

WAR AND THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CONDITIONS OF PEACE. By William Brown. (A. & C. Black; 7s. 6d.)

This is a new edition with three additional chapters of the author's *War and Peace: Essays in Psychological Analysis*, published four months before the war. The original chapters are unrevised, but lead naturally to the new material which is concerned with the philosophy and psychology of the Nazi state, the psychological factors leading to war, and the psychological conditions of peace.

Broadly, Dr. Brown's thesis appears to be that although ethics and religion are, as he says, 'the ultimate court of appeal,' the causes of war and the conditions of peace are primarily psychopathological. Is this altogether certain? Undoubtedly one of the chief causes of war is the conflict of ideas in normal men of good-will. As Hegel saw, the human tragedy is that while most men strive to do right, they differ passionately in their ideas of the right; and these different conceptions of right are bound at times to conflict. Another obvious cause is the conflict of sheer evil with partial good—a conflict that does seem largely to explain the present war. Beside these immense issues the psychopathological forces seem relatively insignificant; but Dr. Brown argues that their importance is *conditional*. Neurotic states of mind condition our good and evil tendencies; and few will deny that the neurotic conditions generated by modern industrialism (together with the inherent contradictions of industrial society itself) lead to war.

Dr. Brown's argument will lack conviction for many readers, particularly those reared in the traditions of this journal, on account of his assumption of the truth of certain psychological premises. He takes for granted many of the Freudian premises on the mind and its structure (the *unconscious*, the *ego*, the *super-ego*, and the *id*), a conception rejected by the Adlerian school, and ruthlessly criticised by Allers. He also assumes the aggressiveness of primitive man, a position open to considerable doubt. He may be right; but unless his premises are certain his diagnosis will be unconvincing and his remedy ineffectual. The present uncertainty of psychological knowledge makes any attempt to get rid of war on psychological grounds extremely problematical.

Some of the best things in the book are in the new chapters. The survey of the rise of Nazi philosophy and psychology traces most lucidly the impact of the ideas of Herder, Fichte, Rosenberg, and others, on a people emotional and somewhat *paranoid* (having delusions of persecution, i.e. encirclement), and reveals that Germany is the aggressor precisely because she thinks on aggressive lines. The idea of one race-state as supreme must lead to war with other races and states. Dr. Brown quotes Rosenberg as saying that 'Nordic blood represents that mystery which has replaced and supplanted the old sacraments.' As a solution for the post-war chaos, he suggests a renewed League, or a Federal Union; but—and it is an im-

portant 'but'—he emphasises that there must be a wider psychological knowledge in the statesmen who comprise the new League or Federation if it is to succeed. Diplomacy needs more of the psychology of Dr. Brown, and considerably more of the Theocentricism advocated by Mr. George Glasgow, the ratio being one of means to end.

The book is clearly and attractively written. There are signs of haste at times, as when Dr. Brown misleadingly speaks of war as invariably the worst of all evils and elsewhere as necessary in certain situations, or when he criticises the view in *Mein Kampf* that peace can only be established by war after having implied that war may be necessary to preserve the peace. But he is always readable; and in the main his judgements of political events are sane and unbiased.

ROBERT HAMILTON.

THE LAW OF LIBERTY. By Margaret M. Harvey. Swarthmore Lecture, 1942. (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. cloth, 1s. 6d. paper.)

Though speaking as a Quaker to Quakers, the author discourses fairly generally on the duties and responsibilities of Christians in and beyond the present crisis. There is first the communal witness for peace. In the words of the Friends of 1804: 'It is a solemn thing to stand before the nation as the advocates of inviolable peace,' and professed pacifists cannot but ask themselves if they too have not lived with little protest as members of a society which they saw to make for war.

There is also the witness for liberty; but the liberty a Christian looks to is 'the liberty of the glory of the children of God,' which has been veiled and countered by the 'liberties' granted by a secularist State. 'There has been liberty to create scarcity, to plan monopoly, to destroy the very means of life, and for the victim there has been liberty to waste his youth, his strength, his manhood, unwanted and purposeless. Small wonder then that men, seeing no true liberty in their precarious lives, have judged it visionary, impossible of attainment, and have largely abandoned the search, seeking now a lesser, though they feel perhaps an attainable good, security.'

For us as for our ancestors, remedy lies in the fresh and fearless application of the eternal laws of God. 'It has been one of the special temptations of our day to speak as if the word of God may have sufficed for those in quieter times, but as for us, we are in the grip of vast inexorable forces . . . The precepts of old, we say, do not suffice for our peculiar difficulties or are too difficult to apply in these more complicated days. But those books which impress us most with their eternal significance and truth, Isaiah—the Psalms—the Gospels, were written in time of crisis by men and