

This lies, first, in the clarity of his presentation of the various approaches to ideology, and his critical discussion of each. Secondly, it lies in the question-opening form of many of his comments. For example, he criticises (p120) Goldmann's attempt in the critique of literature to distinguish that which is expressive of a worldview of a class, from non-significant literature. He objects that there are no

criteria for making such a distinction in practice, and therefore Goldmann has to do it arbitrarily. That may well be true, but may we not need the distinction anyway? Or are all works of literature equally and in the same way ideological? If I disagree with Larrain's conclusion, I shall have to think about how criteria might be developed.

Once again, an enormously useful book.
Martin Barker

NEWS

THE CUTS AT NELP

'Is it coincidental that the management of North East London Polytechnic wants to bury the humanities and social science departments, which have traditionally produced some of the poly's more meddlesome members of staff, and is at the same time courting NATO for financial support and backing for a new course in war studies?'

This pertinent question was asked by Time Out (February 29 - March 6 1980) which goes on to quote NELP assistant director, and former wing-commander, Colin Milner, as saying he would like to see counter-insurgency and the use of the military to aid the civil powers being studied in the proposed course.

As many of our readers will by now know, a working party of the board of governors of NELP produced a report early this year which advocated by far the most sweeping and draconian cuts in staffing and services yet seen in the higher education sector since the Tories came to office. The cuts are to include dissolution of the facilities of Humanities and Environmental Studies, and the closure of the Departments of Sociology, Applied Economics, and Mathematics, and of the Humanities part of the School of Education and Humanities. Services concerned with student counselling, services for disabled students, and the Poly's only two autonomous research centres are also for the chop. Finally, higher student/staff ratios are to be imposed in the remaining departments.

These cuts if fully implemented would cost more than 280 teaching staff jobs, over 200 non-teaching staff jobs, and up to 300 job-losses in the local areas due to reduced Poly spending. The working party justifies the proposed cuts primarily in terms of an estimated shortfall of over £3 million on estimates for 1980-81, because of Government cash limits. Although some of this shortfall may be met by the three local authorities involved, an estimated deficit of some £2.45 million remains.

The recognised unions have been fighting a united, vigorous, and well-argued campaign against the cuts. They explicitly reject the necessity for cuts of any kind, but go on to point out that the Governors' working party, having accepted the need for cuts, imposes a massive change in the whole aca-

demic and educational shape of the institution without further rationale. Where are the alternative plans? Where are the reasons for selecting this rather than some other pattern of cuts? The THES quotes Poly Director Dr Brosan as arguing that 'If any courses must be closed they must surely be those for which there is national over-provision, for which the quantity and quality of recruitment is declining, or which do not suit the needs of the new decade'. As the Unions point out, comparison of these criteria, on any reasonable interpretation, with the actual pattern of proposed cuts, makes a nonsense out of the whole exercise. Among the closures and departments and courses which are among the most popular in recruitment terms, and the most innovative. Many are also highly vocational, and/or offer indispensable service and back-up to other vocational courses.

The unions have also criticised the almost complete lack of clear costing of the proposals in relation to the financial situation of the Poly. On the analysis provided by the unions, any 'economies' achieved by the cuts in the Poly will have adverse economic effects for the local community, as well as for the funding local authorities themselves, as rent and rate income, jobs and services which are directly or indirectly dependent upon the activities of the Poly are lost. Finally, the unions have pointed to the complete lack of prior consultation, not only with the unions, but also with the Academic Board of the Poly.

The events at NELP illustrate several important features of our situation in higher education as well as providing valuable lessons in resisting the cuts. First, the unity achieved by the unions is exemplary, as is the quality of their analyses and written responses. There is a vital need, now, to coordinate support for all those under threat at NELP.

Second, we can see quite clearly in the lack of any plausible publicly expressed rationale for these cuts, beyond an assumed financial necessity, that the financial crisis of higher education is being used as a cover for a radical restructuring which has quite other motivations. The general climate of uncertainty, division, and pessimism among students and staff is the condition of possibility for this restructuring to be imposed with minimal resistance from below. Fortunately, the strategy seems not

to be working at NELP! As the unions point out, one of the central educational principles set out by the NELP Academic Board in 1971 was the provision of education for self-development. The restructuring envisaged by the current plans amounts to the complete burial of any such educational philosophy in favour of a narrowly vocational approach. This shift of perspectives was, of course, initiated and boosted by Callaghan and Shirley Williams during the latter part of their term of office. It has been intensified and imposed by the Tories. But the shift from a 'self-development' to a 'vocational' perspective is by no means all that is going on. Many vocational courses are to be cut, too. Preparation for professions in the public sector, and especially welfare-state functions, is most heavily hit, whilst private business and management-oriented courses are being restructured away from any broader cultural, intellectual or ethical context-setting. The shift is, therefore, not just towards vocational education, but also towards a very narrow and blinkered 'training' for a selected range of future careers (business management, law and order, and warfare). So much for another of the educational principles adopted by the Academic Board in 1971: '... a student is encouraged to make a positive contribution to the development of our industrialised society or to promote changes in that society by legitimate and democratic means.'

What is also highlighted by these events is the complicity of the Labour leadership, both locally and nationally in them. Not only was the reorientation of education towards identifiable business requirements initiated by the Callaghan/Williams 'great debate', but the local authorities whose refusal to fund the deficit on the 1980-81 estimates is responsible for the financial crisis at NELP, and which were represented on the governor's working party are all labour-controlled. This illustrates the need for those of us who work in education to be actively involved in the political life of our local communities in a continuous way, and not just at times of crisis, when the need for local community support is obvious. To me, it also indicates the great importance of the fight being waged in the Labour Party for democratic reform of the party's constitution. This applies just as much to the question of accountability of local councillors as it does to the parliamentary party. For others, of course, it will be seen as further evidence of the obsolescence of the Labour Party as a vehicle for progressive political aims.

Finally, the whole episode is a further reminder of the immense concentration of power within the institutions of higher education. Despite the struggle and reforms of the 60s and 70s, the replication of committees, and the semblance of democratic participation in some areas of institutional life, decision-making power over the key issues of distribution of resources, institutional structures, and educational objectives remains in very few hands. Moreover, the subordination of the academic hierarchy, never mind auxiliary and manual employees, to the top administrative staff is made

quite explicit. Not only this, but the links between the top administrators, through the board of governors, to power-holders and vested interests in the external community (which are exhibited in the composition of the working party) are a useful guide to the way in which external interests can shape the priorities of an apparently self-governing institution.

Ted Benton

Vive le Discours

(Foucault Conference, Central London Polytechnic, 29-30 March 1980)

'First, commentary. I maintain, but without being very sure, that there is hardly any society where there do not exist major writings that are retold, repeated and varied. Formulas, texts, ritualised ensembles of discourse that are reiterated according to quite clear circumstances; things once said that are conserved because of the suspicion of some kind of secret or wealth within them. In short, one can suspect that there is quite often in societies a sort of levelling off between discourses: the discourses that "say themselves" in the course of time and exchanges, and which pass away with the very act that utters them; and discourses that are at the origin of a number of new verbal acts which take them up, transform them or talk about them, in brief the discourses which definitely, through their formulation, are said, remain said and remain to be said. We know them in our own cultural system: they are religious or legal texts, they are the texts which are strange when one thinks about their standing and which are called "literary"; to a certain degree they are scientific texts.'

(Foucault, L'Ordre du Discours, 1971, pp23-24)

The conference, a private initiative by one of the staff of the Polytechnic, but enjoying substantial support from Ideology and Consciousness, drew up to 150 people over its two days. Foucault received a variety of treatments: intellectual biography; exposition of obscure entanglements with critics; critique from within the Structuralist principles (Is there a secret reversal to the subject of the utterance? Is his concept of power a secret globalising unity?); rearrangement to show how he resolves our problems (situating theoretical work in the social domain) or cannot resolve them (Does his theorisation of history replace real history and normative discourse with 'police'? Does his concept of sexual repression amount to denying plain reality?).

It was all there. But all of what? In the final session some irritated and some puzzled interjections were heard. Why, said one, had so little of the pleasure of reading Foucault come across? What would someone who had not read him expect to find in his work? He would, I'd say, expect concepts, structures, debates, but none of his sceptical realism about the foundations of

our debates, and none of his ironic, critical penetration of the hidden undertow of others' writing. Would such a person bother to look, then?

Another asked, were we being required, as we had been ten years ago with Althusser, to swallow an imported theory whole in order to sustain any pretensions to be in the swim of the left intellectual current?

Well, of course, it is not new for the Left to put itself through such agonies. But it is ironic to see it happening with a thinker who can write the passage I have quoted above, a thinker, that is, who can teach so much about understanding debates by insisting on the place of the 'discursive practices' in them. Foucault himself (in the lecture I have cited) goes on to say that the 'genealogical analyses' he engages in are also 'critical analyses' that 'describe the forms of exclusion, limitation, and appropriation' in discourse. If we want to take him seriously, we must take this to heart and ask about the practices that are at work in this importation of which the conference was a part.

Something was heard during the conference from one of Foucault's translators, about the problems of translation. That makes a good starting point, I think, for the obvious problem of translation (namely that of finding in the language into which one is translating a word with the same connotations with other words and experience as the original word one is translating from) appears at two further levels: that of finding a style that reaches an analogous readership to that which enjoyed the original; and that of finding a point of entry for the translated works into pre-existing ways of thought and debates. Now each of these searches could, I would say, be regarded as discursive practices in themselves, though necessarily subordinate to the discursive practice into which they hope to integrate the imported work. But (of course!) it does not really matter whether you can, or wish to, see this in 'Foucauldian' (yes, I promise you that is the expression) terms. The point is that translation is only the beginning, we must also be aware, and more aware if we take Foucault seriously, of the way translated works are transposed into a new intellectual environment. In transposition a work cannot escape, I am saying the pressures of intellectual habit, roles, and institutions ('discursive practices' in fact) of the environment into which it is moving. That is a clear implication of Foucault's own studies. Let me cite some of these practices.

It is not difficult to observe the manner in which someone who studies an unfamiliar way of thought can assimilate its style more easily than its ideas. I will freely confess to a Wittgensteinian style on my own part when first set to study his illusive writings. Of course, the style and vocabulary of the writer have their rationale and hence to assimilate them has too. But doing so is also a device whereby the shadow of understanding can obscure the trail to the substance, either followed by the student himself and others or by the student's critic. Now, the transposition of foreign

thinkers on the Left has in recent years been accompanied by a widespread barbarism of style, motivated, I feel, by a concern not just to translate faithfully, but also to impress and overwhelm. Some critics at the conference confessed to the difficulty they experienced in breaking into the discussion. One reason was the language in which the debate was couched. A questioner asked How was Foucault applicable? There were, came the reply, 'various applicabilities'. Foucault's efforts to define a political position in his historical studies became 'rediscovering a positionality which will open the historical terrain to interpretation' (no kidding!). Abstract nouns never came singly, but always mob-handed, bands of heavies with latinate endings, but with none of the grace that Foucault can sometimes manage in the original.

Now, it takes two to tango, and two (at least) to make a discourse. There is evidently another practice (which is hardly the fault of the organisers of this conference) of not being able to understand which has some sway in Left intellectual circles (though it probably carries over from school and from our education practice). Without that we cannot account for the patience and persistence of a large audience who evidently had the very greatest difficulty in following papers read out at speed which were designed to be read, not heard, and to be read by an esoteric readership at that. The audience assumes, I would say, that it ought not to be able to follow and, the corollary of this, the speakers assume authority over the audience. Though it is hardly their limit, I cannot think of a better place for critical analyses to begin than with the power relations assumed at an event of this kind between those who know and those who do not.

It may be this assumption of authority by those who know that produces the discursive practice which dominated, and of course, confined, the work of the conference: I am not referring to the effort to explain what Foucault says, though there were some attempts. Look at the list of what was done: Foucault was defended against his critics; he was attacked from within; he was rearranged; he was presented as the solution to our present difficulties. By working from within an esoteric source of authority speakers could make of their own position a discourse that 'says itself', that is 'is said, remains said, and remains to be said'. But not just that. As Foucault goes on to say, a commentary is 'nothing other than the reappearance, word for word (but this time solemn and expected) of what is being commented upon'. The commentary upon continental imports allows us to hide novelty (or indeed, banality) in the authority of what has already been said, in a way too difficult for most of you to understand, across the channel.

I would share Foucault's scepticism about escaping from the sway of discursive practices. So I have not made these points about the transposition of foreign writings to suggest that those involved in what is an important and valuable task can simply override these practices. But surely, in trans-

posing Foucault of all people, one should be aware of them.

The full transposition of foreign writings, I have argued, requires a conscious integration of them into our own discourse. This caution applies in particular to Foucault. Now, one questioner (himself close to Althusser) expressed the view that Foucault lacked a philosophy of science. The point was not taken up in any of the work at the conference. It so happened that I do not think this comment on Foucault is accurate, but it is vital to raise it. For Althusser underwrote in this country a claim to scientific status for social science on the Left. If Foucault's theory is to replace Althusser, it must do so at the cost of all scientific clout for Left social science. Can we then find any effective philosophy of science in Foucault if we import him? The difficulty is that, whereas in France his work can be a step in a debate around a structuralist philosophy of science that continues to be the accepted starting point, in this country structuralist left-wing social science may be too weakly established to survive the introduction of a fifth column. If it cannot, we must quickly look for an alternative.

Noel Parker

A Conference against Biological Reductionism

I was lucky enough to have the chance to take part in a conference in Bressanone, Italy last April. The conference, with biologists (of many descriptions), mathematicians, psychologists, sociologists and philosophers taking part, had as its aim to discuss the 'dialectic of biology and society in the production of mind'. The immediate impetus was the resurgence of biological reductionism in sociobiology, psychosurgery, biomedicine, and many fields of behavioural science. The need to combat these went hand in hand with the need to develop our alternative accounts of the place of biology in our human lives.

Incredibly, given the scope of conference and participants, it was a big success. A real exchange and development of ideas took place, and valuable groundwork was done for future exchanges. A volume of papers (all of them significant contributions to the field, but also accessible outside their specialist origins) is in preparation with Allison and Busby. The conference has a real significance, I believe, for Radical Philosophy. Philosophers have generally been very backward in dealing with biological issues. Philosophy of biology is seen as one of those fringe areas best left to failed epistemologists and logicians.

But the fact that evolutionary theory, for example, sets important challenges to all fields of philosophy, most obviously to the philosophy of mind (where a case can be made that mind-brain identity theories have already made a bridgehead - unrecognised - for reactionary political ideas). And the uses of various reductionisms for political

and moral purposes seriously needs our attention.

The hope of the conference was to widen the circle of involvement in formulating our ideas, and I would very much like to see more people involved from in and around Radical Philosophy. I will happily supply further information to anyone writing to me.

Martin Barker

BOOKS RECEIVED

- D E Cooper, Illusions of equality, RKP, £8.95 hc
- M Curti, Human nature in American thought, University of Wisconsin, £13.65 hc
- R Dhavan and C Davies (eds), Censorship and obscenity, Martin Robertson £7.95 hc
- D Elson (ed), Value: the representation of labour in capital, CSE Books, £12 hc, £4.95 pb
- N Fischer, Economy and self, Greenwood Press, no price
- P Hain et al, Policing the Police Vol.2, John Calder, £8.95 hc, £4.50 pb
- J Harris, Violence and responsibility, RKP, £8.50 hc
- J Hornsey, Actions, RKP, £7.50 hc, £3.95 pb
- J Israel, The language of dialectics and the dialectic of language, Harvester Press
- Istituto Universitario Orientale, The Study of English Culture, I.O.U. (80134 Napoli), no price
- D Lee (ed), Wittgenstein's lectures 1930-32, Blackwell, £7.95 hc
- M Liebman, Leninism under Lenin, Merlin, £4.50 pb
- D Locke, A fantasy of reason: William Godwin, RKP, £8.95 hc, £4.50 pb
- G Lukacs, The ontology of social being: Vol. III, Merlin, £2 pb
- J Mackie, Hume's ethical theory, RKP, £8.95 hc, £4.50 pb
- J McCarney, The real world of ideology, Harvester, £12.50 hc
- W Newton-Smith, The structure of time, RKP, £10.85 hc
- P Pettit, Judging Justice, RKP, £8.50 hc, £4.50 pb
- M Platts (ed), Reference, truth and reality, 12.50 hc, £6.50 pb
- L Portis, Georges Sorel, Pluto Press, £2.95 pb
- M Raptis, Socialism, democracy and self-management, Allison & Busby, £7.95 hc, £3.95 pb
- W Reese, A Dictionary of Philosophy and Religion, Harvester, £40 hc
- R Rosdolsky, The making of Marx's 'Capital', Pluto Press, £4.95 pb
- J Rosenberg (ed), The genius of John Ruskin, RKP, £9.95
- K Shrader-Frechette, Nuclear power and public policy, D Reidel, \$19.95 hc, \$10.50 pb
- P Thomas, Karl Marx and the Anarchists, RKP, £15 hc
- E P Thompson, Writing by candlelight, Merlin, 7.50 hc, 2.70 pb
- J Trusted, The logic of scientific inference: an introduction, MacMillan, £8 hc, £3.95 pb
- M Walzer, Just and Unjust Wars, Penguin, £2.95 pb
- A Wilden, System and structure (2nd edition), Tavistock, £6.95 pb
- J Zeleny, The logic of Marx, Blackwell, £12.50 hc

Social Praxis, Vol.6, Nos.1-2, 1979
Alternative Press Index for April-June 1977,
 Vol.9, No.2

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Editors,

A brief note on the inside front cover of RP23 announced to the reader the appearance of a (hitherto unsuspected?) cash crisis, seemingly of pretty chronic severity if a 50% price increase is deemed necessary. It's impossible to glean from the contents of the magazine any idea of the significance, financial or otherwise, of local college sales, but assuming them to be of some interest, here are some views as to Radical Philosophy's situation with regard to its readers, especially students.

One of the undoubted good points about selling in colleges is that it can act as a focus of interest in RP on a kind of level which is obviously not possible with bookshop sales. To me this interest should be reflected in some kind of dialogue between the editorial collective and readers. However, a glance through recent RPs is sufficient to establish that this kind of relationship does not now exist, and in this respect RP comes to resemble the purely academic journals. This raises the problem that the very idea of local sellers seems to presuppose a certain relationship between readers and editors, and if this can't be maintained, presumably neither can local sales initiatives.

Injecting a little more dynamism into these links might be achieved in a variety of ways. For example, carrying articles on student concerns, such as attempts at pushing through course reforms; publishing résumés of major points of policy brought up in discussion in editorial meetings and news of how the magazine is progressing all round; notes on contributors; and maybe encouraging a letters page! Some of these suggestions could only be realized by students and readers generally themselves, but this in turn relies on more editorial accessibility. Publishing discussion of editorial meetings shouldn't be too difficult for the collective to manage...

A final note on the price increase, hopefully demonstrating some justification for what I've said: I doubt many people would begrudge RP an extra 25p, but it would be a far healthier situation for readers to accept it on the grounds of e.g. a £2,000 debt, rather than because 'for some time now RP has been underpriced in relation to comparable journals', whatever these might be.

Yours etc.
Nigel Dick
(local seller, North London Polytechnic)

Roger Waterhouse writes:

Nigel Dick's letter stimulated a lot of discussion in the Editorial Collective. We returned to a host of issues which regularly come up at our meetings - the magazine and its readership, the collective and local initiatives, the pressures towards academicism, and so on. What follows is a personal response, not only to Nigel Dick's remarks, but also to some of the problems which other readers will have been aware of.

The journal Radical Philosophy is now in ninth year of publication. Other RP activities have waxed and waned in accordance with local situations and student interest. Local groups have come, gone and been re-formed. Annual festivals have been replaced by termly dayschools. The magazine has, as we intended, remained a crucial focus of our activity.

Radical Philosophy has established itself on a permanent footing, both as a journal providing a forum for philosophical discussion on the left, and as a broader movement which sometimes erupts into activity. Our readership has grown steadily over the years: we are currently printing (and eventually selling) 3,600 copies of each issue. Our subscribers are found throughout the British Isles, in Europe, North America, Australasia, and a few in more exotic places. Contributions have been received at one time or another from most of the places where we have subscribers - and that includes most British institutions of higher education where philosophy is taught, as well as some where it isn't.

Nigel Dick was perhaps right to pick us up on what we meant by 'comparable journals'. We have avoided both the style and the content of orthodox philosophy journals, but have held serious and important philosophical discussions. What we had in mind more was other theoretical journals of the left. Compared with many of these we are a remarkably open, undogmatic group, with a distinct distaste for anything which smacks of the esoteric or the élite. The Editorial Collective is large - currently twenty-two members - and encompasses a wide spread both in philosophical and in left opinion. It is not normally given to factional disputes. Our editorial procedures are quite elaborate: most articles submitted are read by a good proportion of the Collective before being discussed at a meeting. When we reject an article we tell the author why we took that decision, and if we think that a re-written version might be acceptable we indicate the broad direction the new version ought to take. We have a wide circle of book review-

ers, and are always prepared to add to this list - so if anyone wants to review a title from the 'Books Received' column, just write to Martin Barker. Sometimes reviewers have become involved enough to join the Editorial Collective.

Now for the bad news. We depend to a very large extent on voluntary labour. We pay for typing and printing, and recently we have been paying also for the production work which turns the raw typescript into the layout the printer reproduces. That leaves a lot of work, much of it of a clerical or menial kind, which we do ourselves. The editorial process involves a lot of correspondence. Each article considered probably generates twenty or so letters before it is discussed at a meeting - and that's ignoring phone calls. Members of the editorial collective are scattered throughout the British Isles. We meet as a group only three times a year: for the rest we rely on the postal services. The process of reviewing books again involves much correspondence - with publishers, with potential reviewers, in dispatching books, in receiving (or not receiving) reviews on time, in circulating these to referees, in collecting reports for the editorial meetings, in reporting decisions to reviewers and authors ... and so on. Then there are the really boring things, like keeping lists of subscribers, making sure subscriptions and addresses are up to date, and that they receive the issues they have paid for; like parcelling up bundles of back issues (for which regular orders come in) and duplicating copies which are out of print; like distributing bundles of each current issue to college sellers; like keeping the accounts; like dealing with library subscriptions, and so on. All these things we do ourselves in our spare time. But sometimes we are less efficient than a professionally run operation would be. We try to rotate the different jobs amongst members of the Collective, and some people are better at them than others. Which brings me to the matter which triggered Nigel Dick's letter.

A while ago we had a financial crisis. It was not due to any long-term viability problem, but to a hiatus in the cash-flow. Most immediately this was caused by a serious failure in dealing with library subscriptions. The subscriptions were coming in, but we weren't keeping them up to date, and the money wasn't getting through to our account. This forced us to review our whole financial position, and we realized that in any case we could no longer keep the price of the magazine down when costs were escalating. Hence the price rise. There was no simple debt we could mention - rather it was an asset and liability calculation of some complexity, with the crucial question being the timing of various payments. By now it has sorted itself out and we are on an even financial keel again, though some readers may find that their libraries have not yet caught up with the latest issues.

A more recent breakdown has come in relation to our list of individual subscribers. Some people have found that they were not getting issues they had paid for, or reminders that their subscriptions had expired.

Anyone still in this position should write to Ian Craib (Department of Sociology, University of Essex, Colchester). In fact he would welcome a note from anyone with a subscription so that we can check expiry dates etc.

A lack of efficiency which particularly affects college sellers is the variability of our publication date. Our aim is always to get a new issue out by the beginning of each term. We are usually a week or two late: this time we are even later.

Every time we run into difficulties like these the Collective discusses possible changes in our mode of operation. A recurrent topic is the 'professionalization' of an aspect or aspects of the work. For example, if we were to put ourselves under the wing of a commercial publisher we would probably be much more efficient about production deadlines etc. We have so far resisted this, because it would probably mean a sharp rise in price, and might affect drastically our relationship with college sellers, to say nothing of other readers. Another possibility, which would simplify our operation without adversely affecting price, would be to change from our present large format to the standard journal size of A5. This would mean sacrificing our individually designed pages for something more conventional and visually less interesting. These issues are far from closed. If any reader wants to contribute to these discussions we would welcome his or her views.

Now to the specific suggestions which Nigel Dick makes for improving the relationship between readers and editors. He suggests we carry articles on student concerns, and instances course reforms. We have done in the past and would like to do so again. We usually have a 'news' section and are always anxious to receive contributions for it. The same applies to letters. When we receive them we usually publish them (unless they are very specific comments on minor points in earlier issues). 'Notes on contributors' is something we used to have, but dropped for the not very good reason that the effort of compiling them seemed more trouble than it was worth. I can see that 'news of the magazine' will be of interest to some readers, which is why I have put some in. But as for publishing discussions of editorial meetings, I think that readers would find them exquisitely boring. Minutes of the last all-day meeting, for example, ran to five typed pages, contained about 35 separate items most of which involved decisions, but none of which involved 'major points of policy' which would be of interest to readers. The Editorial Collective has no undisclosed policies: its decisions are directly reflected in the pages of the journal.

Finally, can I say that we would welcome a more active readership, which told us more about what it thought of the journal, or what it thought about Radical Philosophy in general. Letters please!

Secretary to the Editorial Collective