lating air pressures so that the flow of air is always away from the infant, Reyniers considers that a mechanical system of barriers to cross-infection can be erected. I. Rosenstern and E. Kammerling describe an experiment designed to compare Reyniers' mechanical method of cubicle isolation with Wells' ultra-violet light barrier isolation method, and with ordinary air-conditioning as a control. Each system is being tested on a block of twelve cubicles at the Cradle, Evanston, Ill., the three groups of infants being comparable in point of age, general health, and respiratory infection rate. The result of the experiment is not recorded, but the authors give details of preliminary bacteriological tests made by spraying *Chromobacterium prodigiosum* into the air and following its distribution.

The last paper is a detailed description by William F. Wells of his method of reducing the bacterial flora of hospital air by means of ultra-violet light screens.

The greater part of all of the papers is devoted to technique, but the authors also discuss the many uses to which the methods they describe may be put.

PRACTICAL MALARIA CONTROL

Practical Malaria Control

A Handbook for Field Workers. By Dr. Carl E. M. Gunther. Pp. 91. (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1944.) 2.50 dollars.

THE title of this book is an ambitious one, and our appetites are sharpened by the reputation of the author as an entomologist of repute, one fully acquainted with the literature of malaria, with practical experience in the field, as well as in the laboratory. In performance, however, the result is a little disappointing. The style is somewhat involved and confused, and the author has failed to make the most of what is a great opportunity. Many of the statements are dogmatic and open to criticism. For example, it is recommended that in conducting a malaria survey the best method is to collect adult *Anopheles* and post them to the nearest school of tropical medicine, or even the British Museum, for identification. At this point the student is left entirely in the air with the advice that no useful purpose can be served by detailing special control methods applicable to individual species of *Anopheles* which constitute the whole basis of species sanitation.

Under personal measures, the author declares himself a zealous advocate of prophylactic quinine, and, because of the excellent results he has obtained, insists on its use by every member of the non-immune population more than ten years of age. For small children quinine prophylaxis is not advised, as tending to produce the typical thin, pale and languid 'tropical' child. It will be noted that distinctions are drawn between measures applicable to those who are immune and those who are non-immune to malaria.

The author's brief instructions on the control of malaria in military campaigns can scarcely be of practical value under present war conditions.

The clinical section suffers from generalizations, and no attempt has been made to distinguish clinical syndromes produced by different species of *Plasmodium*, but one can infer from the sense of the text that the subtertian form is the one with which the author is most familiar. In treatment the author is by no means enthusiastic about 'Atebrin'; he prefers intramuscular injection to oral administration. When given by the mouth 'Atebrin' is, he avers, erratic in action, while 10 per cent of patients are highly sensitive and suffer from poisoning which is marked by "racking intractible bilious vomiting" lasting 12–14 hours. The treatment of blackwater fever does not follow on generally accepted lines; there is, for example, no evidence that blood transfusion aggravates intravascular hæmolysis. P. MANSON-BAHR.

THE BACKGROUND OF IMMATERIALISM

Immaterialism

Annual Philosophical Lecture, Henriette Hertz Trust, British Academy, 1944. (From *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, **30**.) By Dr. A. A. Luce. Pp. 16. (London: Oxford University Press, 1944.) 2*s*. net.

IN this lecture, given before the British Academy, Dr. A. A. Luce comes forth as an explicit defendant of the doctrine that there is no such thing as matter. There are periods in the history of philosophy when immaterialism becomes fashionable. Bishop Berkeley, in his "Principles", and Collier, in his "Clavis Universalis", arrived independently at the doctrine in the early years of the eighteenth century. Dr. Luce's lecture throws great light on the intellectual soil which gives rise to such a doctrine.

Just as Berkeley started from Locke's position that "all our knowledge is by way of ideas", so Dr. Luce starts from the position of Moore, Russell and Broad—in principle the same—that all our knowledge is by way of sense-data. Hence he substitutes for the question "Does matter exist?" the question "Is there material substance *over and above the sum total of sense-data*?" The negative answer which he gives to the second question has no tendency to show that matter does not exist except to a believer in sense-data.

As soon as philosophers analyse experience into components, whether ideas or sense-data, matter cannot be found; it lingers on only until someone like Bishop Berkeley or Dr. Luce gets up to say that, as it cannot be found, it would be as well not to keep on talking about it.

But the fault may lie in the original analysis, which omitted something of importance. Dr. Luce says: "When in Boswell's presence Dr. Johnson kicked the mighty stone and 'refuted' Berkeley, he was simply appealing to what he could touch and see, i.e. to sense-data and *sensibilia*, and if that be all that is meant by 'matter', any reasonable immaterialist would accept it" (p. 6). This way of dismissing Johnson's refutation under-estimates the innate good sense of that mass of English judiciousness. It is possible that Dr. Johnson was appealing not to sense-data but to a quite different experience, namely, a direct awareness of another body opposing my body, in which the sensations of touch are merely episodes, featuring in, but not exhausting, the total experience. If so, this kicking of the stone was a valuable commentary on a missing element in all such theories as Berkeley's. Those philosophers who speak of sense-data as 'presented' to us or as 'presentations' forget this element and talk as though life was like a cinematograph film unrolling before us, instead of what it is and is felt by us to be, an interaction of bodies. If we surrender this point, we surrender matter. WINSTON H. F. BARNES.