

right sources to draw on, and I am in general sympathy with Pilling's approach. However, it must be said that he does not go beyond his sources. Much of the book consists in the rehearsal of familiar passages from Marx. I would say therefore that the book is likely not to be too exciting for specialists. On the other hand it would be a very useful companion volume to anyone tackling *Capital* for the first time.

One gripe about presentation that I have is that the system of referencing employs that ugly method currently gaining ground which inserts *dates* but not *titles* in the text. This leads to such meaningless formulae as 'Marx 1963' and 'Hegel 1968'. In

scientific literature it usually makes sense because the date given refers to the announcement of research results. To employ it when the date is that of the printing used is nothing but an unpleasant distraction when one knows perfectly well that Marx did not publish anything in 1963 and one hasn't the faintest idea to which text it refers without grubbing in the notes. I would also find it helpful if bibliographies using later editions would also cite the original date of publication.

C.J. Arthur

NEWS

Ollman V. University of Maryland

In June last year, Bertell Ollman lost his lawsuit against the University of Maryland over the rejection of his appointment at the University's College Park campus. Ollman had claimed that the University's president, John Toll, had rejected him for the chair of the Department of Government and Politics because of his marxist politics. The district court dismissed the charges, however.

In his decision the judge agreed that it was Toll's 'considered judgement that Ollman did not possess the qualifications to develop the department ... in a manner which President Toll thought it should develop.' He said the court was not evaluating Ollman's credentials, but merely arguing that Toll had acted 'honestly and conscientiously'.

The case goes back to March 1978 when Ollman was recommended for the U.M. position by the faculty search committee, the Provost and the Chancellor of the College Park campus. The recommendation was then sent to the U.M. president Wilson Elkins for his normally routine approval. The appointment became a national controversy when the Governor of Maryland, Blair Lee, said that it would be 'unwise' to appoint a marxist to chair a U.M. department. The issue was debated in the editorial pages of most major newspapers throughout the USA. Elkins retired before making a decision on the appointment. The incoming president, Toll, then reviewed the matter and rejected the appointment, saying that Ollman was not the best qualified person for the job. Although he refused to elaborate at the time, Toll testified at the trial that his decision was based mainly on Ollman's lack of administrative experience and judgement.

During the trial a great deal of evidence showed that Toll, Elkins and the U.M. vice-president, Lee Hornbake, were under considerable pressure to reject Ollman because of his marxist politics. For example, Hornbake said that Ollman's role as department chairman would be negatively affected by his refusal to seek Defence Department funding for his own research. Hornbake also said that Ollman's appointment would hurt the department's image and would make it more difficult for other faculty members to do consulting and receive funding from other government agencies. The *Washington Post* and the *Baltimore Sun*, both of which had questioned Toll's original decision, argued in editorials that the trial had 'vindicated' the U.M. president. Toll said the decision 'gives extremely important support for a University's right to make its own appointments in accordance with a careful evaluation of candidates, without regard to external pressure'.

Harry Magdoff (of the *Monthly Review*) and others

have circulated the following statement: 'Ollman must come up with \$15,000 to \$20,000, which he does not have, in the next three to four months to launch his appeal. (Most of this money will pay for typing up the month-long-trial transcript.) For that he needs our help. The issue of academic freedom affects us all, directly or indirectly, now or potentially', and asked for contributions to be sent to the 'Ollman Academic Freedom Fund', c/o Michael Brown, 210 Spring Street, New York, NY 10012.

(Report adapted from the (US) *Guardian* of 26 August 1981)

'Praxis' Professors Reinstated in Yugoslavia

In an important gain for the fight for democratic rights in Yugoslavia, seven dissident Marxist professors have been reemployed at the University of Belgrade, reversing an earlier decision by the authorities to fire them.

In 1975, eight professors associated with the philosophical journal *Praxis* were barred from teaching and their journal was banned. One subsequently found work at a sociological institute in Belgrade. In December 1980, the authorities moved to dismiss the seven other professors (who had remained on staff at 60 per cent of their pay).

In reemploying the seven, however, the authorities have taken care to try to keep them isolated from the student body as a whole. They now form an autonomous Center for Philosophy and Social Theory, which is involved only in graduate work with young scholars.

Nevertheless, the seven professors called the move 'an important step toward normalization' of their status.

In addition, the passport of one of the seven, Mihailo Marković has been returned, following its revocation in January. All seven are now free to travel and teach abroad.

Chris Arthur

Joint Session of the Aristotelian Society and the Mind Association

One useful symposium on aesthetics aside, the recent Joint Session at Manchester University (10-12 July 1981) gave more insight into the politics of philosophers than into philosophy.

Rumours of professorial disapproval preceded a meeting to discuss the U.G.C. report; philosophers at

Surrey, Aston, Hull and Stirling faced redundancy. The meeting itself was small, cool and dispassionate, with no mention of union activity. The strong views of the affected philosophers and of the few senior academics who supported them were almost smothered in petty arguments and in the general sense of impotence fostered by some of the more secure members of the profession. That a letter was drafted and a national coordinating committee of philosophers set up to fight the cuts was quite a victory in the circumstances.*

The final evening was devoted to an unplanned discussion of socialism. D.A. Lloyd Thomas and Richard Norman initiated a discussion of equality, liberty and property. The detailed arguments were barely discussed before Anthony Flew rose to attack Norman's final suggestion that socialism is necessary to secure liberty and equality. There followed much ill-informed discussion from the floor in which egalitarianism, socialism, the Soviet Union and genetic engineering were equated. The rest of the audience retired to the bar, some voicing the suspicion that political philosophy is merely a matter of flag-waving.

The socialism discussion, while showing the political illiteracy of some of the participants, raises important strategic questions for *Radical Philosophy* readers. While the conventional political wisdom of the philosophical establishment should be challenged, is this best done in the philosophical 'mass meeting'? What should we hope to gain from such discussions and how is success to be judged? Given the potential radicalization of academics in the face of cuts in government spending, these issues might fruitfully be reassessed.

Jennifer Todd

*See the separate report on this meeting for subsequent developments.

Hegel Conference — 150 years of Hegel

An international conference commemorating the 150th anniversary of Hegel's death took place last September at Merton College Oxford, hosted by the Hegel Society of Great Britain. The Americans and the Continental visitors must have been struck by the lack of home support. Except for Professor Walsh, Oxford residents were conspicuous by their absence. Nonetheless, there *is* a Hegel revival going on in Britain and the enfeebled state of analytical philosophy gives it every chance to make strides. The proceedings of the conference will be published. Next September the HSGB will be having a conference on the *Phenomenology*. Details of the Society and the Conference may be obtained from the Secretary, Dave Lamb, Philosophy Department, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester 13.

Chris Arthur

Thesis Eleven — A New Journal

Thesis Eleven is a new journal of socialist scholarship that has emerged from Down Under. The first issue contains at least three articles that should be of great interest to readers of *Radical Philosophy*. One is a translation of Hans-Georg Backhaus' seminal paper 'On the Dialectics of the Value-Form'. Another brilliant piece is George Markus' 'Four Forms of Critical Theory - Some Theses on Marx's Development' which periodizes Marx's work in a novel way and relates the philosophical transitions to his ambivalences on the division of labour. A third useful

article is Agnes Heller's 'Is Radical Philosophy Possible?' I don't agree with her Utopian approach but it is a bravura performance. The second issue of *Thesis Eleven* is just to hand and contains a stimulating, if controversial, article by Heller and F. Feher: 'The Fear of Power: The genesis of Eurocommunism!' *Thesis Eleven* can be contacted c/o Alastair Davidson, Politics Department, Monash University, Clayton, Australia 3168.

Chris Arthur

Jean-Paul Sartre Conference

The British Society for Phenomenology Conference last July brought together intellectual resources from three academic disciplines and three countries.* It takes that kind of breadth to tackle a figure like Sartre - though even that proved limited in a way.

Perhaps the most academic approach was to be found in those papers built upon the exegetical history of ideas formula 'Sartre and X'. Thus Hugh Silverman of NY State University gave us 'Sartre and Barthes', painstakingly expounding the chasm between Sartre's view of the writer's role in 'Qu'est-ce que la littérature?', and the way Barthes undermined the very role of literature by his view of the tension of the speaker's 'parole' and the institution of 'langue'. And Christine Howells from Oxford traced the common opposition of Sartre and Derrida to the deceptive negativity of negative theology.

Philosophical treatment of Sartre was made on two quite different planes. On the one hand, Anthony Manser from Southampton University seemed locked into a fairly sterile debate with D.Z. Phillips on the logical incoherence of the self-deception element in 'bad faith', understood in common-sense terms. On the other hand, Phyllis Morris from Hamilton College began by locating Sartre's concept of transcendence in comparison to that of Kant and then, in defending Sartre against recent criticisms of his use of transcendence, provided some valuable clarifications for understanding his position. She set out the role of the body and of the fundamental project as conditions for a variety of experiences which were transcendent in Sartre's sense, and which he undoubtedly pursued in his varied cultural and political activities.

But the approach that seemed to offer most was that which began in literary analysis, perhaps because in pursuing literary themes the speakers were most easily led by Sartre to the profounder questions that he himself was trying to get at in his literary works. David Reeves of Bath University outlined the problem that the hero of *Nausea* has in exposing his self-consciousness and his self-identity in his writing, which alters even as it describes. Then he showed how phenomenology appeared to offer Sartre a solution to this problem by inverting the common-sense relationship between consciousness and its intentional object. For insofar as consciousness is intentionally related to objects rather than being determined by them, to read the expression of a consciousness in a novel may be, in Sartre's words, 'to assume a world of consciousness'. Here we are tackling a real problem, albeit one posed largely in a literary culture. It was a problem found also in the commentary on Sartre's *Flaubert* as a case of existential psychology provided by Ross McKenna from Bordeaux University.

Hazel Barnes, who has both translated and written about Sartre, attempted to bridge the gap between the literary and the non-literary in the theory of the emotions. She did this by asking whether various emotions did or did not elide human freedom and were in consequence cases of bad faith. In the case of love, for example, she found that the paradigm, falling in love, *was* bad faith, but that comradely

love, which generates common goals and praxis was not - with the love of parent and child holding a position in between because its inherent instability makes it a stage of bad faith that gives way to a realisation of freedom. Sartre's interest in the special role of comradeship was echoed, too, by Eleanor Kuykendall of NY State University in a discussion of the attitudes to the possibility of transparent mutual understanding within the group and to group violence which Sartre expressed in interviews he gave in 1979 and 1980.

But it was strange that the conference failed to deal more squarely with the ways that, in the words of that last interview, 'consciousness is engendered by the other' in the full complexity of the social world. For behind Sartre's remarks on the 'groupe en fusion', and the political commitments he embraced, lay the full-scale analysis of social ontology in the *Critique*. Yet this failure was not, I am sure, by design. Rather the academic disciplines brought to bear upon Sartre here did not stretch to that level. It would be nice to think that sociology could have plugged the gap. Yet I am not so sure; for, as Joe McCarney argues in the correspondence page of this issue, there are limits to the capacity of conventional academic culture to embrace what is subversive in continental thought.

Noel Parker

* Manchester University Press hopes to publish papers of the proceedings, in conjunction with Sartre's later interviews, some time in 1982.

The Death of Jacques Lacan

It was characteristic that the final years in the life of Jacques Lacan, who died in Paris on the 9th September 1981 at the age of eighty, should not have been spent in calmly enjoying the recognition of a lifetime's labour. Towards the end of 1979 yet another movement against the autocratic and peremptory manner in which Lacan presided over his psychoanalytic school, the *Ecole Freudienne de Paris*, began to gather momentum. And on 27 September 1980, after many months of wrangling and mutual recrimination, the School voted - at Lacan's prompting - for legal dissolution. Even before this formal vote took place, however, Lacan had begun to assemble his closest followers into a new grouping, *La Cause Freudienne*. Under this banner would be gathered the circle of the unreservedly faithful. The School of *La Cause Freudienne* would be - as Lacan wrote, in an almost pathetic acknowledgement of his inability to separate personal and theoretical allegiance - 'the school of my pupils, of those who still love me'.

If many well-disposed observers in France found the débâcle of the *Ecole Freudienne* a severe trial of their sympathy, its effect on this side of the Channel could only be to enhance an already deep-rooted suspicion of Lacan and of Lacanianism. The dominant ideological reflex in this country has long been to dismiss the leaders of French thought as verbose, over-speculative, and unable to distinguish between rhetoric and rational argument. In Lacan's case the offence is compounded: not only does his writing appear tortuous and obscure, but these qualities are paraded as positive attributes of his style. For many this was enough: Lacan's success - his influence over an entire generation of writers and thinkers - could be adequately explained by a peculiar French susceptibility to intellectual

charlatanry. For the scattered groups of devotees, on the other hand, for those who had fallen under the spell, the oracular brilliance with which Lacan deployed his high erudition was sufficient to excuse his personal shortcomings and the notorious innovations of his psychoanalytical technique: the shrinking of the session to a matter of minutes, and the studied - almost contemptuous - silence of the analyst.

Neither of these attitudes is justified. Much of Lacan's writing is obscure, perhaps in a number of places irredeemably so. Yet anyone who has worked systematically through an *Écrit* such as the 'Seminar on "The Purloined Letter"' cannot doubt that here the poetic resources of language are being harnessed in a theoretically cogent way: a possibility which analytic philosophy finds impossible to grasp, although it has been a commonplace of European thought since Hegel. On the other hand the difficulty and allusiveness of Lacan's style cannot be assumed to exempt him from careful examination and coherent criticism, as has been the case to a large extent even in France itself.

In the long run, as such criticism comes to be undertaken, it is possible that Lacan will appear primarily not as an innovator in the theory and practice of psychoanalysis - the proportion of clinical material in his writings is minimal - but as a contributor to a long-standing debate on the relations between language, subjectivity and self-consciousness. For Lacan, from the moment we begin to speak, we are caught up in a world of symbols and meanings which we are never fully able to master (this is essentially what he understands by the Unconscious). The central problem then becomes: how to give theoretical expression to this situation without that false assumption of mastery which the concept of theory itself implies? To this question Lacan's teaching - in its very preference for evocation rather than statement - represents one kind of answer.

Peter Dews

Day School on Utopianism

On a very wet Saturday last October a dozen or so people participated in a very interesting seminar on Utopia, organized by Radical Philosophy, which culminated in some quite lively exchanges. The speakers were Barbara Goodwin from Brunel (author of a recent book on Utopian thought) and Keith Taylor from Lanchester Poly, Coventry. Both argued forcefully the case for Utopian thought. Watch out for a forthcoming book on which they have collaborated.

Chris Arthur

News Items

If you attend or hear of events related to *Radical Philosophy's* broad interests or aims, or belong to a group with goals in common with those of *Radical Philosophy* (whether or not the group is concerned with the narrowly philosophical), other readers may like to hear about it. Why not send us a short report for the News Section, at the editorial address?