

the worker tries to gain mastery over the labour process). The contradictions arising directly from this type of work are arguably near-maximal for free labour: labour allows negligible mastery of skills; the efficacy of labour is felt to be *external* to the labour process and is located in the spheres of circulation and exchange. It is through consumer power that the worker feels at home in the world; labour power is 'recognised' as consumer power. Character formation consequently involves individualist types of spending pattern, domestic habits and attitudes, which are thought to compensate for the emptiness of work ('consumerism'). However, contradictorily, work remains the decisive arena to contest the terms of exchange between capital and labour and such contest-

ation involves collectivist character traits necessary for attempts at mastery of the labour process (strikes etc.). This all points to the validity of Lukács' claim about the primacy, as a category of social being, of control by the subject over the act of labour, whether as a consequence of more mediate considerations arising from social labour (e.g. wages/workers' control) or those intrinsic to the act itself.

The many points of departure for theory development contained in *Labour* make it worthwhile (if difficult) reading.

Howard Feather

NEWS

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?

Women's Studies Conference

Recently a conference on teaching Women's Studies was held in London. The day began with a presentation, by women involved in Women's Studies and related courses, of some of the joys and pitfalls of their teaching and studying. One of the most interesting, and revealing, sessions was run collectively by the students in their final year of the MA in Women's Studies at Kent University. They had had to confront several problematic issues - for instance the question of men teaching on the course, and the more general worry over the nature of the teacher/student relationship. Their general position was that they did not object to men qua men teaching, but they did have qualms about, for instance, a particularly aggressive male teaching a course on sexuality. And they believed that there were ways in which the role differences of teacher and student could be minimised. But some people at the conference had reservations about the possibility, or indeed, the legitimacy, of playing down the difference in function of teacher and student.

For us women in philosophy an exciting session was

one that took place in the afternoon. Perhaps for the first time in this country, a group of feminists involved in some way with philosophy met to talk about the relationship between their feminism and their philosophy. We discussed the ways in which our feminism either might or does influence our teaching. A few texts were mentioned as potentially useful in this regard. Some were American publications written by American women in a similar position to ourselves.

It emerged that there were political differences between us, but these were not sufficient, at least at the outset, to deter us from deciding to continue the discussions.

Alison Assiter

RP Dayschool on Hegel Marx and Dialectic

As readers will know from Joe McCarney's letter in *RP 30*, with the revival of interest in Hegelianism in Britain and North America it is very much a live issue whether the study of Hegel and Hegelianism should be a major concern of *Radical Philosophy*. The dayschool on 'Hegel, Marx and Dialectic' held on 22 March at Goldsmiths College in London went some way to showing how it might be.

Two themes of importance were explored. Chris Arthur and Peter Osborne (from Sussex) read papers which both bore on the question of the leverage upon social critique afforded by Hegelian concepts. Chris's argument, in many ways a development of his article in *RP 30* - with, incidentally, his first

response to Hunt and Swan's article in the same issue - discussed, amongst other things, where it was useful to use the idea of the negation of the negation. There were, he argued, sloppy and uninformative uses, notably in Engels, where the negation of the negation amounted to little more than a term for describing the emergence of new concepts in place of contradiction. But the negation of the negation added substantially to our understanding of social progress where a common subject can be identified at each stage of the process - notably in Marx's account of the negation of human beings by alienation in private property. But even these substantial uses may lead, as they did in Hegel, to merely enclosing unsatisfactory social institutions within others. Thus Chris wanted to insist that the 'negation' of a negation such as property had to be its real abolition, and that as a ground for further social progress.

Peter Osborne took issue with Gillian Rose's recent *Hegel contra Sociology*, in which she argues that all social theory since Hegel - and notably Marx and Habermas - has reinstated Kantian transcendental pre-conditions for social critique. While much of the discussion naturally focussed on what Rose's interpretation of Hegel amounted to and whether it could be sustained, Peter's paper also took up the more general question of whether an Hegelian approach as described by Rose could be a basis for social critique. On Peter's account, Rose regarded the Hegelian Absolute, in which finite and infinite are united, as a sufficient basis for critique, even though the absolute cannot be known but only expounded in a phenomenology such as Hegel's. Peter argued that this experience of the Absolute only showed us that social or 'ethical' life was in general determinate and finite. We would still need a social theory to understand the given forms of determinateness, and that is implicitly ruled out by Rose's view.

The second important theme raised during the day was that of the justification of acts of resistance to an established order. Dave Lamb (from Manchester) read a paper on Hegel's view of the 'moral rebel' who in opposing a given level of ethical development brings about or foreshadows progress beyond it. The subsequent discussion on the role of the rebel seemed to me the liveliest of the day. The considerable detailed knowledge of Hegel which Dave and others present were able to bring to the discussion made insights from Hegel rise above the usual obscurity.

We hope to hold another dayschool on the same general area. For attendance at the school exceeded our expectations, more speakers are available, and there is clearly plenty to discuss. A further school may take place in June, so readers should keep a lookout for notices, or write to Madan Sarup (at Goldsmiths College, New Cross, London SE16) or to me (at the editorial address) for more information nearer the time.

Noël Parker, March 1982



Derrida in Prison

Towards the end of December last year the French philosopher Jacques Derrida suffered, at the hands of the Czech authorities, the kind of harassment which has already been meted out to visiting academics from Britain and Canada. Derrida, who is married to a Czech, arrived in Prague on Saturday 26 December with the purpose of participating in an 'unofficial' philosophical seminar. This was to be one of a series of meetings which, for the previous year and a half, had been held on a weekly basis under the aegis of the former Charter '77 spokesperson Ladislav Hejdanek. Czech writers and academics whose political views clash with the dogma of the regime are not only expelled from their posts, but deprived of access to libraries and other basic instruments of information and research. Hejdanek's seminars, like those formerly organised by Julius Tomin (now in exile), were in part intended to alleviate the resulting intellectual isolation by putting such people in contact with representatives of their disciplines from other countries.

Derrida did participate as planned in the seminar at Hejdanek's home the following Monday, but failed to return as expected the next evening. Since two other participants had been tailed after leaving the meeting, it was assumed that Derrida had been picked up by the police and expelled from the country like his British and Canadian predecessors. In fact the Czech authorities had gone one step further. In line with a growing tendency to employ criminal charges against domestic political offenders, Derrida had been arrested and imprisoned on a ludicrous accusation of 'drug-smuggling'.

Fortunately, Derrida's spell in jail was not prolonged. After a flurry of diplomatic activity in Prague and in Paris he was released in the early hours of Friday morning, and left for France by train the same day. As is the custom on such occasions, a group of leading French intellectuals - including Etienne Balibar, Michel Foucault, Felix Guattari and Jean Genet - issued a communiqué expressing relief at his release. The statement continued:

Because Jacques Derrida represented us all in Prague, indignation is not enough. We consider the increasing cynicism of this totalitarian regime as an act of force, an ill omen, and a political attack on all those, both in Czechoslovakia and in Poland, who are struggling for basic freedoms.

Peter Dews



A New Journal of Philosophy of Education

A group of philosophers of education centred at the University of Auckland have told us of their plans for a low-cost alternative journal of philosophy of education to challenge stagnation in that field and give attention to emerging critical themes. The journal, to be called *Access*, will be published twice yearly from the Department of Education at the University of Auckland, Private Bag, Auckland, New Zealand. Early editions are likely to include work from Kevin Harris, Maxine Green, Ian Snook, Colin Evers, Jim Walker and James McClellan. Requests for subscriptions should be sent to Reaper Press Ltd, 28 Rothesay Bay Road, Auckland 10.

Noël Parker

Books Received

- D. Aers, J. Cook and D. Punter, *Romanticism and Ideology*, RKP, £6.95 pb
- W. Bienkowski, *Theory and Reality*, Allison & Busby, £10.95 hc, £5.95 pb
- D. Davis, *The Unique Animal*, Prytaneum Press (121 Bouverie Road, London N16), £12.95 hc, £6.95 pb
- S. Clarke, *The Foundations of Structuralism*, Harvester, £20 hc
- H. Cowen, *The Crisis in Urban Planning - A Marxist Perspective* (Glos. papers in Local and Urban Planning 11, Dept of Town Planning, Glos. College of Arts & Technology), no price.
- M. Davies, *Meaning, Quantification, Necessity*, RKP, £14.95 hc
- M. Evans, *Lucien Goldmann - an introduction*, Harvester, £15.95 hc
- J. Femia, *Gramsci's Political Thought*, OUP, £17.50 hc
- R. Geyer and D. Schweitzer (eds), *Alienation*, RKP, £12.50 hc
- P. Green, *The Pursuit of Inequality*, Martin Robertson, £12.50 hc
- J. Hall, *Diagnoses of Our Time*, Heinemann, £16.50 hc
- F. Halliday and M. Molyneux, *The Ethiopian Revolution*, NLB, £15 hc, £5.95 pb
- K. Harris, *Teachers and Classes - A Marxist Perspective*, RKP, £4.95 pb
- S. Heath, *Questions of Cinema*, MacMillan, £12.50 hc, £4.95 pb
- R. Keat, *The Politics of Social Theory*, Blackwell, £12.50 hc, £4.95 pb
- A. Lacey, *Modern Philosophy - an introduction*, RKP, £7.95 hc, £3.95 pb
- S. Kruks, *The Political Philosophy of Merleau-Ponty*, Harvester, £16.50 hc
- C. Levi-Strauss, *The Naked Man*, Jonathan Cape, £17.50 hc
- M. Lowy, *The Politics of Combined and Uneven Development*, NLB, £12 hc, £4.50 pb
- G. MacDonald (ed), *Perception and Identity*, essays presented to A.J. Ayer, Macmillan £6.95 hc
- J. Moline, *Plato's Theory of Understanding*, University of Wisconsin Press, no price
- W. Newton-Smith, *The Rationality of Science*, RKP, £9.95 hc, £5.95 pb
- M. O'Brien, *The Politics of Reproduction*, RKP, £11.95 hc
- P. Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, Cambridge, £20 hc, £6.95 pb
- T. Rockmore et al, *Marxism and Alternatives*, D. Reidel, no price
- G. Rose, *Hegel Contra Sociology*, Athlone Press, £18 hc, £6.95 pb
- K. Soper, *On Human Needs*, Harvester, £18.95 hc
- J. Thompson, *Critical Hermeneutics - the Thought of Ricoeur and Habermas*, Cambridge, £17.50 hc
- C. Wringe, *Children's Rights*, RKP, £12.50 hc
- A. Whitmarsh, *Simone de Beauvoir and the Limits of Commitment*, Cambridge, £14.50 hc

