

REVIEWS

Most of the schemes are good and practical, and a useful bibliography is given after each section. But here another problem presents itself: a bibliography and 'no books'! If any one feels that the Guild is doing good work but regrets that he cannot take an active part in it he could not do better than help with the formation of a library. This is particularly important in poorer districts. Will some benefactor come forward?

H.P.

SOCIOLOGY

THE REVOLT AGAINST MECHANISM. By L. P. Jacks. Hibbert Lectures, 1933. (Allen & Unwin, 1934; 2/6.)

These two lectures are on the theme that mechanism is a good servant but a bad master. To-day mechanism has the upper hand, but the world is becoming aware of this and, being conscious of it, tends to revolt. There are signs of this revolt in education, philosophy, science, and society in general. Unfortunately we have become mechanically minded and look for salvation to schemes of control that are themselves mechanical. Mechanism is opposed to creative life, the highest form of which is religion. Religion therefore is the great hope, but mechanism is always tending to control religion too, whereas it should be no more than its 'resisting medium.' The old opposition between religion of authority and religion of the spirit leads Dr. Jacks to exaggerate the blessings of religious confusion, but his list of the effects of mechanism on religion on p. 70 forms a very valuable scheme of self-examination even for Catholics. Dr. Jacks names Ruskin, Morris, and Samuel Butler, as heralds of the much-needed revolt. But Carlyle's essay, *Signs of the Times*, appeared in 1829 and a closer parallel to the Hibbert Lectures of 1933 could hardly be found.

A.E.H.S.

MONEY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE. By the Rev. F. H. Drinkwater. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne; 2/6.)

We have been listening almost unceasingly of late to the pronouncements of the professional economists both in attack and defence of the present system, and it is refreshing as well as valuable to hear the views of a layman on such matters. Father Drinkwater has no inherited prejudices to fight against; his point of view is the point of view of a clearthinking and disinterested parish priest, and if we consider how few economists or financiers are either disinterested or clear-thinking, and how fewer still are parish priests (or even Christians) his advantage over them in discussing the social aspects of their science can scarcely fail to be recognized.