

tion is given to their discoveries rather than their personality differences. Adler is famous for his emphasis on the feelings of inferiority which produce a style of life organized to protect the individual from the real or imaginary threat that his feelings of inferiority evoke in him. This orientation meant that the central core of the personality was found in the ego, man's conscious awareness of himself and the resultant interaction between himself and others. This removed the importance of the unconscious on which Freud placed so much emphasis. The trend towards a greater appreciation of the importance of the ego is seen in the majority of recent advances in dynamic psychology and Adler's contributions are receiving a belated but rightful recognition.

For Adler the goal of Individual Psychology which is the name he gave to his movement is to help the patient overcome his various feelings of

inferiority present in his way of life and thus reintroduce him into a satisfactory relationship with his fellow human beings. It is a positive goal with optimistic expectations about man's capacity to achieve this and of society in general to rise above the limitations imposed by selfishness, isolation and aggression. In this sense he was much more optimistic about human relationships than Freud.

Adler was basically a humanist but unlike Freud had no theoretical objections to religion which helped man to achieve the socializing goals of improved human relationships.

The book contains twenty-one papers by Adler of variable quality and there is inevitably a great deal of repetition in the contents. They are, however, an invaluable source for any one concerned with the original thinking and works of this great psychologist.

J. Dominian

EDUCATION AND VALUES by G. H. Bantock. *Faber and Faber, 25s.*

18+ UNITY AND DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION (Edited by Marjorie Reeves). *Faber and Faber, 25s.*

Professor Bantock is concerned to remind the teacher from various points of view that he is 'inescapably involved in the world of values'. He is critical of the increasing precision about educational means, not in itself but in so far as it seems to imply increasing vagueness about purposes. He is adept at ferreting out covert value judgments in those whose writing is allegedly empirical, and of reminding them of the danger of converting factual into value statements. Here his training in linguistic analysis serves him well. Yet he is deeply distrustful of the 'rationalist' who 'is a great enemy of waste, under which heading he is inclined to include aspects of social life which fail to fit in with the narrow range of his morality'. He is critical of much educational sociology, of much 'progressive' educational thought and of modern educational research in general in these terms. When he comes to discuss value and purpose he relies largely on the literary intelligence, the educated

sensibility and the insights into the 'manalive' this gives. Besides the analytic and sceptical there is the tradition of 'rootedness' and acceptance, the tradition of authority, represented by Newman, Arnold, Eliot, Lawrence, Leavis. Professor Bantock rightly stresses for instance, how T. S. Eliot in *Notes Towards a Definition of Culture* appreciates a dimension in 'culture' which the anthropologist misses; just as Henry James, sees a dimension to the individual, which is beyond the psychologist. This 'rich complexity' of individual and social life, is available only, in Lawrence's phrase, to 'the flow of our sympathetic consciousness'. Professor Bantock sees, though I am doubtful about this, a reconciliation between the literary and empirical approaches in Schultz's concept of *Verstehen*, the construction of *homunculi*, human models, scientific in their relevance, adequacy, logical consistency and compatibility, yet literary in their human sensitivity.

Professor Bantock does education a great service in continually referring discussion to the level of values. He is the Socratic gadfly of English educational thought, dedicated to asking basic and uncomfortable questions.

Such questions might with profit be asked of many of the contributors to *18+*. This is a collection of essays by a representative group of very intelligent, well-intentioned academics, agonizing a little over the ambiguities of their vocation in the troubled post-Robbins world. Much of the most sensible talk seems to come from those concerned with sixth forms. For the rest there is a good deal of candyfloss progressivism; a slightly shrill fear of being left high and dry by the evolutionary wave, which sends the authors tumbling along in its wake, scrambling to see if they may not even ride on its crest; there is insufficient discussion of the direction of progress; few to say that there may be forms of social evolution which ought not to be passively accepted let alone actively supported. There is a great deal of rather vague talk about broadening and deepening, about trans-

discipline courses and the discovery of meanings. It is surprising to find even Miss Reeves committing herself to the very strange statement: 'Standards must be shaped to the people rather than people to the standards'; which must surely already be filed among Professor Bantock's most interesting specimens.

Among all this there shines, *sicut leo in silva*, an essay by Brian Wilson which does go to the heart of things. The university's mission is the transmission of our cultural inheritance. This is menaced by publicity, expansion, big business, attitudes in the new technologies, the pervasive materialistic youth culture from which universities make little attempt to wean their students. These forces are to be resisted. The real need of students is for an ivory tower. Minority culture is to be accepted, otherwise status inflation will simply devalue the cultural currency. This courageous raising of basic questions of value and purpose provides an essay one can get one's teeth into. It is in these terms that really worthwhile educational dialogue can be conducted.

Kevin Nichols

CHARLES PEGUY: A STUDY IN INTEGRITY by Marjorie Villiers. *Collins, 42s.*

*Celui qui a le goût de l'absolu peut être un innocent, un fou, un ambitieux ou un pédant, mais il ne peut pas être heureux.* This is the motto from Aragon which Mrs Villiers puts at the beginning of the most sympathetic and comprehensive account of Péguy which has so far appeared in English. Many of his contemporaries would have called him *un fou*, but it is his innocence, or integrity, and also his personal unhappiness transformed, at the end, into creative joy that has had such a profound effect on later generations in France – during the Resistance, and year by year on the road to Chartres. Outside his own country, however, he has had comparatively little impact because he continues to be seen as a publicist, politician or prophet and not primarily as a poet. Apart from his end on the battlefields of Marne his life had little outer incident; it was so closely and even

tediously bound up with the ideological situation of the France of his time and it 'tends to fall flat in the telling', as Mr Alexander Dru says in his essay of 1956 which complements the present detailed biography in important ways.

But Mrs Villiers shows that the flatness can to a large extent be avoided. In the first two sections of the book (1873–1907) she has unravelled the tangled mass of the social and political background and has guided us in a skilful and scholarly narrative to a deeper understanding of the culminating achievement of Péguy's last years – his poetic and really creative work (1908–1914). Not that she analyses his literary work critically, for that is not her field; she tells us about it and simply allows Péguy to speak for himself in translation. Modestly, she calls this 'transliteration', but it is far more than that, and it is here, perhaps, that the greatest value of this