxists will welcome its fresh adaptation of class analysis and the movement of class forces in shaping the dynamics of the early plantation economy. It cuts through most of the old colonial history. His analysis of the pre-industrial culture of the early Virginia settlers gives us a crucial peek at what that world must have been like. The settlers were not prepared for carving out settlements in the wilderness and constantly resorted to enforcing the labor of first the indigenous population, then of thousands of indentured servants and finally of African slaves. The introduction of slavery into Virginia during the chaotic years of the 1660's and 1670's drove a wedge into the fueling class conflict between planter and aspiring servant. As African slaves entered the society, the smoldering class conflict between white planter and white servant was extinguished. Out of this white unity to protect Virginia society against the racial menace came the tradition of Jeffersonian democracy, the animus of the philosophy of the American revolution and the American nation state. This is one of the most important books published in American history in a long time and no doubt has been particularly upsetting to consensus historians of early American history.

Eugene Genovese's *Roll, Jordan, Roll* is the culmination of many years of research into the ante-bellum South, and the product of sophisticated theoretical analysis. A detailed examination of this work is impossible here,<sup>12</sup> but an analysis of Genovese's model of slave culture is necessary to see how it assists us in uncovering "the world the slaves made." As in past work, Genovese opens his *magnum opus* with

an analysis of the planter class and the ideology of paternalism. More refined and a lot sharper, Genovese has hardly retreated from the positions of his early *The Political Economy of Slavery*. The Southern slave system represented slavery in its purest form since it was a social system conditioned on the mutual acceptance of paternalism by both master and slave. The slaves translated paternalism into their own doctrine: the notion of customary rights. This internalization of paternalism allowed slaves to develop “. . . their most powerful defense against the dehumanization implicit in slavery.” For slaves the acceptance of paternalism represented “. . . the belief that a harsh and unjust social order is preferable to the insecurities of no order at all.” Slaves also, through their doctrine of customary rights developed a complementary concept of reciprocal duties, of obligations masters had to slaves. Paternalism was total in creating a society in which acceptance of authority was complete.<sup>13</sup>

In his subsequent analysis of the forms of slave culture, we find how pervasive is the paternal impulse. Slave religion is dissected brilliantly, but it is a religion of compromise and resignation, offering little in the arena of political or ideological affairs. Their religion merely conformed to the vision the planters had of it. Planters saw slave religion as social control, and promptly blocked and restricted any evidence of independence. Lacking a prophetic tradition, slave religion yielded to planter control, and Afro-American culture was still determined by the whims of the planters. Genovese’s interesting remarks on labor routine still refuse to acknowledge the only power the slaves had: the power to withhold their labor.

The actual work rhythm of the slaves, then, had to be hammered out as a compromise between themselves and their masters. The masters held the upper hand, but the slaves set limits as best they could.

The black work ethic is seen as merely re-enforcing the control of the planters over the slaves. The “Mammy” seems more sentimental romanticism in the tradition of Phillips, than of sophisticated Marxist analysis. Reviving Frazier’s old argument that privileged slaves carried the culture of the Big House “down” to the quarters, Genovese writes “the house servants appear to have been the primary agents for the cultural fusion of Africa and Europe. . . .” The chapters on kinship, courting patterns, parenthood, children and domestic life,—little evidence is presented to show us how Afro-Americans developed a

kinship system and associated norms within and throughout the slave system.<sup>14</sup>

We are left with an analysis of slave culture determined by the ideological needs of the planters. Slaves are blamed for not forming a revolutionary tradition out of their religion which could have provided the kind of ideological cement necessary to form a political movement. The planters emerge all the stronger in Genovese's treatment of slave culture. His ahistorical treatment of paternalism leaves much to be desired. First, we must know the planters—who were they, what class did they emerge from, and how did they come to command the machinery of Southern society? Genovese seems to indicate that it emerged after the African slave trade in 1808, yet no sure evidence is presented. Genovese argues that the planters were unified in their purposes and goals—a view which ignores much of the new research into the origins of the Civil War, and of events like the Texas War, the Kansas-Nebraska compromise, and the Dred Scott decision in splitting Southern unity.<sup>15</sup> In trying to unravel the dialectic of resistance and accommodation, Genovese has maximized the accommodation side at the expense of resistance. Not that resistance was the determining element in slave culture, but that adaptation was in a situation in which independent cultural forms were suppressed and initiative punished. Genovese argues that planter goodwill left the slaves little room to carve out anything which might have challenged their cultural rule over their slaves. Like Fogel and Engerman, in their crucified work, *Time On The Cross*, Genovese argues that the treatment of the slaves was superior to that of most European peasantries. Needless to say, this view is challenged magnificently in an essay by Richard Sutch.<sup>16</sup> Genovese has very little to say about the domestic slave trade—the forced migration of over one million slaves from the upper to lower South—and its relation to the patriarchal ideology. It represents the ultimate collapse of the “paternal model.” No benevolent, enlightened and gracious planter sold slaves, broke the bond of parent and child, and forcibly fragmented kin groups. Such behavior was antithetical to customary rights and reciprocal duties. Yet planters were agricultural capitalists and paternal concern was discarded when it conflicted with pecuniary interest. Nowhere is Genovese's argument more flawed than in his scant attention to racism and its effects upon Southern whites of all classes. It was racial power, which gave the South its peculiar class form—the *Herrenvolk* democracy.<sup>17</sup> Genovese's analysis must be stood

on its head. Social classes were prevented from realizing themselves because they remained attached to the racialization of reality and it was this racialization of all things social that defined Southern whites of all classes. To confuse class consciousness with racial consciousness is a serious flaw in Genovese's analysis and one which weakens the focus of his argument.

Fogel and Engerman's *Time On The Cross* has been the subject of a stirring historical controversy.<sup>18</sup> Its failure is a testimony to the vitality of traditional history and an indication of promising work in the future; one hopes that its arguments will not be resurrected.

The new trends in Afro-American history indicate a continuing emphasis on slave culture and the ways the slaves developed, maintains their sanity, within "the Peculiar institution." Historians and social scientists alike await Herbert Gutman's important study of the Afro-American family, *The Invisible Fact*. This work will indicate another new phase in the debate on slavery, one which will allow us to see how, why and when Africans and then Afro-Americans created a culture which put meaning into their lives. We can then see the *adaptive* nature of the slave experience, and the adaptive strategies slaves utilized in creating a kinship system which ordered their world and sustained them through the crises of the Middle Passage, plantation slavery and the domestic slave trade. It will allow us to see the Afro-American experience as a historical process, as the interaction between the culture of the slaves and the society in which they entered. We must turn from "Sambo" and Nat Turner to reach the world of the average slave to see how this adaptive culture facilitated his adjustment to a harsh and brutal world. The new emphasis is on the world of slaves, not a world made for them by the planters.

In concluding, I would like to offer a passage which sums up much of the theory behind the slavery debate, from the controversial essayist and novelist Albert Murray, whose work continues to be ignored.

It seems altogether likely that white people in the United States will continue to reassure themselves with Black images derived from the folklore of white supremacy and the fakelore of black pathology so long as segregation enables them to ignore the actualities. They can afford such self-indulgence only because they carefully avoid circumstances that would require a confrontation with their own contradictions.<sup>19</sup>

It is only now that we have begun to break this "folklore of white

supremacy and fakelore of black pathology” to uncover the real world that Afro-American slaves inhabited.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> U. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery* (reprinted edition, Baton Rouge: 1966), p. 291.

<sup>2</sup> Kenneth Stampp, *The Peculiar Institution* (New York, 1956), p. vii-viii.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 364, but see the entire chapter 8 “Between Two Cultures,” pp. 322-382. Professor Stampp has recently amended his views in an essay on the Elkins thesis, “Rebels and Sambos: The Search for the Negro’s Personality in Slavery,” *Journal of Southern History*, 38 (August 1971), pp. 367-392.

<sup>4</sup> Stanley Elkins, *Slavery* (New York, 1963), Chapter 3.

<sup>5</sup> Stanley Elkins, “The Slavery Debate,” *Commentary* (December 1975), p. 54.

<sup>6</sup> Eugene D. Genovese, *The World the Slaveholders Made* (New York, 1971) and *In Red and Black* (New York, 1971).

<sup>7</sup> Stanley Engerman, Robert Fogel, Eugene Genovese and Herbert Gutman, “A Forum Symposium on American Negro Slavery: New Directions in Black History,” *Forum* (University of Rochester), (1, Spring 1972), p. 26.

<sup>8</sup> See for example, Stanley Engerman and Eugene Genovese, *Race and Slavery in the Western Hemisphere: Quantitative Studies* (Princeton, N.J., 1975) and Russel Menard, “The Maryland Slave Population, 1658 to 1730: A Demographic Profile of blacks in Four Counties,” *William & Mary Quarterly*, 32 (January 1975), pp. 29-54; and Donald Wax, “Preferences for Slaves in Colonial America,” *The Journal of Negro History*, 58 (October 1973), 371-401.

<sup>9</sup> Roger Bastide, *African Civilizations in the New World*, trans. by Peter Green (New York, 1971), p. 23. This is an invaluable study.

<sup>10</sup> See James Turner and William E. Perkins, “Slavery and the Afro-American Experience,” *Journal of Ethnic Studies*, 111 (Winter 1975-1976), for the problems in Wood’s demographic analysis.

<sup>11</sup> Lorenzo Turner, *Africanisms in the Gullah Dialect* (Chicago, 1949).

<sup>12</sup> I am currently revising an essay on Eugene D. Genovese’s *Roll, Jordan, Roll*. A short version was presented at the annual meeting of The National Caucus of Black Political Scientists, May 1, 1975 at the panel Plantation Societies in the New World and Old, as “The Worlds Genovese Made: Marxism Without Marx, Slave Culture without Slaves.” The Current essay is tentatively titled, “Eugene Genovese’s, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*: A New Marx for the Master Class.” This will be a detailed examination of his analysis of slave culture.

<sup>13</sup> Eugene D. Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll* (New York, 1974), pp. 3-7, 48-49, 75-86, 90-92, 113-115, 122, 125 and especially pp. 148-149.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, Book 3, Part 2, “. . . and the Coat of Many Colors,” pp. 443-584.

<sup>15</sup> One such work on the splits in the planter class is William Barney, *The Secessionist Impulse* (Princeton, N.J., 1974).

<sup>16</sup> Richard Sutch, “The Treatment Received By American Slaves: A Critical

Review of the Fogel-Engerman Thesis," Paper Presented at the M.S.S.B.-University of Rochester Conference, "*Time On The Cross: A First Appraisal*," October 24-26, 1974.

<sup>17</sup> For an analysis of this idea, see George M. Frederickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind* (New York, 1971), especially pp. 58-70.

<sup>18</sup> For a review of the critical literature on *Time On The Cross* see Thomas Haskell, "The True and Tragical History of Time On The Cross," *New York Review of Books*, October 2, 1975, pp. 33-39.

<sup>19</sup> Albert Murray, *The Omni-Americans* (New York, 1970), p. 38.