

us. May it help us to appreciate a large and influential body of Christians, who have a history distinguished for the social work they have undertaken for the good of their neighbours!

H. FRANCIS DAVIS

FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY IN EDUCATION. By G. H. Bantock. (Faber and Faber; 18s.)

When a book starts out by claiming on its title-page, with Peacock, that the nonsense written on education in the past outweighs the nonsense written on anything else, we can be tolerably sure of a lively treatment of the author's theme. We can also expect that he will be speaking from coherent terms of reference, and that he will be constructive as well as negative; for otherwise the challenge on the title-page would rebound upon himself. Mr Bantock's book has certainly fulfilled its very bold task with flying colours. It is indeed one of the greatest merits of the book that the several chapters, most of them familiar to the readers of the various educational journals in which they have appeared, take on when reprinted together a unity which, on the one hand, will stand the closest scrutiny, and on the other hand could not have had its organic strength detected as they came out piecemeal before.

The theme is a reassertion of the need for *authority* in the education of our children. Mr Bantock joins issue squarely with the two characteristic features of the Progressive movement—'self-expression' and 'group activities', as both of them leading to impoverishment and barbarisation through an incomplete (and therefore false) view of what the human person is. At the very outset, then, the Catholic reader is attracted, since this is the crux of his own diagnosis of modern educational wastage and *malaise*. He reads on to discover what kind of humanism is going to be offered.

Mr Bantock's method is first of all to strip away some of the complacency of doctrinaire Progressives by attacking their fashions at the source: the ideas from which they flow. This involves a devastating analysis of the philosophy of planning, as mustered in the work of its most respected exponent in this country, the late Professor Karl Mannheim. The charge is not only that Mannheim's planning, if consistent, would lead to the discounting of personality in education altogether, but that it cannot in any case be consistent. 'The individual finds his protection in the future of the community and the anonymity which that implies; responsibility for the future is pushed on to the impersonal forces involved in the proper working of society that the plan implies, and is to a considerable extent removed from the care of the individual'. Yet the planners have to admit that there is no objective measurement they can apply to the plan, but only their own subjective assessment, and one moreover

which falsely makes man's social aspect their supreme criterion. To this Mr Bantock opposes the personalism of Mr T. S. Eliot, in which culture can never be abstractedly planned, 'because it is also the unconscious background to our planning'.

It is his contention that the exponents of 'self-expression', likewise, are misled into a false assumption that freedom is automatically a good irrespective of the *quality* of the freedom allowed: that despite the gains that have accrued from Froebelism, 'the child' rather than 'the child transformed' is being regarded as the end of education, with methodologies of 'interest' and 'activity' which threatens to become absolute instead of (properly) merely introductory to hard disciplinary *training*. For 'it cannot be overemphasised that in schools our primary consideration is the training of *minds*; activity is quite futile and meaningless unless it is guided by a sense of purpose; and the comprehension of purpose belongs to the realm of the mind'.

Upon this diagnosis, of incomplete views of man and of freedom, the treatment recommended is derived from three pioneer reformers—Matthew Arnold, Cardinal Newman and D. H. Lawrence. The three chapters on these men are most skilfully written, since their fundamental positions are not uniformly well grasped by the educated public and it was necessary to 'expound' at times the content of their works without seeming to do so overtly.

From Arnold, Mr Bantock reinforces the distinction between means and ends (and reminds us that Arnold was making it nearly a century ago now), in a view of culture which always set supreme store on the quality of *living*, by contrast with Dewey's debased subjectivism. But while he does draw attention to Arnold's 'inability to conceive any authority which transcends the State', he does not discuss that matter at all adequately: which is a pity, since this defect in Arnold is surely fatal to his view of the future.

From Newman there comes, in a truly magnificent chapter, all that the Catholic reader would himself expect: the unity and the hierarchy of the sciences, 'knowledge its own end' (and what this did *not* mean), liberal education, the true inwardness of conviction and 'real assents', and freedom as a discipline subordinated to purpose and needing training—in sum, a philosophy of education which, says Mr Bantock, one does not necessarily have to be a Catholic to endorse. He is not a Catholic himself.

From D. H. Lawrence, who appears here as complementary to Newman, and jointly with him as a corrective to Arnold, comes a subjective reinforcement—the call to *live* not from the head but from 'the vital centres'. Mr Bantock devotes immense care to disentangling Lawrence's essential meaning from the 'legend' that has grown up around his name at the hands of those who thought him preoccupied with sex. There are occasions when one feels that things are getting a little stretched—e.g., when 'New-

man's acceptance of the Church provides an example of how a man could still fulfil his deepest nature [Lawrence's point] by accepting one of the presented forms of current civilisation'. Is that what Newman was doing? But if we are at first startled to see it asserted that Newman and Lawrence meet 'in the sphere beyond personality, in what Newman called the Object and what Lawrence termed "the third ground"', by the end of the chapter we have at all events had this thesis marshalled in a fascinating manner.

It is altogether a book most disturbing in its diagnosis and most stimulating in its treatment; severe, but not unjust, and buoyant throughout. Curiously enough, though Maritain is nowhere mentioned, the philosophical Personalism of Mr Bantock is essentially of the kind that his Catholic readers will have learnt from Maritain's *True Humanism* and *Education at the Crossroads*. And they will be grateful for the incisive exposition that this book gives to it.

A. C. F. BEALES

THE BODY. A Study in Pauline Theology. By John A. T. Robinson. (S.C.M. Press; 7s.)

This is a brilliantly instructive study of the Pauline doctrine concerning the Church as the Body of Christ; intended above all to expound its realistic Christological meaning. The expression 'Mystical Body' is even accounted unfortunate, as tending to suggest a metaphorical sense. The Church is a Body, not because it is so close-knit a society, so powerfully informed by the one Spirit of Christ, that it is thereupon seen as deserving to be so represented, but because it is in reality one with the suffering, the eucharistic, the glorious Body of Christ himself. But does this not then simply require that the Body of Christ is to be conceived of according to some rarefied sense of the word? According to our ordinary conception of the Body, this surely would have to be said—if, that is to say, Body is conceived of in contrast to soul, as matter in contrast to form, as a principle of individuation and exclusiveness. This, however, is not what the Bible, not what St Paul, take Body, in its quite literal meaning, to signify. For St Paul, Body as such already has what we with our Greek way of conceiving of it can only reckon a highly mysterious meaning. Taken quite literally it can mean, for him, not one part of the whole human being, but the whole human being and personality, considered 'in the solidarity of creation', as made for God.

The great value of this book, then, is that it sets out with remarkable clarity this original biblical concept of Body (as also the kindred, yet strongly contrasted concept of Flesh), and, as it says, 'correlates all Paul's language on the body'. We can hardly fail in some degree to misunderstand St Paul if we substitute our