

that experience be uniform. Perhaps he could not be expected to have read Poulain and Bainvel, Garrigou-Lagrange and Saudreau, but he ought at least to have known that their happy quarrels are evidence of the Church's respect for the varieties of religious experience; still easier and perhaps more convincing would have been a passing glance at the Calendar of Saints.

If he will also read Gilson, he will find he is placing his foot—perhaps somewhat heavily—on the right way when he speaks about the Divine Existence. He will tread that none-too-easy way a little more lightly under thomistic guidance and perhaps emerge to continue the struggle with atheism, but equipped with more suitable weapons and heightened zeal.

EDWARD QUINN

ADVERTISING AND ECONOMIC THEORY. By E. A. Lever. (Oxford University Press; 9s. 6d.)

Mr Lever draws attention to a serious omission from the works not only of the classical economists but also of more recent exponents of the science. The problem lies deeper than the simple question of advertising, in the long neglect of the consumer's part in the interplay of economic forces; this may seem small enough in the prolonged abnormality of the post-war years, but his choice and the factors which influenced it were much more problematic than economists were inclined to admit in the days of comparative plenty. One of the most important of those factors was advertising, the place of which in economic theory is here skilfully indicated. The various kinds of advertising (competitive, combative, informative) are explained and many of them—contrary to preconceived opinions—shown to be genuinely economic in a more popular sense of the term. Statistical evidence, drawn largely from American sources, is generously provided and an urgent plea for similar information from British advertisers and industrialists will command the support not only of economists but of the general public. For the term 'advertisement', though not unduly charged with emotional significance, is very often enlarged in its meaning so that it readily creates feeling and calls forth moral judgments. It is to Mr Lever's great credit that he maintains a scientific detachment while insisting on the relevance of ethical principles, on condition that they are clearly recognised as such.

EDWARD QUINN

OUR NEW MASTERS. By Colm Brogan. (Hollis & Carter; 8s. 6d.)

During the war-time political truce, the Conservative Party, seemingly secure in its huge parliamentary majority, was subjected to a series of guerilla attacks by prominent Socialists, through the medium of the Victor Gollancz 'Roman' books. There can be little doubt that these publications contributed largely to the defeat of the

Conservatives at the poll in 1945. To date, Conservative reaction to these shrewdly timed assaults has been limited to rather bewildered protestations of innocence, which lacked the spirit necessary for successful counter-attack.

Mr Colm Brogan has stepped into the breach. In 'Our New Masters' he brings his artillery of wit and contempt to bear on the Labour Party, both collectively and individually. He argues that the full implementation of Socialism is impossible without loss of liberty. This, he maintains, was the meaning behind Mr Churchill's much-discussed 'Gestapo' broadcast, but Mr Attlee, by the very mildness of his reply, turned the strength of the denunciation to the credit of the Labour Party.

The author presents a summary of the past records of the present Cabinet members, his purpose being to show how, during their years in opposition, with reckless promises of utopian conditions through the suppression of the profit motive and the substitution of nationalisation, they fostered false expectations and class-hatred, making their present position one of considerable embarrassment. The difficulty being, to persuade workers who for years were plied with promises of increased leisure and better conditions, that to prevent starvation they must work nearly twice as hard. The weak Government attitude towards the unofficial strikers is then compared to the threats used by Mr Strachey when the Master Bakers questioned the advisability of the bread-rationing scheme, illustrating the class prejudice inherent in most of the present Ministers.

With admirable restraint, Mr Shinwell and Mr Bevan are saved until the concluding chapters. They are the obvious and most satisfactory targets, principally because neither held positions in the Coalition Government and were a perpetual thorn in the side of that body. Their vulnerability arises from the fact that their parliamentary projectiles prior to the Election can be neatly deflected to hit themselves before they have comfortably settled on the ministerial benches, an example being Mr Bevan's frequent harangues on housing.

The official foreign policy of the Labour Party has, in the course of the war, completely reversed itself, the cornerstone of Russia being rejected in favour of the United States. In calling our attention to this the author makes very entertaining play on past speeches and resolutions received with enthusiasm at party conferences; but shows appreciation of Mr Bevin's qualities as Foreign Secretary, together with his handling of the few remaining rebels.

This may well be the book the Conservatives await to assist in the restoration of their political fortunes. It is very readable, with a neat turn of phrase that should appeal to the section of the electorate from which the present Opposition must win votes in a return to power: the hard-pressed lower middle class.

As a balanced study of contemporary politics the book does not

deserve really serious consideration; is not so much partisan as anti-partisan. The criticism levelled at the Labour Party should sometimes be shared among their partners in the Coalition Government, as in the case of the Education Act, which was implemented in its original form by Mr Butler and only slightly altered by the Socialists. Nevertheless, one cannot help feeling that Mr Gollancz and his bitter band of socialist intellectuals are only reaping the tornado from the gales they sowed as Romans.

MAURICE McLOUGHLIN

THE CROWN OF LIFE. By G. Wilson Knight. (Oxford University Press; 18s.)

One type of literary criticism, claiming the accuracy of scientific method, demands that the critic should go to his task with a mind completely empty; he should then dissect the work under consideration and make judgment solely on his findings. But every judgment demands two terms, and dissection will only give us one; we find the other term not in an empty mind but in a basic scale of values. To judge Shakespeare against himself alone is less than worthless. It is impossible. He must be judged according to principles.

Professor Knight, or any other modern critic, is compelled to write within a 'climate of opinion' which tends to minimise the value of principles and singles out the attitude 'which evades dogma and lives broadly in the spirit' as the most praiseworthy characteristic of Shakespeare's age. So in reading *The Crown of Life* one receives the impression that despite the author's principles this background is responsible for much obscurity. Although the book is mainly concerned with mysticism and the mystical significance of the later plays we are never sure what mysticism is. Again, we read that 'art is an extraverted expression of the creative imagination which, when introverted, becomes religion. But the mind of man cannot altogether dispense with the machinery of objectivity, and the inwardness of religion must create, or discern, its own objective reality and name it God'. In this manner absolute values are diluted and obscured in their formulation, and we find profound truths jostling startling half-truths: 'the Christian cross is only the symbol of the greatest of tragedies'; 'God himself is part of history'. Professor Knight describes the 'Shakespearean Renaissance' accurately, but cannot bring himself to lay down definitively the principles which lie behind Shakespeare's discriminating treatment of *Il Cortegiano* and Prospero's final renunciation. 'Today', he says, 'we have lost contact with mystery'; but that is because we have lost contact with dogma. Thus, while it would be far from just to call Professor Knight's criticism unprincipled, it does appear that the craze for 'non-sectarian' criticism and the cultivation of the mind that is so broad that it loses depth have blinded him to the full richness of his own interpretation and to some degree marred the clarity of his work. This must not detract