

surely reasonable, to see some useful insight in all the various theories of meaning which are advanced by people in different scientific disciplines and of different philosophical persuasions. The logical positivist contention that the meaning of a non-analytic statement is the way in which it may be verified, for instance, is neither accepted nor rejected *tout court*; it is shown to have a useful application to a restricted range of cases.

The author remarks on the curious fact that so few philosophers have taken into account the science of linguistics in discussing the problems connected with meaning. The physicist's concept of 'material particle' is taken seriously as a starting-point for philosophical analysis; it is odd therefore that the equivalent is not true for 'meaning' (p. 29). The meaning of every word, and consequently every sentence, in a language, is interrelated more or less closely or remotely with every other; the meanings of words in such a 'field' all affect one another to a greater or lesser extent rather as every body whatever in the

universe has some gravitational effect, however tiny, on every other. But just as, for most purposes, we can study the motions of Mercury without taking into account the movements of population from London to Brighton on a fine summer week-end, so we may profitably study the concept of friendship in the modern world without dragging in that of zero (p. 185).

It follows from this that the usual division of statements into analytic and synthetic is far too crude. Not that the author goes so far as to deny all use to the notion of analyticity; it is just that he finds it applicable to particular *uses* of certain sentences rather than to such sentences over the whole range of their application. The statement 'Phosphorus melts at 44°C', for instance, could communicate information about a substance identified in some other way, or could stipulate that nothing which did not melt at this temperature should be called 'phosphorus' (p. 182).

One can hardly leave this book without a comment on its erudition, which is really breathtaking.

HUGO MEYNELL

GIVING IN ON BIRTH CONTROL?, by Rosemary Haughton. *A Living Parish Pamphlet*. 1967. 1s.

Without pre-judging the issue, Mrs Haughton sets out the substance of the majority and minority reports of the Pope's Commission on Birth Control. She states the principles of the Church's teaching on the place of sex in marriage, which have remained unchanged; and describes how their application by theologians has changed from the Old Testament, through the New Covenant, and through St Augustine's fight with the gnostics, until the present time when even the concept of 'natural law' is under discussion.

The point where Mrs Haughton draws the line between unchanging principle and change-

able application may not appear to all readers to be the correct one. Some indeed may doubt that it is ever possible to draw a line except by hindsight, for St Augustine's teaching that sexual desires are a corrupt aspect of man's nature seems to have been regarded as a principle by the Church (though wrongly so) for several centuries.

For many, however, this will be a lucid and satisfying exposition; and as such it is a splendid preparation for an official decision allowing control other than by the rhythm method, should a decision one way or the other ever come.

DAVID AND MARGARET WALLACE

THE NEW RADICALS, by Paul Jacobs and Saul Landau. *Penguin*, 1967. 7s. 6d.

Oh, demonstrations! Oh, marches! I once arrived in the centre of Birmingham to attend a march against, I think, apartheid, only to discover that my fellow demonstrators had passed by me unrecognized because of the smallness of their numbers. I only realized that I had missed them as they disappeared up a side street. The protest—so promising in emotional appeal, so exciting to organize, attracting such satisfying publicity, so ineffective. What good does it all do? Precious little, as this book admits, unless it can be harnessed to a viable policy for gaining control of, or replacing, the power structure of the country. Otherwise the protest achieves only a

pricking of consciences, a stimulation of public debate. The Establishment becomes indignant, the masses are entertained, the moderate liberals lose a little sleep. Then everything is as before, only more so. Yet protest is an essential part of a healthy society. Order and stability are one thing, but the government has to be called to account for all that it does not do. No social order is sacred, but it often pays those in power to foster the legend that it is. This is done very subtly, but nonetheless effectively, in countries like Britain and America. The story in this book is of the fight that has been going on in America since the McCarthy doldrums of the fifties against