

chief apostle, and the *Kulturkampf* in Germany. Erastianism in each of these cases is perceived to be the necessary outcome of a high theory of state sovereignty, and any theory of the state which involves its right to interfere with men's consciences must, it is held, be fallacious. One is forcibly impressed with the fact that political theory even today springs in no small degree from the relations of church and state.

Whether in every particular these ideas will withstand the effect of criticism, there is no doubt that they offer in some respects a much better explanation of contemporaneous political tendencies and movements than the Hegelian theory that the state is an all-inclusive metaphysical organism, which governs the practical politics of modern Germany.

WALTER JAMES SHEPARD.

University of Missouri.

The Leveller Movement. A study in the History and Political Theory of the English Great Civil War. A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Literature, University of Chicago. By THEODORE CALVIN PEASE. (Washington: American Historical Association. 1916. Pp. x, 406.)

George Thomason, the indefatigable collector and arranger of the priceless collection of civil war tracts now in the British Museum, tells us that this "chargeable and heavy burthen . . . continued about the space of twenty years, in which time I buried three of them who took great pains both day and night with me in that tedious employment."

Any one who has ever dipped, though never so slightly, into this enormous mass of over twenty-two thousand crabbed controversial pamphlets, can appreciate the "chargeable and heavy burthen" also involved in the careful analysis of the Leveller movement here given us by Mr. Pease, and the debt we owe him in consequence. It is a very solid and valuable contribution to history and political science, and much the most detailed and thorough study we have of the political theory of probably the most interesting group in a most momentous period—a task well worth doing.

The Levellers were merely a number of agitators and pamphleteers and their followers, whom their enemies slightly and rather loosely designated by that name; but Mr. Pease clearly shows that they were

none the less a real, though a small, party consolidated and marked off from others by their common belief in "the supremacy, not of government, nor a branch of government, but of law"—a supremacy, moreover, not based like Cromwell's upon force, nor upon the exclusion of all save the "saints," whether Presbyterian or Independent, but one to be secured only "by convincing the people of the excellence of certain political principles." These certainly were "valuable contributions to the world's stock of political ideas and political experience," and the author makes no extravagant claim when he says they are of the first importance "for both English and American constitutional history."

These principles Mr. Pease believes may be traced to two sources, "the ancient theory of the English constitution as fundamental law, and the ecclesiastical policy of the Independents;" and in the elaboration of them, the Levellers "evolved the idea of a written constitution of paramount law as a limitation on the power of government. They devised machinery whereby the sovereignty of the people might express itself in the framing and acceptance of such written constitutions. Carrying their concept of government by law to its extreme, they designed the enforcement of their constitutions like all other laws, through the courts. Lastly, for spreading their principles they designed a democratic party organization that suggests the committee of correspondence of the American Revolution." These high claims Mr. Pease has abundantly substantiated, but it is possible that he has somewhat overstated the influence of the Levellers on the growth of the judicial review of legislation.

The author's long continued immersion in such English as Wildman's may be the explanation of a few such lapses as these: ". . . . can make the most rambling paragraph climax with a crack like a whip-lash;" "yet with all his naïveness;" "a government bound by paramount law from endangering their liberties;" "his part in the Leveller movement is easier underestimated than overestimated;" "The other 'corrupt interests' of the Kingdom were all sheltering with the Rump."

To this essay was awarded the Herbert Barton Adams Prize in European History by the American Historical Association in 1915.

C. H. McILWAIN.

Harvard University.

Public Opinion in Massachusetts during the Civil War and Reconstruction. By EDITH ELLEN WARE. (Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law. 1916. Pp. 219.)

The justification for a detailed study of this topic by Dr. Ware is found in a letter quoted from Robert C. Winthrop to Judge Clifford: "I cannot but regret that our state is put forward so prominently. Sumner at the head of foreign affairs, Wilson at the head of military affairs, Butler commanding one wing, Banks commanding another wing, Adams Minister to London, Burlingame to Peking, Motley to Vienna"

By influence and reputation Massachusetts is ranked as a strong Republican state; but political opinion is never expressed perfectly by the majority. It is thus Dr. Ware's purpose to estimate the strength of the minorities and their reasons for opposition. Her conclusions, that during the civil war public opinion was "for the support of the administration in the preservation of the Union, through emancipation, if need be, although emancipation was for the most part a subsidiary issue;" and that during the reconstruction period opinion was for "the support of the victorious party, which is to say the Republican party;" and that "in neither period was there unanimity of opinion;" do not alter the generally accepted judgment. The monograph is valuable rather in that it gathers together and portrays the almost daily registration of opinion and shows how the leaders and the press stood on the crises which occurred. Thus the chapter "The Defense of the Union" vividly shows how the hesitancy and critical opinion described in "The Election of 1861" and "The Period of Secessions" were so precipitated that even the *Boston Courier*, which was "anti-Republican, anti-administration, anti-war and sometimes anti-union," could declare, "there will be no more talk about rights or wrongs; that day is happily past. . . . Hereafter *we act*." The chapter on "Emancipation" traces the growth of the movement, from the nine persons who founded the *Liberator* to the conversion of the majority to the belief that emancipation would hasten the end of the war. In "Copperheadism," which is defined as a movement to supplant the administration and reverse its policies, are discussed both the turbulence and the skillful acceleration of public opinion together with the political organizations of that period. The chapter on "Reconstruction" discusses the various theories held by different groups and