

nowadays. There is a tendency nowadays for legal writers to draw a clear distinction between law and morals, and to expound legal positivism in one form or another. The reviewer remembers having natural law explained to him by a university lecturer as if it were an interesting survival from a more credulous age, like belief in the world being flat: one had to deal with it, as it was in the syllabus, but far more time was spent on the ideas of Austin and Bentham. Against this tendency the present book provides a strong counterblast.

One criticism that may be made is that the book is somewhat rambling. Thus one whole section of more than seventy pages, entitled 'In the School of Christ', is largely an examination of the teaching of our Lord in regard to lawyers and law, in a series of discursive essays. The main part of the book is however an historical review of the links between the natural law and the common law, first in England and then in the United States of America. Even in this part there is a certain tendency to ramble, so that, for instance, more space is devoted to references to the natural law in Shakespeare than to the development of equity in the late middle ages. No doubt the justification for this is that the book is a personal statement of one man's legal philosophy, without pretensions to being a logical exposition or defence thereof.

On one point the reviewer would disagree with the author. This is in the view, implied throughout the whole book, that the natural law has today gone underground. As stated above, there is a tendency for writers to decry natural law. In practice, at any rate in England, neither the judges nor practitioners commonly give way to this tendency. The advocate who presents a case which, though apparently sound in law, is devoid of merits, may expect to have a pretty rough time in almost any court. The advice which Dr Wu ascribes to Lord Denman's master, Mr Tidd (who, incidentally, wrote *Tidd's Practice*, a work admired by Uriah Heep), that in giving his opinion the lawyer should first master the facts, then consider what is right, before considering the law, is still given today, by at least one eminent English judge. It is not true in practice that natural law has gone underground. It might have become somewhat inarticulate, but it is no mere chance that the proper title of the law courts in London is the Royal Courts of Justice.

D. C. POTTER

THE MOVEMENT OF WORLD REVOLUTION. By Christopher Dawson.
(Sheed and Ward; 13s. 6d.)

The occasion of the first essay in this collection (the thematic essay

on the Relevance of European History) caused me no little amusement when it first appeared in *History Today*. Professor Dawson was prompted to write it by Barraclough's work, *History in a Changing World*, in which Barraclough calls upon historians to stop regarding Europe as the centre of universal history and bemoans the fact that European historians are so ignorant of the wider world. Dawson in his reply showed quite convincingly 'that it is only by way of Europe and the western historical tradition that it is possible to approach that universal world history which has so long been the ideal of the philosophers of history'. My amusement sprang from the fact that Dawson, in the course of his reply, incidentally displayed an astonishing knowledge of the extra-European world—knowledge that Barraclough may well envy—thus refuting his opponent twice over, once deliberately and once indirectly.

With the details of the historical argument readers of this journal are not specially interested. It will be enough to say that Dawson briefly tells the story of how Europe (through her missionaries, traders and technicians) has become the central force in world history, and how the world revolution in Asia and Africa is both a reaction against, and continuation of, that European force.

What stands out as particularly relevant in this place is the distinction Dawson draws between the old cultures (Hinduism, Confucianism, etc.) and the new nationalisms; these are often treated by western commentators as though they are identical, whereas the nationalisms are for the most part secular and western in tone and bitterly opposed to the old cultures. Hence the fashionable Catholic notion that Christians must adapt themselves to the ancient cultures of these countries may be very misleading. Perhaps our attempts at adaptation will only incur the contempt of the rising classes of nationalists. And if Dawson is right in surmising that 'the key points of oriental Christianity will be found in the great urban centres like Calcutta and Bombay, Tokyo, Shanghai, Canton, Singapore', then it is to the conditions of those centres that we must adapt our spiritual teaching. This conclusion may sound a little depressing now that we have at last begun to take the old culture seriously. On reflection it will be seen to be encouraging. It means that if we can develop a form of Christian life true to the structure and demands of living in great cities then we shall not be far out in our aim of bringing the Christian message to those distant peoples.

But have we managed this in the west? Or are we not still peasant-like in our churches and societies?

DONALD NICHOLL