

seriously Daly's hostility to and dehumanization of other people. This direction of her spirit should be looked on with sorrow and pity, rather than anger. It should be recognised as a mindset of one who has sojourned too long in the realms of negativity, and not as a "radicalism" to be admired or imitated.

However, I recommend that the first level of the book be read carefully and with the utmost seriousness. On this level Daly has much to tell us about radical evil, about the systems of deception that justify violence, terror and destruction of life. She is undoubtedly correct when she begins by saying that this book appears in the 1980s, a time of extreme danger for women (and, I would add, for men as well) and for the earth and all her creatures who stand in danger of annihilation by nuclear bombs, chemical contamination, hunger and disease, all of which "proliferate in a climate of deception and mind-rot".

ROSEMARY RADFORD RUETHER

EXPERIENCE, EXPLANATION AND FAITH: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION, by Anthony O'Hear. *Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984.* Pp. xiii + 266. £6.95.

Although this lucidly written and (for traditional theists) challenging book is an introduction in the sense that it covers most of the topics relevant to the philosophy of religion, it is not so in the sense that it can be recommended as an introductory book for students (alongside such books by H.D. Lewis, John Hick and Brian Davies). However, it certainly deserves consideration by those who specialize in the philosophy of religion. There are six chapters on faith and religious life, religious experience, religion and morality, religious explanations, suffering and evil, religion and the rational man. Particular attention should be paid to what O'Hear says about the differences between religious and sensory experience, to his critique of natural theology and to his remarks on evil. His thesis (as summarized at the end of his introduction and expanded in his last chapter) is the negatively bold one that religious beliefs are not rationally acceptable; that faith derives its strength largely from its inbuilt tendency to uncritical dogmatism; and that therefore rational men should look beyond religion for the fulfilment of their spiritual needs. I do not find O'Hear's presentation of the thesis convincing. On the contrary some of his statements tell in favour of theism's rational defensibility. Nevertheless the thesis (in this or in any other form) requires examination by Christian philosophers.

H.P. OWEN

WHY BELIEVE IN GOD? by Peter Lee. *Beckett Publications. Oxford, 1984.* Pp.79. £2.50.

There are many arguments for the existence of God, and plenty of literature about them. But it is hard to find a short and cogent defence of belief in God suitable for those who cannot or will not wade through the technical treatments of it. This book therefore fulfils a real need, for it is direct and easy to read as well as sensible. Lee bases his case for God on simple statements of the cosmological argument and the argument from design. Subsequently, he deals with topics such as morality, religious experience, God and beauty, God and history, Christianity and world religions, and the problem of evil. There is nothing particularly original in what Lee says, and there is plenty in the text with which one could take issue or ask to be developed. But the general approach seems to me a reasonable one. It is presented in a popular manner, but it shows signs of philosophical sophistication. The proverbial layman should find the book very useful, but so should many others. In terms of scope and rhetoric it cannot compare with the work of writers like Küng. But in terms of conciseness such writers cannot compare with Lee, who in this book shows how important matters can still be considered in a way that is both unpretentious and to the point.

BRIAN DAVIES OP