

to the generality of modern readers in his own Middle English tongue, and had better not be submitted to them in the bastard tongue which results from a partial modernisation. So, taking his courage in both his hands and bidding defiance to all specialists and pedants, he has given us a translation of Rolle into modern English. We welcome the achievement quite cordially. We have often felt it odd that while the French—thanks to Dom Noetinger—can read our fourteenth century mystics in their own modern tongue, we English should have him only in what—to most of us—is an impossible medium. We are now satisfied. Here is a comprehensive selection of Rolle's works in an English which we can read without trouble, and even with pleasure.

J.M.

EUGENICS : AIMS AND METHOD. By Henry Davis, S.J. Paper, pp. iv, 79. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne.)

The author of this work on Eugenics has so often made us his debtor by his outspokenness in the matter of eugenic sterilisation that we find it hard to speak quite truthfully about what impression the book has made on our minds.

Perhaps we can approach the difficult duty of criticism by quoting the first lines of the summary: 'The Science of Eugenics is welcomed by all Catholics. Some of the methods suggested for the improvement of the race are condemned by Catholics. We should not, however, confuse the science with the methods' (p. 71).

So far from *all* Catholics welcoming or even admitting Eugenics as a Science Mr. Belloc's book on 'Survivals and New Arrivals' is proof to the contrary. Mr. Chesterton, too, is responsible for the famous epigram, 'Eugenics is not a science; Eugenics is a stink.' Now it is undeniable that Mr. Belloc and Mr. Chesterton are Catholics. It is equally undeniable that they are important Catholics. What they say to-day, thousands will say to-morrow. On grounds of observed fact it cannot be said that 'The Science of Eugenics is welcomed by all Catholics.'

Even on logical grounds Eugenics, as proposed by the Eugenists, is not a Science, but an Art. Its avowed purpose is to do something to improve the human breed. Now just as medicine is an art, this eugenics, if it existed, would be an art.

Fr. Davis's attitude towards sterilisation is so sound that it has not prepared us for the unformed thinking behind his attitude towards segregation.

Blackfriars

Nowhere has the book distinguished between voluntary and involuntary segregation. Involuntary segregation is imprisonment; and, if the segregation is life-long, it is life-long imprisonment. Fr. Davis seems to view with complete complacency the inflicting of life-long imprisonment not for any crime, nor for any threat of crime, but for the mere chance of some hurt. If such a law came into force a Socialist party in power could segregate for life all members of religious orders (Dominicans and Jesuits!), all Conservatives and Liberals, and all whose incomes were, say, over £10,000 a year.

Moreover, the chief avowed purpose of this segregation is to prevent procreation. Has Fr. Davis considered the moral state likely to arise in institutions where the aim is to prevent, not impurity but procreation?

Fr. Davis's attitude towards sterilisation has been so fearless that we invite him to reconsider the futility and dangers of involuntary segregation.

V. McN.

THE CHURCH IN MODERN TIMES: 1447-1789. By A. Leman.
Translated by E. Cowell. (Sands & Co. and B. Herder
Book Co.; London, Edinburgh, and St. Louis, U.S.A.;
3/6; pp. 236.)

This very capable essay deals with four great enemies of the Church, the Renaissance, the Protestant Reformation, Gallicanism, and Modern Unbelief. The evil elements of the Renaissance sapped the strength of the Church in many countries and left her weak before the powerful Protestant revolt. Calling up all the reserves of her strength, she at Trent gained a signal victory, which ushered in the great Catholic Restoration and put an end to Protestant aggression. An almost worse enemy next arose in Gallicanism, perhaps little more than a polite name for the system, introduced into England by Henry VIII, of neglecting entirely the Holy See. This in turn gave place to Modern Unbelief, whose high priests were Montesquieu and Voltaire. This led up to the French Revolution, the limit assigned to this essay, but in his conclusion the author shows us the Church again triumphant. 'We find her, under the direction of her sovereign pontiffs, whose authority does not cease to increase with every year that passes, once more taking up the work of restoration and of conquest, a work she will perform by blunting, in turn, the edge of every one of the so-called scientific weapons which a too-hasty system of philosophy forges for her destruction.'