The following essay deals with men of universal genius, polymaths they are called; Archimedes, Leonardo, Euler, the three Bernoullis, John Wallis, Sir Christopher Wren, Newton, Thomas Young, Lagrange, Hamilton, D'Alembert, Huygens are briefly mentioned as examples. The careers of two polymaths, Kelvin and Heaviside, are discussed in more detail and an interesting comparison is drawn between the fame of Kelvin during his lifetime and the comparative obscurity of Heaviside. Kelvin is described as an extrovert, Heaviside as an introvert with greater depth both scientific and spiritual. In another essay, on Newton, credit is given him for industrialism: "If recent industrialism is a blessing, give initial credit to the *Principia*." This oversimplification reflects the general tendency of the book to discuss only English scientists and contributions to science.

In an essay entitled "Industrialism" Dean Slichter defends the scientific method as capable of resolving the conflicts of modern civilization. "Science brings its own remedies and removes the evils that it has itself created. If it were otherwise science would not be science." He evidently does not take the point of view that science assists men to get what they want, but must leave the determination of those wants to factors outside the domain of science. He assumes: "There is a best way and experts are selected to find and direct it." He believes, apparently, in "government for the people." The essay entitled "The New Philosophy" discusses controlling the power provided by science. Dean Slichter says: "in England spiritual control may grow and spread from the Universities. In America I expect the hope of the new philosophy to lie not with the university faculties, but with men of the world; with leaders in the industries; with engineers and business men and lawyers and men close to affairs. We must look for a new Christopher Wren who can look upon life as a whole. . . ."

<div style="text-align:right">W. FLEXNER</div>

Essai sur l'Unité des Sciences Mathématiques dans leur Développement Actuel. By Albert Lautman. (Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles, no. 589.) Paris, Hermann, 1938. 62 pp.

In the introduction to the first edition of his *Gruppentheorie und Quantenmechanik*, Hermann Weyl remarks that whereas it was fashionable in the past century to arithmetize all branches of mathematics (for example, the study of geometry was reduced to the study of a metric), it has now become fashionable to axiomatize all branches of mathematics (the study of analysis is now based on a study of abstract spaces). Lautman attaches undue significance to these remarks, and interprets them as meaning that there is a schism in mathematics. Lautman's personal belief is that the distinction between the two kinds of mathematics corresponds only to historical conditions in the development of mathematics, and he undertakes to prove in this book that the schism implied by Weyl's remarks does not exist.

As a matter of fact, no such schism exists, and it is to be doubted if any mathematician really thinks that one does exist. A careful reading of Weyl's remark in its context would seem to indicate only that he was drawing an analogy between the earlier change in the point of view of the mathematicians and the change then occurring in the point of view of the physicists because of the new quantum mechanics. So Lautman is tilting against windmills.

In spite of its inconsequential result, the book is interesting to read. Lautman takes algebra (of the van der Waerden type) and topology as representative of the one sort of mathematics, and analysis as representative of the other sort of mathematics. He then gives many examples of cases where the methods or results of one are used in the other. In the first chapter he discusses uses of the ideas of linear dependence and dimensionality in analysis, as in Hilbert space for instance. Also he brings out