

Chadaev, though only a 'qualified' Westerniser himself, dared to publish an article comparing Russia unfavourably with the West, he was promptly declared insane and placed under house arrest by the Tsar Nicholas I. That Belinsky felt no qualms eulogizing the monarchy only three years later, when the same Tsar was still on the throne, shows that any sense of outrage that may have been felt at Chaadaev's treatment soon evaporated.

At the same time, the 'left-wing' Westernizers were of course still a relatively small minority. But their influence was growing, and intellectually many of them soon progressed from Hegel to Marx. It is here, I think, that Copleston's book begins to falter. He is on the whole much happier when he deals with literary figures and religious thinkers, than when he is trying to unravel the mysteries of dialectical thought. Consequently he lavishes on the former a great deal of space and attention. The discussion of Dostoevsky, Tolstoy and Solovyev alone occupies nearly a quarter of the book. Now, of course, there is no question that these three towering figures have exercised a profound influence on the intellectual life of Russia, and Copleston is right in emphasising their importance. Yet one wonders whether in a book of this sort the right balance has been struck, and whether, for example, the discussion of Russian Marxism from its beginnings in the nineteenth century to Lenin and Stalin, which is given about the same amount of space, should not have been discussed in more depth, given the immense consequences that the seizure of power by the Marxists in 1917 has had not just for Russia herself but for the world as a whole. The treatment of Plekhanov and the marxist-inspired social-democratic movement, is woefully inadequate. In his discussion of Lenin, Copleston concentrates almost exclusively on Lenin's 'Materialism and Empirio-Criticism', while Lenin's immensely influential work 'State and Revolution', which has been studied like a biblical text by generations of Communists, is mentioned only in a footnote. Stalin's once enormously influential 'Voprosy Leninisma' ('The Problems of Leninism') does not get discussed at all, and it would appear that what Copleston has to say about Stalin is mainly derived from a few articles that are available in English translation.

Still, despite these failings, the book as a whole is a remarkable achievement. With the exception of Marxist philosophy it provides what seems to me to be a thoroughly reliable as well as sympathetic insight into the Russian philosophical scene. It is also—like all Copleston's books—immensely enjoyable for its lucidity and the elegance of its prose.

EDO PIVČEVIĆ

THE CHRISTIAN RESPONSE TO INDUSTRIAL CAPITALISM by William Charlton, Tatiana Mallinson, Robert Oakeshott. *Sheed and Ward*. 1986. Pp. 263. £9.50.

One would not have thought the Christian response had been so various, occasionally eccentric but occasionally also effective. This is a lively and readable text, equally for learning as for teaching, which fairly states the record. Shepherd for Dr. Sheppard of Liverpool in the index is perhaps a happy fault and the undeserved omission of the Oxford Movement's own social criticism understandable. It is also a statement of intent, or rather a confession of interest in the co-operative solution.

It is achieved with conviction. Take the persuasive case histories of recent examples: Bewley's Cafes in Dublin, made over by its original Quaker owners to the employees, the Scott Bader Commonwealth, similarly Quaker in origin, now worker owned, the Antigonish movement founded by the two priests, James Tompkins and Moses Coady, which helped to bring Nova Scotia through the depression, the co-operatives of Mondragon in the Basque country, which have been 'almost unbelievably successful', now employing 19,000 and providing social security for 50,000. Mondragon is the model for a solution to the problems generated by the Industrial Revolution. Co-operatives form the eye of the needle through which the camel of human cupidity and ambition can safely pass

and be transformed in the process. The authors have no time for the extremes of Christian reaction to the perils of this world: the view that poverty alone qualifies for the Kingdom of Heaven, or the medieval embargo on interest-charging, or the renunciation of marriage altogether in an effort to put down selfish accumulation. State socialism is anathema to them as much as the unregulated market is a disgrace. Fair-shares, partnership, co-operation, moderate size, please them. Lord Stockton rather than Margaret Thatcher; Tawney rather than Savonarola or Simon Stylites. The feature of Christian thinking that impresses them and that they have richly documented is 'the growing conviction that some middle way must be found between unrestricted individualistic competition on the one hand and state socialism on the other'. Christians join with anarchists in anticipating evil from the latter; Proudhon and Marx reach hands towards Christians in the radical critique of monopolistic capitalism. The focus is on the place of work in human life. Simone Weil believed that without religion we have no hope of creating a 'civilisation founded upon the spiritual nature of work'. It is also upon roots. 'Every human being needs to have multiple roots'. Weil again, baptising Marx, Proudhon and Kropotkin. Not only work, but the over-riding concern for the right to work.

The authors hold that 'doubtless there are still those (especially in the Roman Catholic Church) who think that the most perfect realisation of (our) capacities is contemplative prayer. Nevertheless for general consumption most Christians would settle for something nearer to what we find in Marx's Paris Manuscripts: free and intelligent productive work, or use for the benefit of all men of the natural world God has created for the benefit of all'.

E.P. Thompson comes in for criticism for his swipe at the Sunday Schools movement and their indoctrination of working class children in the worst phases of the exploitation of labour and for his punitive singling out of the Methodists; Edward Norman for his loyalty to the political and economic tradition of *laissez-faire*. We are a long way from the Peterhouse right. There is less about Maritain than about F.D. Maurice, Peter Maurin and Dorothy Day. Schumacher of *Small is Beautiful* we learn was Jewish, married a Lutheran and became a Catholic. There is something of this pluralist pilgrimage about the book, evidence of its author's strengths in philosophy, history and economics. The text is a model of evenness and clarity. The record is told with justice to the humanist as well as the Christian roles.

Such a history is badly needed for senior students, teachers and for those of us who may have thought it was a dull or a dishonourable story. Lamennais would recognise the echo of his 'Since liberty is individual it follows that property, in its essence, must be individual too' and the Methodist Hugh Price Hughes the re-iteration of his conviction that Jesus Christ came to save human society as well as individuals and that you can't effectually save the one without saving the other. This is a book to be read before the election as well as in the schools, apt for the crisis of capitalism as well as socialism, remembering the Congregationalist R.F. Horton who, lecturing on unemployment, 'spoke of Jesus as the leader of the labour party (or Labour Party—reports differed).'

ARTHUR HILARY JENKINS

THE UNACCEPTABLE FACE. The Modern Church in the Eyes of the Historian by John Kent. *SCM*, 1987, pp 261, £12.50.

John Kent reviews in this book the way modern Church history has been written and he is intensely critical. Very often, it has to be confessed, the tone is one of acerbic displeasure of almost every book and every point of view—Anglican, Catholic, Evangelical, Marxist, scholars in the Durkheimian tradition. I think he probably dislikes Anglicans, especially the Anglo-Catholic viewpoint, most of all. He has undoubtedly a good case—a great deal of Church history is conceptually very inadequate and rather softly self-satisfied. Nevertheless it may be questioned whether the critique here offered is really thought through in