

anything to do with the matter, it was because he was negro, not because he was slave. It is time historians—and practical politicians as well—should begin to take this fact into account. The inveterate habit of attributing solely to the existence of slavery—which has in all conscience enough ills rightfully chargeable to its account—the general social characteristics which were produced in America, as they have been produced in every land known to history, by the presence of an inferior race by the side of a superior race too proud and self-conscious to tolerate amalgamation—this habit should in the twentieth century be at last discarded.

Olmsted's *Seaboard States* and other volumes will always have a great value for their record of facts; but this value will be at its maximum only if a proper allowance be made for the now wholly antiquated character of his interpretations.

WM. A. DUNNING.

*North Carolina: A Study in English Colonial Government.* By CHARLES LEE RAPER, Ph.D. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1904. — xiii, 260 pp.

Dr. Raper's excellent study of North Carolina government in the period of royal control is perhaps the best and fullest work which has appeared on North Carolina history since the publication of the *North Carolina Colonial Records* in 1886-1890. It follows the general plan of other monographs in the same series, as Smith's *South Carolina*, in analyzing minutely and scientifically the government of one of the royal provinces in America. It treats in successive chapters of the governor, the council, the lower house of the assembly, the "territorial system" (*i.e.* the land system), the fiscal system, the judicial system, the system of defence, and in two closing chapters it discusses the conflict between the lower house of the assembly and the governor and the downfall of the royal government. The book is written in the manner of solid and creditable scholarship. It will prove a valuable source of information to the student of American colonial institutions. It shows the process by which an American community passed through its formative period, and brought its forms of government to that stage of development at which they were able to take on themselves the support of an independent state.

Till the publication of the *North Carolina Colonial Records* this study could not have been made. The little which was then known about North Carolina colonial institutions was drawn chiefly from the documents which Dr. Hawks collected for his history and from the scant

unpublished records in the office of the secretary of state in Raleigh. The ten volumes of the *Colonial Records*, however, contain the richest collection of documents from the English public archives. From these one may learn the ultimate word about the colony's history. The careful examination of them which is now presented to the public meets all the requirements of a final discussion. It has been made with pains and intelligence, and with how great difficulty one will guess when he learns that the series out of which most of the facts are taken is entirely without an index. With what appreciation of scientific truth Dr. Raper has written one may see in the fact that he rejects the locally popular story of the "Mecklenburg declaration of independence." He goes so far as to say, in effect, that the resolutions of Mecklenburg county were not so radical as the action of Cumberland and New Hanover counties in organizing armed resistance to England. The treatment of the "War of the Regulation" is similarly unbiased. This struggle is described as a kind of peasants' rising, and not, as many people have hastily concluded, the initial phase of the revolution in North Carolina. Such sane treatment of controverted points speaks well for the prospects of North Carolina history when it shall fall into the hands of its young scholars.

TRINITY COLLEGE, N. C.

J. S. BASSETT.

*Das Wesen der Ministerverantwortlichkeit in Deutschland.* Eine staatsrechtliche Studie. By RICHARD PASSOW, Ph.D., J.U.D. Tübingen, Verlag der H. Laupp'schen Buchhandlung, 1904. — vii, 79 pp.

This monograph deals scantily with a subject which the German writers have generally neglected. It possesses a special interest, on account of the recent agitation of the Social Democratic party looking to an extension of the responsibility of the imperial chancellor to the Reichstag. The monograph contains (1) a review of the forms and general principles underlying the system of ministerial responsibility in monarchical states; (2) an analysis of the constitutional provisions of the several German states relating to the responsibility of ministers; and (3) a discussion of the status of the imperial chancellor.

The forms of ministerial responsibility are described as disciplinary, criminal, civil, constitutional and politico-parliamentary. The first form exists only in absolute monarchies, the second and third do not differ essentially from the responsibility of other officers or private citizens, while the fourth form has reference only to a special respon-