

2. The balance is redressed to a large extent in Chapters 14 and 15, where general relationships between crops and pests are discussed, and consideration is given to problems of pest numbers and crop yield and to various aspects of natural control. Population problems are also discussed in some detail in the chapter of 52 pages on plant parasitic nematodes—the subject of the senior author.

Nearly half the book (195 pp.) is devoted to insects, which are taken in systematic order. Notes on family classification are followed by brief taxonomic descriptions of the more important species which are illustrated with line drawings (which sometimes lack precision). The descriptions lead into biological summaries and notes on crop hosts, damage, and control methods. Sometimes the biological notes are out of date: few applied entomologists to-day would accept that a wireworm population of 5–600,000 per acre does no damage to cereals, or that most crops can be grown with safety on 1 million wireworms per acre (p. 117). Pea moth is said (p. 93) to have become increasingly important in parts of eastern England, when growers generally appear to be much more concerned about crop maturation delays caused by weevil, thrips, or aphid attack than by moth damage. Generally, however, the biological notes are excellent and the authors are to be congratulated on condensing so much scattered information into concise and readable prose.

Four pages are devoted to molluscs, and the section on slugs (1.5 pp.) could with advantage be expanded in future editions, because some modern farming methods (ploughing-in long combine stubbles from successive cereal crops on heavy land, for example) appear to be encouraging slug population growth.

The 29 pages devoted to vertebrate pests form a most useful addition to the book, bringing together in one place much scattered information from journals and bulletins which students probably cannot hunt out individually.

In all, this is a remarkably good book. The authors have taken great pains to cite up-to-date literature, often papers published in the past five years or so, the latest being a report published in March 1964, two months before the book went to press. As an added precaution many of the sections into which the book is divided were checked prior to publication by established specialists, and the acknowledgements in the authors' preface include many respected names. Printing and paper are good, typographical errors minimal, and most of the plates—culled from many sources—are excellent even though they are often badly placed in relation to the text. A. H. STRICKLAND

## STYLE AND COMMUNICATION

### Science, Humanism and Libraries

By D. J. Foskett. Pp. ix + 246. (London: Crosby, Lockwood and Son, Ltd., 1964.) 26s. net.

**I**N *Science, Humanism and Libraries* Mr. Foskett has sandwiched, between five essays based on a thesis dealing with T. H. Huxley as a writer on science, a miscellany of sixteen papers and essays delivered over the years 1951–62. They comprise such themes as special libraries, readers' needs in industrial libraries, documentation in the humanities, in the social sciences and in occupational health and safety, national lending libraries, classification and communication and reference services, comparative and faceted classification, the work of the classification research group, and a historical essay on the pioneer of documentation, Marc-Antoine Jullien. Scattered through them are quotations from the writings of T. H. Huxley, but the thread of communication, while plausible, is somewhat tenuous. Some of the essays, in fact, are rather too technical or specialized for the general reader, who may thus be deterred from pursuing a book which contains much of general interest and goes to the

roots of what is involved in the present-day controversy over two—or more—cultures.

This would be unfortunate, for the papers do far more than display the range of Mr. Foskett's interests and the penetration of his thought. Even at his most technical he has shrewd, sound comments to make, though it must be admitted that here and there the essays require to be brought up to date. He pays a generous tribute, well-deserved, to the work of Dr. S. R. Ranganathan, and to the many stimulating comments which should not be overlooked by his professional colleagues.

Of the core or inner layer of the book, it could be said that it is a remarkable demonstration of the feasibility of combining in one person expertise and clarity of exposition, specialized and general knowledge. In other words, the antithesis of the two cultures is a false dichotomy, and from that point of view this part belongs to the outer layers with their dissertation on science, on humanism and libraries. It is only because a thinner sandwich might have attracted a wider circle of readers that there is reason to regret the more technical filling was not curtailed.

Mr. Foskett's study of T. H. Huxley as a writer on science convinces him that it is possible to present scientific results in good English, understandable by all, and that difficulties of communication are due ultimately, not to the material but to lack of good style on the part of the writers. Dullness, he observes, lies in the presentation of the material. A. N. Whitehead, in *The Aims of Education*, asserted that style, in its finest sense, was the last requirement of the educated mind. "The administrator with a sense of style hates waste; the engineer with a sense of style economizes his material; the artisan with a sense of style prefers good work. Style is the ultimate morality." Lewis Mumford expresses much the same idea in the sense of fitness for the purpose which pervades his *Technics and Civilization*, and George Stuart Gordon in *Anglo-American Literary Relations* asserted that "Wherever a man has fairly set down the best that he knows about the thing he knows best, and in words that tell his meaning, there, always, will be literature".

Mr. Foskett's onslaught on this imaginary gap between science and humanism is timely and finds ample support. It is refreshing to find an expert who not only quotes Quiller-Couch on writing but also refers to Pater's essay on style. Curiously enough, he does not quote the most pertinent passage in that essay, the reference to the dependence of style on self-restraint, the skilful economy of means, the choice of the unique word, phrase, sentence, paragraph, absolutely proper to the single mental presentation and vision within. Nevertheless, he reminds the scientist that false reactions in presentation and writing depend not on the qualities of the subject but on factors extrinsic to the subject, and that if the character of scientific material does not properly arouse human feelings, the writer has not presented his material efficiently.

These opening and closing essays of the book deserve to be widely read and pondered, not only in relation to the present-day debate on the two cultures, but in respect of the even wider issues of communication. Communication, he reminds us, is more than merely being told something; a successful lecturer constantly strives to bring his new ideas into relation with what the audience already knows. The primary requisite is to arouse interest, and the writer succeeds in communicating inversely with the effort the reader has to make to establish this bridge of understanding. Mr. Foskett offers no prescription for improving the situation other than his challenge to his fellow librarians to make a particular professional contribution, but what he writes is stimulating and suggestive. Neither the general reader nor the scientist need be at a loss for clues as to what steps he could himself take to remedy a situation that constitutes an indictment of our educational system as a whole. R. BRIGHTMAN