Love of Order: South Carolina's First Secession Crisis
groups made them a logical and shrewd choice as the government's agent.

Milner's study focuses on the Hicksite Quakers' administration of the northern superintendency in Nebraska which included three Plains tribes—the Omahas, Otos, and Pawnees. Despite their "good intentions," even the Quakers found themselves unable to accomplish much. Part of the problem rested with their heavy-handed brand of paternalism which viewed Indian assimilation as the only viable solution for Indian survival. This bankrupt idea was doomed to failure from the outset. Also, it became painfully obvious to the Quakers that not only was the government uncooperative and inefficient in its efforts to aid the Quakers in their work, the Indians themselves exhibited an unyielding resistance to their efforts. In short, Quaker honesty alone fell far short of mitigating the rapidly declining fortunes of these three tribes.

The story is a well-worn one from so many other times and places—only the location and cast of characters in the "script" have been changed. Milner tells it quite well, however, drawing skillfully on a variety of primary sources. The "good intentions" theme is replayed over and over, sometimes to the distraction of the reader, but this is not a fatal flaw for this work, just an overly repetitious annoyance which is at times unnecessary.

This study provides a valuable investigation of this particular episode of Indian-white relations.

Western Illinois University
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Love of Order has both substantial merits and certain problems. First, as is proper, to the virtues. The chief one is that Barnwell illuminates the existence in antebellum South Carolina, among whites, since colonial decades, of what has come to be known as a "siege mentality." Another asset of the book, one closely related to the first, is a reflection of the sophistication with which the author examines why and how South Carolinians perceived themselves to be different from other Americans. Indeed, they were different—different in white-black population ratios; in the positive steps Carolinians took to initiate, recognize, and perpetuate slavery; in whites' early distaste for free Negroes; and in the consequent rejections by white South Caro-
linians of democratizing pressures that, elsewhere, were the very essences of the Ages of Jefferson, Jackson, and early Lincoln.

Barnwell describes clearly South Carolina’s unique qualities. His descriptions and impressive supporting data, derived from his research in demographic and political sources, combine to create a most useful supplement to Freehling’s *Prelude to Civil War*, Channig’s *Crisis of Fear*, and Hamer’s older *Secession Movement in South Carolina*, all of which Barnwell acknowledges. Barnwell’s most valuable contribution to this literature results from implicit questions he perceives. These questions rise from the fact that South Carolinians, who loved order, especially in white-on-top race relations, alone even among slaveholders came so often in pre-1860 decades to the brink of disunion and disorder. Even more often, they advocated overt resistance to normal operations of national and state politics, when the decisions of popular majorities at the polls and in Congress displeased them. The state was, indeed, “a fireship in the Union,” as one chapter title asserts. The author found these questions most sharply focused in the 1850 “compromise” crisis. His painstaking exhumation of the background, the events, and the results of that critical year, is commendable.

No reader should mistake the book’s title for irony. It is history’s own comment on the human capacity for self-deception. For, as “compromise” (elsewhere I have suggested that all the misnamed “compromises” of 1820 through 1860 were sectional sellouts to the South) in 1850-51 occurred, would-be secessionists in the state lamented the fact that love of order there had delayed proslavery independency.

In reality, then, white Carolinians’ “love of order” reflected not love, but hate and fear. Their passions extended to local blacks, slave and free, who, whites worried, were fodder for revolts and worse. Hatred was manifest for whites who questioned the values of slavery. Witness James Hammond’s toothy letter to Lewis Tappan in mid-1850, quoted by Barnwell: “It is obvious that you have brought the entire non-slaveholding portion of the Union into line and arrayed them against us. . . . [But] you will never free a negro, I give you the most solemn assurance, save those you may cause to run away from us, which is a very small business, and those you may bring to the gallows” (17-18).

Barnwell illuminates this unhappy story with effective demographic data. His analyses, derived from these sources as well as from more traditional information useful to historians, implicitly (I would have welcomed greater explicitness on his part) underscore the tragic blindness that afflicted race-focused whites. This blindness resulted in their perception of their stands in both 1832 and 1850 as defenses of
order, not of brigandage, which in my judgment their policies were. Carolinians deceived themselves into believing that their alleged failures (i.e., willingness to "compromise") in those occasions derived from their own unwillingness to risk upset to order (pp. 186-187). Ten years later, in 1860, they were to overcome their "love of order," and initiate the longest, bloodiest, most shaking war fought anywhere in the western world since Napoleon's downfall.

Next, to negative aspects of the book. These result essentially from Barnwell's reluctance to escalate his own function as historian into that of moral critic, a reticence which basically limits the usefulness of this volume, in my judgment. This reluctance is reflected in his dulling insistence on quoting recent secondary writers. Very frequently his secondary sources use quite ordinary language to express ideas that Barnwell could easily have stated as well if not better than those he quotes. Quotations from persons contemporary to the events of the 1840s and 1850s, like that of Hammond, above, help us to understand better their thoughts and actions. But intrusive quotations from academics of our own time? No. They belong in footnotes.

This complaint aside, *Love of Order* is a useful study of a significant subject. It deserves close use by specialists and a place in every research library.
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In this latest novel, A. B. Guthrie, Jr. returns to complete the story begun in *The Big Sky* (1947) and continued in *The Way West* (1949). The first of these introduced Boone Caudill, Jim Deakins, and Dick Summers, trappers in the 1830s and 1840s, the high time of beaver days in the Rocky Mountain West. The second novel placed Dick Summers in charge of a wagon train bound for Oregon after the trapping days were over and the great overland migration had begun. *Fair Land, Fair Land* picks up Dick Summers as he climbs out of an Oregon valley headed this time eastward toward the country he loves best, the Rocky Mountains of the Upper Missouri. Dick hopes to escape the present, which brings too many people crowding into his West to suit him. He wants to relive instead a day already past when *Fair Land, Fair Land* opens—the day of a virgin West when men brave enough to risk the mountain life had God's plenty of prairie and mountain, of wind and weather, and of the beaver and the buffalo.

While Dick loves his privacy and his wilderness life, he fully appreciates the worth of lasting friendship between likeminded men.