

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

society's failure to make real progress toward solving its fundamental problems of poverty and civil rights, or of creating an educational system which really frees the mind for independent enquiry instead of moulding it according to the requirements of big business. Order, contentment and stability are bestowed by means of a good dose of material prosperity—the opium of the people.

Luckily, as *The New Radicals* shows, the drug has failed in America in two important respects. A sizeable number of people—in particular the negroes—remain poor, underprivileged and discontented, while others have become aware that the real aim of their education is a good deal less worthy than that professed by their mentors. They are not encouraged to think radically, to leave no social attitude unchallenged, or to free their minds of the comfortable platitudes of accepted opinion. We all have some idea of what has been the result—the civil rights campaign, the Free Speech movement at the University of California, the agitation against the war in Vietnam. By means of a selection of relevant documents this book describes how these movements have grown among young people. I find one of the healthiest and hopeful signs in it all is the realistic approach of the protagonists to the problems involved. They recognize the enormous difficulty of stirring the consciences and changing the hearts of the great majority of well-meaning liberal Americans (which includes the government) into radical action on the issues which have not yet been solved; the danger of taking refuge in safe but ineffective attitudes, in outdated controversies and spectacular demonstrations, which cannot result in action; and the trap of doctrinaire ideologies which do not arise out of the American situation here and now. (The radical student of the sixties does not read Marx—happy fellow!—and does not admit Marx's necessary relevance to the issues he is concerned with.)

What then can be done? With a proliferation of organizations and issues it is more and more realized that if the movement is to hang together it needs an ideology which is a genuine growth out of the thinking and experience of this generation. An impressive extract from C. Wright Mills (the great hero of the radical left in America) scorns the rigid dogmas of Marxism on the one hand, and the impatient rejection of all ideologies on the other, and looks to the students to form the basis of a mass

movement. The fact is, however, that at the moment there has been no effective mass mobilization of negroes, workers or students. To do this is the most urgent task of the immediate future. Some think that co-operation with the liberals in the present power structure is called for, but others, and they are gaining ground, think the whole edifice is too rotten, and that contact will merely infect the movement with its corruption. Barbara Brandt in this book even argues against schemes to take over the existing power structure—it should rather be by-passed altogether. This sort of thinking has given rise to the conception of 'freedom' institutions, like the free university, growing out of the genuine needs of the people. Similarly, Black Power is fundamentally a rejection of the existing power structure as useless to the negro cause. This by-passing of the Establishment may sound unrealistic, but it is well argued in this book that such a move is in the true spirit of the American revolution itself. The American revolutionaries, they say, by-passed British colonial institutions and set up their own, and this in the face of majority support for the *status quo*. The present American government is alien to this tradition at home and actively suppresses revolution abroad in the name of the universal fight against Communism.

This is going to be a long struggle and not much has been achieved so far. The Vietnam war is waged as bloodily as ever, the bureaucracy at Berkeley is in full swing, civil rights and social welfare legislation is slowed down at the slightest hint of military or business necessity. As yet, the best that can be said is that a great debate has been initiated. The masses have not been moved to action and the future is very much in the balance. Even if the idealism and impetus can be maintained, the difficulties and dangers are considerable. But everyone who believes that democracy means people deciding for themselves rather than a self-perpetuating élite choosing for them, or who thinks that society has worthier aims than higher profits or material prosperity, must wish them well. In England this survey of action politics should be read with close attention. Our own left is very high and dry at the moment and could do with a shot in the arm. Perhaps the LSE revolt will prove the beginning of better things. If so, they will owe much to the experience and struggles of their American counterparts.

GEOFFREY PONTON