

inction from the soul seems to merit no mention at all. This may be due to an exaggerated deference to modern prejudice against anything savouring of 'faculty psychology'; even Spearman's 'Factors' receive only a passing reference, while his experiments in factorial analysis which have done much to rehabilitate the despised faculty theory in the eyes of the moderns are not detailed. The omission of such a fundamental doctrine together with the sketchiness of the treatment of the nature of knowledge would seem to constitute a serious weakness in a book which purports to provide a course in scholastic psychology and which in other respects is excellent of its kind.

EGBERT COLE, O.P.

IS THE PROGRESS OF SCIENCE CONTROLLED BY THE WANTS OF MAN?

By Dr. F. Sherwood Taylor (Society for Freedom in Science, Occasional Pamphlet No. 1; 1s. 6d.).

Popular interpreters of the history of science have for some years been fascinated by the notion that a scientist is not independent of the mental climate of the society he lives; they seek to find relations between scientific advance and the contemporary state of society as a whole. Unfortunately this useful line of investigation has too often been coupled with the presupposition that science has not been, and should not be, pursued for the sake of understanding nature, but for the sake of the material benefits which applied science can confer. Moreover, attention has thus been diverted from the study of the internal development of science according to its own proper dialectic. The works of Bernal, Hogben, and J. G. Crowther, for instance, are marred, if not vitiated, by these mistakes.

Dr. Sherwood Taylor has written a lively commentary on a typical pamphlet of this school, entitled *The Development of Science* and published by the Association of Scientific Workers. The contentions of the spokesman of the Association are found to rest on facile history, bad reasoning and neglect of the internal logic of science. His main conclusion, that "the broad lines of scientific development are governed by the practical needs of men, but especially by the needs of those men who control the wealth and power of the community", is found to be entirely without historical support. Many scientists have been aware that the economic interpretation of the history of science is being carried to absurd lengths, but it needed Dr. Sherwood Taylor's scholarship to show exactly where the fallacies lay. There is room for a larger work on the interpretation of the development of science, and the respective contributions to it of disinterested curiosity, the desire for fame or gain, and philanthropy, among human motives; and, among external influences, technology, medicine, philosophy, and religion. The over-emphasis of economic factors would be best corrected by a balanced account including the other factors.

E. F. CALDIN.