observed that "men have fallen into the idea of State-sovereignty because it has seemed the easiest, if not the only, way out of the slough of individualism."* And when men see the conscientious objector standing stiffly by what appears to them to be only his personal caprice, they tend to react to a conception of the will of the community as absolutely authoritative for all its members since it seems to be the only alternative to this misconceived and impossible individualism. The demand arises for a political uniformity which, in this case, is also a religious uniformity; and we have theologians and preachers urging on us a view of the divinity of the State which gives its demands a sacrosanct character, in the presence of which the vagaries of the individual conscience must disappear. But this is surely to misconceive both the structure of society and the psychology of religion. The former is not to be understood as a single undifferentiated mass demanding a single line of conduct that its individual constituents must toe. Maitland, in an interesting passage† reviewing "the structure of the groups in which men of English race have stood from the days when the revengeful kindred was pursuing the bloodfeud to the days when the one-man company is issuing debentures, when Parliamentary assemblies stand three deep upon Canadian and Aus-

---

* G. D. H. Cole. Op. Cit., p. 153.

† Introduction to O. Gierke, "Political Theories of the Middle Ages," pp. xxiv. f.