

'counselee' as a responsible person, rather than the solution of the particular problem. And it is the empathy of the counsellor and his 'permissiveness' (in the technical sense of the word as used by psychologists) which encourages the counselee to change and develop his attitudes, without necessarily implying a subjectivistic ethic on the part of the counsellor. Father O'Brien analyses the development of the counselling relationship in some detail, and very well. He is particularly good on the importance of the counsellor's catching the general tone of the counselee's internal experience, rather than details of external problems, and on the degree of structuring called for in particular cases. The actual problems, and the psychological abnormalities of clients, are (quite rightly, in a book of this kind) treated fairly briefly in the last two chapters. The illustration of particular points by an imaginary dialogue is generally very helpful, though in an introductory book these might well have been more numerous.

R. S. Lee is an Anglican priest who has written several books on psychology and religion. His little book is concerned with the underlying principles rather than their detailed working out in practice. He considers the place of counselling in pastoral care, and distinguishes the functional role of the priest in proclaiming the word of God and administering the sacraments, in which he acts with authority, and his personal role in counselling, where he has to avoid acting as an authority figure. This is a useful distinction, but one that cannot be pressed too far, or it will be difficult to show that it is valid, either in theory or in practice.

Mr Lee goes on to consider what we mean by the pastoral relationship and analyses the work of pastoral care, taking as his starting point an outline by D. W. Winnicott of what is involved in social casework. He has an excellent chapter on the pastor himself—the nature of his office, his motives and training, his experiences (and disappointments) in practice. In a final chapter on the religious aspects of pastoral counselling, he returns to the subject of roles and authority, and stresses that persons are of more value than systems. In all this a great deal that is of value has been concentrated into a small space.

On the debit side, it is rather surprising that in a small book on basic principles of pastoral counselling two chapters are devoted to personality development in early childhood. These are well done, but necessarily sketchy, and the material is easily available elsewhere. And there are two chapters, entitled 'Wrongdoing, sin and moral disease' and 'Confession, counselling and forgiveness', which could be positively misleading. Mr Lee does not distinguish between moral conscience and the action of the superego, between rational conviction of guilt and guilt-feelings. And his terminology is confusing. He makes the usual distinction between material sin and formal sin, but he uses the term 'formal sin' for what has traditionally been called 'material sin', and the term 'actual sin' for what has generally been called 'formal sin'. There is much that is wise and valuable in this book, but it has to be read with a good deal of critical awareness.

AUSTIN GASKELL, O.P.

ANARCHY AND CULTURE: The Problem of the Contemporary University. Edited by David Martin. *Routledge & Kegan Paul*, London, 1969. 212 pp. £1 15s.

STUDENT POWER: Problems, Diagnosis, Action. Edited by Alexander Cockburn and Robin Blackburn. *Penguin Books*, London, 1969. 378 pp. 7s.

Unless reading and writing books and reviews of books is a form of idleness, like gossip, or a reflex action, such as scratching one's head, then we should occasionally halt these activities and ask ourselves, what is the good of them. Here are two books about the contemporary university and student unrest, one mainly by the dons and the other mainly by the students, and of which I find myself asking this question now that I have read them: do they do any good?

When I took up the dons' book, *Anarchy and Culture*, it fell open at a chapter which begins, 'The late 50s and early 60s were the golden age

of the don. He researched, he published, he broadcast, he travelled, he sat on Royal Commissions. The B.B.C., the Ford Foundation, the University of California at Berkeley (yes, there was such a place), the United Nations, etc., paid him substantial sums to air his views.' Naturally I took this piece of writing to be the beginning of a satire, but as I read further I became less sure of this and by the end of the chapter I realized it was not satirical—at least, not intentionally. There then came into my mind the thought of various of my colleagues and the sort of lives they were living during the late 50s and early 60s: one of them

in particular, now dead, had the opportunity to do himself proud in the fashion quoted above; but instead he devoted himself to his students, teaching them, finding them jobs, helping them in their personal difficulties, never sparing himself. And I was angered to realize that the inanity of a professor from the L.S.E. which I have quoted will be taken by many people as the truth about how university teachers spent their lives, whereas my friend's selflessness will be known to few.

And I was tempted to come to the conclusion that the dons at L.S.E. deserve the trouble they have been having lately if that is how they were behaving ten years ago, solving the world's problems on the B.B.C. instead of being present with their students. Which would have been unjust, of course, to all those dons at L.S.E. who have been doing a proper job of work. And yet a number of the L.S.E. contributions to *Anarchy and Culture* are written in such a style that one is irresistibly reminded of that meretricious television programme of those days, TW3; there is the same initial attempt to be satirical which peters out miserably—because the performers have no firm position from which to direct their shafts—then there is a semblance of seriousness which inevitably degenerates into pretentiousness.

What a contrast there is between the tone of these pointless exercises and some of the other contributions; the essay by Professor Sykes, for instance, on 'The new academics', where the author's case both for his colleagues and the students comes through so convincingly; and the excellent essay by Professor Crick, of Sheffield, on 'The proper limits of student influence'. One could gladly recommend both of these contributions to those of our students who are trying to find their way through the welter of current debates; but any such student would be incensed at the flippant, supercilious tones of Professors Martin, Gellner and Wiles, and the Warden of All Souls, who presents us with an extended version of his *Listener* article 'Revolted Students?'. One would have thought that dons who are constantly assuring students how mature they themselves are might have asked themselves what good their essays were supposed to do in the present situation; and then, possibly they might have disciplined themselves into silence.

However, if relations between dons and students would hardly be improved by presenting *Anarchy and Culture* to the students, could we hope that relations between students and the rest of the community might be improved by distributing *Student Power*? The answer again is, sadly, 'No'. From the students one had hoped for better things if only because 'hope for better things' is the positive drive animating many of those who have been in the midst of the recent turmoil. But any member of the public seeking to find out what student unrest is all about could hardly come to any conclusion, after reading this book, other than that students are a humourless, fanatical, destructive, pretentious and ill-formed group of preachers. From none of the thirteen contributors does one ever get a single flicker of humour—possibly because humour has something to do with humility. Each of them is so fanatical as never to consider seriously any alternative to their own point of view—I say 'their' own because they are liberal in their commendations of one another so long as it is at the expense of those outside the group. Their destructiveness is evidenced throughout, but particularly by the one who hopes that factors that have delayed revolution in Britain 'may also make the ultimate explosion all the greater'. The pretentiousness comes out most strongly in 'Components of the National Culture' by the editor of the *New Left Review*, who is preparing a thesis at Reading University and who clearly has a first-rate mind; but can he ever actually do anything worthy of his abilities unless someone teaches him the difference between rhetoric and judgment, speculation and evidence? I eventually gave up counting the number of times he asserts 'It is no accident that . . .' whenever a causal connexion demanded by his prejudices escapes him.

When I now ask myself why I have been so disappointed by these books to which extremely talented people have contributed the answer seems to be that, taken as a whole, each book is frivolous—the one frivolous in the manner of cultured gentlemen and the other in the fashion of barbarians—because the editors and publishers never seem to have asked themselves, what is the *good* of this work?

DONALD NICHOLL