

the author selects his spokesmen for the three traditions. A bishop's statement here, a theologian's there, synodal decisions, private views, conciliar declarations jostle with each other without real evaluation or any sense of deep penetration. When discussing the belief or ecclesial theory of a church there is here some merit in the Roman Catholic tradition of councils and council statements in that one can know, at least in substance, what the Church holds and teaches, whereas it is not nearly so easy to ascertain the Eastern position, and not easy at all to be sure in any detail what is the true Anglican stance. It can be as difficult to be indefinite, as to be over defining.

One can understand the Greek unwillingness to accept doctrinal developments that have taken place in the West since its separation from the East, but the chapter dealing with the

recurrent objection against papal authority as juridical rather than as a 'primacy of love' leaves the key question unresolved—is there or is there not an ultimate juridical authority? Archbishop Fouyas sees this the central of issue between East and West, but while Steven Runciman's work is often referred to, he does not seem to give to the enormous cultural and political sources of the separation the weight they deserve—and as these recede into the past agreement may be reached sooner than we think.

The author is at his best on the Sacraments, where he is less prejudgmental and if, throughout, his comparative study of the three churches had taken this form he would have given us an even more valuable and refreshing impetus to the search for a united christendom.

ANTHONY STOREY

INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE, by John H. Hayes. *SPCK*, London, 1973. 515 pp. + 16 maps. Paperback £2.95.

There is a great deal to recommend this work.

It is a pleasure to find a book so competently sign-posted. Chapter-titles and sub-headings are obvious and informative; charts and illustrations consolidate the text; 16 maps, 3 indices and a 20-page bibliography give the reader ample guidance—though it should be noted that there is nothing later than 1970 in the bibliography: one regrets that no additions were made for this paperback edition of a work first published in 1971. Almost everything possible has been done for the aid and comfort of the reader, except in the problem of the size and appearance of the work. This 'substantial volume' (p. xv) is physically cumbersome to read—the type-line is too long, the margins too narrow, and the general appearance 'heavy'.

Fortunately the text itself, though sometimes dense, is never, like the Bible (in Professor Hayes' opinion), 'occasionally quite tedious to read' (p. 6). There is a forthrightness and simplicity which avoid this.

Simplicity does not replace accuracy. This is a remarkably thorough, scholarly and judicious presentation of the 1970 state-of-play in biblical studies. Professor Hayes is quite willing to leave question-marks and to state that particular problems have not yet been satisfactorily resolved. There is nothing idiosyncratic in this Introduction, nothing that marks it out as especially significant, other than its breadth, depth and extreme objectivity. It is what it claims to be: an Introduction—neither superficial nor polemical.

The final recommendation is the price.

RICHARD PEARCE

MEANING AND CONTROL, D. O. Edge and J. N. Wolfe (Eds). *Tavistock Publications*, London, 1973. 274 pp. £4.

This volume is a collection of twelve papers given at a seminar at Edinburgh University, and in the editors' words they 'reflect the Seminar's exploration of the social meaning of the emergence of modern science and technology, and of the challenge posed by that emergence to the processes of social control'.

The first few essays are concerned with the meaning of this emergence, and start with an attempted demolition of Ryle's description of the possible, or impossible, conflict between scientific assertions and common sense. (I say 'attempted' since, even in Ryle's absence, one senses a certain elusiveness in the argument.) There then follow a couple of much more

relevant papers: one on the use and influence of technological metaphors in describing human behaviour (e.g. the structure of the meeting allowed a lot of feedback to Edge's letting off steam) and another, compressed account by Armytage of the rise of a technocratic class. As befits an article on technocracy it's good on description but poor, or simply incurious, on significance; it reads a little like Armytage's own description of an engineer: 'too busy keeping things going to worry about society'. There is a stimulating, if short, discussion of the paper by Littlejohn, going right to the point of the argument about the dehumanizing role of technology: '. . . the

technocratic class has legitimized itself in the eyes of society at large'.

I was reminded of this comment on reading Bechhofer's piece on technology and shop-floor behaviour; his article, which is in the way of a review and justification of the 'affluent worker' studies, ends with a clear plea: '... it seems (more) sensible to start from the position ... that the nature of man in his work (and more prosaically, at a lower level, his orientation to his work) are matters for empirical enquiry'. This, and the paper by Trist on scientific management can be read together, and between them provide a fascinating account of modern liberal managerial methods and industrial sociology as applied to man-in-his-work. What is missing is any discussion or confrontation with the authors on their assumptions and methods. It is taken for granted that an account of, say, industrial relations practice in Scandinavia really reveals the 'social meaning'. It may well be that all the studies and experiments reveal is in fact man's ability to manipulate, in a limited way, social situations. Which, of course, brings us right back to technocracy. . . .

There then follow a variety of papers about the possibilities and practice of technological change: in education, government intervention in Research and Development in the UK and the USSR, technological changes in the USA. etc. These are, on the whole, a very valuable set of empirical studies, and especially for those interested in the instrumentality of policy making. With one exception, however, they also manage to avoid a direct confrontation with the two major policy issues. First, who controls? The discussions tell us about

governmental planning in the USSR, and the death of MinTech, yet never address the outstanding problem of how 'we the people' can truly control technological development, application and change. The technological imperative is truly overriding. The earlier accounts of industrial 'democracy' apparently support this view, and lead directly into the second omission, which is how social priorities might be incorporated or even achieved. There is hardly a hint in these articles that this, or other 'external' references could ever be an issue, with the one exception of Freeman's outstanding article on the outrageous imbalance between the levels of scientific and technological efforts in and for the affluent nations and the Third world. This is one, and perhaps the most immediately obvious, illustration of the social meaning of modern technology. It is now even easier than before to exploit people. And given the nature of modern capitalism and the size and structure of the multinational companies like ITT, Ford or the large petroleum producers, the possibilities of social control are more and more remote. In fact, as many of these essays exemplify, it is almost impossible even to discuss the issue, so cleverly has it been eliminated.

Technology *can* and *must* be put at the service and control of the people it now serves only to manipulate and use. To realise this sort of social control will require confrontation and profound change. But it is the only way to respond to Littlejohn's challenge: 'those who question the legitimacy of the technocrat's claims must demonstrate that they are in possession of a truth more true than theirs'.
LEO PYLE

PASSING FOR WHITE. A Study of Racial Assimilation in a South African School, by Graham Watson. *Tavistock Publications*, London, 1970 (Paperback edition 1973). 130 pp. 80p.

Appalling social circumstances do not always favour accuracy of analysis: the problems are sometimes too urgent to allow drawn-out deliberation, suffering can be too extreme for further postponement of action. South Africa is a case in point. Much has been written about its social problems, exposing and condemning the political system that keeps them in existence. Apartheid is so obviously wrong that it needs only a rough outline and a few figures to convince the world of its rejectability. The studies sponsored by the South African Institute of Race Relations, for example, would be fully adequate; little more is required to realize that the present regime needs to be opposed. However, we also know that in practical terms there is not much we can or will do to change the situation. Apartheid is indeed quite obviously inhuman, and

yet our liberal arguments fail to convince the Afrikaner, or even the African himself, for it remains the analysis of an outsider.

But an approach is possible in which, instead of making general statements about Whites and Blacks border-line cases can be taken as the point of references and in them the intrinsic absurdity of Apartheid exposed. This is the approach of *Passing for White*, which was not initially conceived as a political study. The author quite deliberately tries to steer away from the usual course of most discussions in South Africa by choosing a neutral area, i.e. a school in a working-class suburb of Cape Town. Although Colander High is officially a White school, it is in fact one of those places where coloured people find access to the privileges and status of the White community. Dr. Watson describes how this