

It starts from the division between body and mind, and though it has little patience with the doctrine that they are different things, its method is to isolate natural science from mental science. Though the author does not find himself, like the later Cartesians, fighting a rearward action to save the properties of mind against the advance of mechanized science (for mind is not what may be left over after the materialists have done their explaining) one cannot but think that the Aristotelean psychology of the living organism is better fitted than the psychology of consciousness, which is adopted, to bring together the facts of social life and the laws which should be their logic. Without a philosophy of abstraction and of natural law, the classical mind may indeed have its world, but it is not this one—for all its claims to be practical, to adopt the historical method and to renounce the 'science of substance' for the direction of mental acts and facts.

More could be said on the need, not least in political science, for a philosophy which covers both body and soul without turning one into the other. The author keeps steadily to mental science in dealing with the problems of society and civilization. He develops the distinction between a non-social human community, which is ruled by something other than itself, and the true notion of society, a self-ruling community of persons. Neither is found in a pure form; the communities we know of are mixed communities, like the European family, where besides the family society of a man and a woman, based on a free contract between them, there is a nursery. But the movement of history is polarized between them; between civilization, the process whereby members of a community enjoy civil intercourse under the choice of a common order, and an opposite and hostile barbarism which accentuates the non-social and non-voluntary character of a community and hands itself over to the control of emotion. Four great examples are analyzed, the Saracens, the Albigenses, the Turks, and the Germans.

Of most philosophers of the native English tradition it can be said that they have a good seat. They ride facts with the respect due to a good horse. Professor Collingwood has their qualities: a sense of the limited objective, which makes abstraction more disciplined than exuberant; and a sense of classical form, which recognizes the validity of an intellectual ordering of things.

R.N.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION  
17th Annual Meeting: Philosophy of Order (\$2.0).

This collection of Papers and Discussions should not go unnoticed among the crowd of other things that America has recently sent us. It is evidence of hard work in a better cause than most. It is also evidence of America. Besides the intrinsic quality, good or not so

good, of the various Proceedings there are, I think, traits and tendencies discernible in the whole body of work, suggesting comparisons with similar efforts in this country and on the Continent. Let me set down roughly what seem to me to be the characteristic notes of this official report of the philosophic thinking of the Catholic body across the water to-day.

1. There can be no doubt about the 'professional' quality of the work. It is learned and well-documented and, for the most part, quite serious. It is familiar with contemporary enquiry in the various fields, especially perhaps in Logic and Psychology. Its tone and arrangement is efficient, sober and unhampered by flourishes and conceit, or almost so.

2. It is unembarrassed. What this negative implies is but another aspect of professional calm. Reading this book I did not feel that the writer or speaker was apologising, on every page, to his fellow-Christians for talking philosophy or to the general public for being rational. Here in England the note of apology is constantly struck. In America they seem to have got beyond that.

3. On the whole it is dispositive, preliminary, exploratory rather than didactic. It has a healthy 'workshop' air, the working notes, as it were, of men who are finding their way. The conclusions, for the most part tentative, are not systematised; no common principle is used to draw them together. 'Order' is indeed the common theme, but it seems to lose itself pretty often in the *melée*. The proceedings are all more or less connected with order or ordering, but these connections are often left implicit or vague. Not that this matters. A mass of material has been worked upon and explored, and if the resulting Report is not very tidy one can at least work with it. It is full of suggestions. It is no use to parrots.

4. Considering the general theme it seems a pity that more is not said about individual ethics. There are good pages on Marxism, pages that inform and instruct; there are some weaker ones on Law; there is an address by Walter Lippmann (only too brief), but there is no statement or discussion of the Thomist plan, so to say, of the good individual life. For St. Thomas order implies wisdom and moral order flows ultimately from Wisdom which is the Gift corresponding to Charity. Must Catholic philosophers leave this out because it introduces the Supernatural? It seems to me like leaving 1 out of the multiplication table. Surely our social thinking needs to be fed by the master's great analyses of the virtues and Gifts that perfect individual lives. Here in England people are terribly pre-occupied with Politics; it is disappointing to find the same emphasis or rather the same lack of a counter-balancing emphasis in the thought of Catholic America.

So much in general. Of the particular contributions perhaps the

PAGE NUMBER 488 MISSING

tianity but his need of Christianity. These are windows opened, if only rarely, upon eternity.

Much more might be said, particularly of the interesting parallel drawn between the aesthetic and the religious senses of the timeless. It is enough in a short review to have traced the main development ; and to recommend strongly that the book should be read, and read with as much care as has gone to the writing.

COLUMBA RYAN, O.P.

WHY WORK ? by Dorothy Sayers. (Methuen : 1s.)

Why indeed if Miss Sayers' diagnosis is correct? Factory work is on the whole ordained to waste—unnecessary products in peace with consequent unnatural stimulus to consumption, and purely destructive products in war. Must we then work for waste and waste to work? Not if we adopt the right attitude to work as a creative and noble occupation. It is refreshing to find one who looks humanly at the problem of modern labour and is not hampered by its economic or 'party' implications. Egregious generalisations there are bound to be in only twenty-two pages, but the main theme is sound and forcibly set out. The change war has wrought in the making and consuming of things must be recognised and consciously adopted. Miss Sayers has some hard things to say about ecclesiastics who apparently have erred in making men work for the Church rather than the Church for the work. But the indispensable distinction between *finis operis* and *finis operantis* introduced in the last paragraph should have played a greater part in the whole essay. The present situation certainly demands an insistence on the perfection of the work, but no work can be perfect without true alignment with its end, that *for* which it is made or done. Readers of this pamphlet should therefore apply the principles of final causality to each of its author's three propositions: (a) Work is not primarily a thing one does to live, but the thing one lives to do; (b) It is the business of the Church to recognise that the secular vocation as such is sacred; and (c) the worker's first duty is *to serve the work*. The purpose of the work and that of the worker are not in all things identical.

CONRAD PEPLER, O.P.

OLD AGE PENSIONS. An Historical and Critical Study. By Sir Arnold Wilson and G. S. Mackay. (Oxford University Press ; Milford. 16s.)

This book, like previous ones on Workmen's Compensation, Burial Costs and Industrial Assurance produced under the co-editorship of the late Sir Arnold Wilson, is indispensable for the student of the social services. From a mass of reports of Royal Commissions, actuaries' statements and parliamentary bills the authors have pro-