

and one which refers to the economic order. Most of the lengthy quotations are designed to bring this out clearly. Its purpose is the common economic good. It is concerned with the institution of property ownership, and its formal object is the social aspect of property. It requires that material goods, even when privately owned, shall serve the common use of all men.

Second, social justice is a species of justice, separate not only from commutative but also from legal justice. That it is separate from the former can hardly be denied in view of an explicit quotation from *Divini Redemptoris*. But many theologians have tried to water it down to being a synonym for legal justice, since the object of the latter is the common good. But Father Drummond points out that it is the common economic good which is the context under discussion, not the complete ordering of society. Hence the subjects of social justice are not men as citizens, but men as members of the economic order. Even whole peoples can be treated as subjects of social justice as is done in questions of under-developed areas, or in cases where one nation in its natural resources has a practical monopoly of some kind of raw material. Those moral theologians who consider legal and social justice as equivalents become very obscure when dealing with the extension of social justice to the international sphere.

The third extension of traditional teaching concerns the distinction of necessary and superfluous goods. Is the duty of distributing superfluous goods different from and more than a duty of charity? Here Father Drummond takes up a matter which will seem to many to need a more satisfactory treatment than it usually gets. If this duty is only one of charity, how can it be called a duty of social justice? These duties pertain neither to legal nor to distributive justice, because they do not affect men precisely as members of organized society. They pertain to social justice because they affect men as administrators of property.

DANIEL WOOLGAR, O.P.

ESSAYS ON FREEDOM AND POWER. By Lord Acton. (Thames and Hudson; 12s. 6d.)

This selection from Acton's work is reasonably successful in its object of introducing the reader to the main points of his thought. The editor, Dr Gertrude Himmelfarb, has chosen two lectures, four chapters from *The History of Freedom and Other Essays*, and an article from *The Rambler* which is here reprinted for the first time since its original publication in May, 1861. This latter, on the political causes of the American Revolution, is the contribution which least deserves its place and, no doubt, owes its inclusion to the fact that this work was

first prepared for a popular library of paper-bound books published in the U.S.A. The collection is rounded off with Acton's letter to Mandell Creighton and the latter's reply. While there are far more valuable letters in Acton's correspondence—some of his letters, for example, to Mary Gladstone would have illuminated the other essays—one has the feeling that this letter has been given in full so as to include the famous dictum about the corruption of power in its original context. Not a bad thing, perhaps, because one realizes how often it is incorrectly quoted. The notes are a little too curtailed, and the reader not given to mental arithmetic will hardly realize that the three central essays, including the famous one on nationality, were written by Acton when in his late twenties. The greater part of the introduction by the editor is devoted to Acton's religious difficulties, and does not commend itself because of its tendentious nature and occasional errors. It is certainly not an adequate introduction to Acton's ideas of freedom and power.

J.F.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

House of the Resurrection,
Mirfield,
Yorkshire.

July 18th, 1957.

Sir,

In reviewing my book *Naught for your Comfort* last year (July-August) Father Finbar Synott, O.P., wrote: 'It is a weakness in the book that Father Huddleston does not define clearly what he means by "apartheid". . . . The "apartheid" that the Church can allow to be a legitimate solution is the complete one . . .'; and he concludes that he 'could not give the book' to his people 'for fear it might make them wrong and biased'.

On July 10th this year the South African Catholic Bishops' Conference in Pretoria (attended by twenty-five bishops) issued the following statement:

'To all white South Africans we direct an earnest plea to consider fully what apartheid means—its evil and anti-Christian character, the injustices that flow from it, the resentment and bitterness it