

applicable, too, his observation that it is 'the great men, of great sees, who are the first in taking large and comprehensive views, and who give up contracted views with the least sparing hand' (p. 201). His sketch of the Spanish mentality (p. 368) is, unfortunately, too long to quote.

Yet some alignments have subtly changed, as the reader will soon see who tries to compare majority and minority, progressive and reactionary, Northern and Latin, at the two councils. A remark of Butler's, that before the Council those who wanted definition at all costs came from 'Catholic countries in which there was no other strongly organized religion' (p. 174) gives a clue to the change of temper. There are fewer places now where it is still possible to ignore the belief of our separated brethren, or refuse it any place in the development of the Church's understanding of the truth she guards. The ecumenical movement has brought about profound changes in the years between the councils. 'There is good reason for thinking that the suspension of the Council, when it had achieved just so much as it had, was an ordering of Providence', says Butler (p. 486). Thirty years later we can agree even more whole-heartedly with his dry conclusion.

LAURENCE BRIGHT, O.P.

PROBLEMS AND PROGRESS, A THEOLOGICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL INQUIRY, edited by Robert W. Gleason, S.J.; Newman Press, \$3.

The essays in this book – originally papers read at Fordham in the School of General Studies – are written to persuade Catholics that a fully Christian attitude involves a commitment to human society, to natural communities. Love is a task as well as a gift, as Fr Gleason expresses the dominant theme.

The papers cover a multitude of subjects from advice to American Presidential candidates to information for the use of Spiritual Directors on how to distinguish genuine stigmata from the psychosomatic symptoms of hysteria. In general they have a relevance to the modern world in that they make a much-needed attempt at incorporating the results of contemporary psychology within the Christian understanding of man.

The assumptions of the writers are somewhat right-wing and they tend to simplify complex problems. There is a paper on mass media, especially television, which works towards the conclusion that 'we wish to see lists of the approved and disapproved programs multiplied' in an effort to ensure the right use of the new means of communication. Difficult subjects like that of Natural Law theory are wielded a little too easily by some of the contributors – notably in the discussion of the rights of the State and the individual, of psychoanalysis and Christianity, and of evolutionary hypotheses.

The essay on 'Evolution and Catholic Theology' by Fr J. Franklin Ewing is perhaps the most blatant example of an essay which not only fails to 'clean the ground of a number of widely accepted myths' but gives further currency to a

gross mis-representation of the careful words of Pope Pius XII in *Humani Generis*. Recourse is had again to the distinction between scientists concerned only with 'how' questions, and philosophers and theologians with 'why' questions, but the vitals of the distinction are somewhat eviscerated by the remark that Scripture is not concerned with the 'how', 'except as it involves the why'. However the essay is rescued by the adoption of the Pauline concept of creation being summed up in Christ: 'Christ not only assumed the past of the universe, but He assumed its future. If there is a goal in evolution, it is God'. It is pleasant to find that one who believes that 'Rome knows exactly what is being taught and written throughout the Church' can express such Teilhardist views today.

In a book which is so replete with phrases about freedom and responsibility it is interesting to note that there is no attempt to deal at any length with the authority of the Church or of conscience (except a well-known quotation from Newman), or of the exploratory speculations of Catholic scholars – though there is a pleasant example of the freedom of Catholics in the expression of totally opposed views by Dr Emilio Dido and the Paulist Fr George Hagmaier on whether Freudian psychology is compatible with Catholic ideas about man.

The essays concerned with man in society are less successful than those which treat of the individual, perhaps because society has become the subject of pseudo-scientific study and is too complacently dealt with in terms of jargon and expertise – population shifts and minority groups are more easily managed than men. From half a dozen essays two passages stand out. The one Fr John Lafarge's illustration of the importance of civic duties – three young firemen, fathers of families, died in a fire; two of them struggling to free themselves from a pile of boxes heaped up in defiance of municipal fire law, the third going to their help. The other Fr Gleason's happy analysis of love as seeing the loved one from within, and unfaithfulness as seeing from without 'as other people see'.

Throughout the book the tone is rather aggressively American and this not only in parallels drawn between the American Constitution and 'certain central Catholic doctrines', nor the need to inform Americans that it is not 'foolish idealism' to be persuaded that they must when dealing with 'the French, the German or the Spaniard or the African' have 'an intense conviction that there are elements of good in them' and the United States must 'draw these out', nor the limited appeal of essays on the New York water front, but also in the multiplicity of words like 'don't-care-ism', 'inequities', 'erosphere' and 'finitisation'.

Despite the evident intelligence of some of the contributors, notably Gleason and La Farge, there is a sense of men who realising the dangers of the ghetto mentality in English-speaking Catholicism, are yet unable to open a way for themselves or others. The book remains an interesting failure.

HAMISH SWANSTON, CONG. ORAT.