

nor does he pursue the circular argument.

The index is good; the critical essay on authorities is just that; and the book is a credit to the Louisiana State University Press. Historians, and the public in general, should be grateful to the editors, to the author, and to the sponsoring agencies for the best and the only really comprehensive history of the South from 1861 to 1865.

Indiana University

Chase C. Mooney

Nationalism and Sectionalism in South Carolina, 1852-1860: A Study of the Movement for Southern Independence. By Harold S. Schultz. (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1950, pp. xiv, 259. Index, bibliography, maps, illustrations. \$4.50.)

In this compact and well-organized book, Professor Schultz has re-examined the slavery question in South Carolina during the 1850's. His thesis, boiled down to its least common denominator, is this: South Carolina politicians and statesmen were afraid of the abolitionists as a political force in national politics and preferred secession to domination by a federal government controlled by antislavery men. And by 1860, South Carolinians were rather certain that the anti-slavery group was going to control the North and that there was no longer any hope of maintaining friends or allies in the northern section. In support of this theory the Carolina leaders cited the Brooks assault, the nomination of Buchanan instead of Pierce, the slim margin of victory enjoyed by the Democrats in the election of 1856, the growing strength of the Republican party in Congress, the unreliable friendship of northern democratic leaders such as Douglas, Seward's "irrepressible conflict" speech of 1858, and finally John Brown's raid at Harper's Ferry. They also declared that Helper's *The Impending Crisis of the South* was the beginning of a dangerous propaganda movement instigated by antislavery leaders in an attempt to array southern nonslaveholders against slaveholders. Consequently, throughout the decade of the fifties when there was a strong nationalistic feeling in the other Southern States, South Carolina, in thought, in speech, and in political action, manifested a strong disunion opinion.

The idea that secession was caused by the slavery issue

is of course, not new. As a matter of fact, this theory was elaborately developed by James Ford Rhodes decades ago and has been more or less undermined by recent historical scholarship; at least, the new school of thought entertains the idea that slavery was only one of several factors that caused secession. Professor Schultz, in his well-documented study, brings us around the circle again to a serious consideration of the antislavery crusade as the major factor in creating the crisis that exploded into civil war. With respect to South Carolina in particular, this book will become an interesting and challenging companion volume to Professor John G. Van Deusen's *Economic Bases of Disunion in South Carolina*, a study that emphasizes South Carolina's desire for economic independence as a major cause of secession.

In addition to bringing us fresh variations on the old theme of slavery, Professor Schultz presents short but vivid accounts of some of the South Carolina leaders including the well-known fire-eater Rhett and the more judicious party man, James L. Orr. Other highlights in the book include a dramatic description of the Brooks-Sumner affair, a realistic and informative account of the role of South Carolina emigrants to bleeding Kansas, and the marshalling of evidence to show that South Carolina was anything but popular among the Southern States after 1850. Some readers, too, may be surprised to find that the versatile liberal sinner, Thomas Cooper of South Carolina College, was a pioneer advocate of nullification although W. S. Jenkins in 1935 and Clement Eaton more recently pointed out this fact.

The bibliography lists manuscript sources, about thirty newspaper files, and published materials including state documents, diaries, periodical essays, biographies, and monographs. The critical bibliophile will note a few titles that perhaps should have been included. For example, Clement Eaton's *Freedom of Thought in the Old South* is suggestive for background purposes, and the studies of the Frank Owsley school of thought might have stimulated a greater interest in what the common people of South Carolina were thinking and doing about the problem of slavery. This, however, is a matter of opinion.

Monmouth College

F. Garvin Davenport