

supernatural truth. Thus he continually denounces 'abstraction' as the enemy of the 'concrete,' but though there are false abstractions, it is *only* through abstraction that we can really understand the concrete. Again, he seems ready to defend all peasant beliefs without distinction, yet it should be evident that such beliefs are either true or false. Some are perfectly good natural theology; some are either in fact Christian or are misunderstood fragments of Christian teaching which need to be reintegrated into their proper context; others are simply false, and anyone who calls himself a philosopher or a Christian should be prepared to say so. Then there is a section on 'doctrine' (pp. 182—186) which has all the haziness of old-fashioned Liberal Protestantism with its invective against 'credal formulae'; and an unfortunate allusion to Shakespeare's freedom from 'philosophical and ecclesiastical fetters' (if Mr. Massingham knew something of Dante he might be better able to assess the relations of truth and freedom, and might incidentally acquire surer standards of literary judgment).

More generally, Mr. Massingham has not really considered what is implied by that acceptance of Christianity which he desires for his rural England. He has some belief in Christian doctrine, but seems seriously concerned only with that part of it which touches his own thesis and is directly applicable to the unnatural conditions of present-day industrial England; this, he seems to say, is what must be preached with authority, and the layman may decide as he pleases about the rest. Well, there is indeed such a part, and the preaching of it is most important; but it comes from the same authority from which comes all the rest. There are many contingent needs which make the stressing of this point or that (whether 'abstract' or 'concrete') desirable and natural in a particular age. The Divinity or Humanity of Christ, the sanctity of marriage, the need for contemplative prayer, the moral theology of war—these are all things which in certain conditions can be taken for granted and in others need special emphasis, but all belong to a consistent body of doctrine which is ultimately indivisible; unless one accepts that doctrine and the authority which teaches it, one does not really accept Christianity. The integration of man with Nature, yes; but also integration with Christ in the Church. A sacramental view of life, yes; but also the Christian Sacraments. That is Christianity; otherwise we remain on the natural level where the South Sea islander enjoys an organic life outside our reach.

WALTER SHEWRING.

CAPITALISM, SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY. By Joseph A. Schumpeter. (Allen & Unwin: 15/-).

At a time when even the salvage-collector absent-mindedly performs his duties with a reconstructional gleam in his eye, political

literature is being served up in formidable proportions. Nevertheless, Professor Schumpeter is entitled to a share of our attention. In this work he gives his view that, the 'achievements' of Capitalism will be the cause of its ultimate disintegration, leaving an economic environment appropriate to the adoption of Socialism, the economic practicality of which he essays to demonstrate. His blueprint unashamedly involves an all-embracing bureaucratic apparatus; the Professor assuming, that since the Capitalist System shows a considerable bureaucratic tendency, its extension should give no cause for alarm. The term 'all-embracing' is indeed alarming; especially to a society, the present liberties of which are seriously curtailed by just such an impersonal bureaucratic system. Does Economic Stability as an end justify such a means?

In many other respects the book is inductive to reflection. Adulators of the U.S.S.R. brand of Socialism may not appreciate the reflection that the Soviet Government is not, and never has been, the custodian of the true Marxist principles. In fact, all Socialists will find much unpalatable material here. The Professor's impartial, if strictly material, manner of analysis, leads him to the final conclusion that Socialism is far more likely to present fascist features than to be the paradise of which the orthodox socialist dreams. Surely a valid reason for guarding against its arrival.

MAURICE McLOUGHLIN.

WHO ARE THE PEOPLE? By Colm Brogan. (Hollis & Carter; 8/6).

In his challenge to politicians the author pins down that vague abstraction, 'the People' to a stage army, composed of journalists, publicists and politically-minded persons of the educated or pseudo-educated class. Their living, according to him, is made by the formation of a public opinion and their vocation is found in the bureaucracy. They are emphatically removed from the hazards and adventures of real life. They are moved by sentimental memories of a social and political struggle long past; their opinions are governed by the vaguest of emotional urges, their inconsistent principles derived from the social ideals of the French Revolution and its unreconciled bedfellow, the economic theory of Karl Marx. They believe that their own notions, if accepted, will lead to an almost perfect state of society. (It is the author's task to show that the conduct of great affairs cannot be controlled by slick journalism). They speak for a small minority. They are pamphleteers, broadcasters and debaters. 'They are in parliament,' (thus the publishers' blurb) 'misrepresenting all parties. They are the self-appointed spokesmen for all of us, but they are not the People.' If they, concludes the author, 'think they can restore the essentials by any other means than religion, we would like to watch them try. On second