

Since our last issue one of the most encouraging developments has been the formation of several new local groups. There are at least two functions these groups can perform - both useful and neither necessarily exclusive of the other. A group may provide a context in which ideas, which are otherwise ignored and suppressed, can be expressed and discussed; and a group may also criticize and confront and seek to change the structures which perpetuate academic philosophy and which suppress radical alternatives. These two functions can, and indeed should, operate in harmony.

As support for radical philosophy grows, however, so opposition begins to manifest itself; and the question: What is radical philosophy? becomes a pressing one. In this issue we are printing a variety of short pieces on this theme in a special section. But the specific problems of defining the aims and activities of our movement also raise general questions about the nature of philosophy, and this theme is explored in this issue in the articles by Horkheimer and Burke as well. We hope to receive letters and other reactions and replies to all these pieces and to continue the discussion in future issues.

So far, the Warnocks have taken upon themselves the role of defenders of the orthodoxy\*. Both proclaim that the radical philosophy movement seeks to make philosophy - an otherwise neutral field - "political". We, by contrast, assert that the sort of philosophy which the Warnocks defend has functioned politically, as ideology: we have no need to make philosophy political, it is so already. Academic philosophy has served a political function, and not just when it has dealt with an overtly "political" subject-matter. The fact that the articles we have so far carried have tended to concentrate on themes in social and political thought does not mean that we think these to be the only areas in which there can be a "radical philosophy". On the contrary, the more abstract discussions of epistemology, logic etc. can be equally active as ideology, even though their social effects are less direct and less immediately

\* See Cambridge Review 20.10.72, price 20p from Cambridge Review, 7 Green Street, Cambridge.

apparent. And at the other extreme too, we see philosophical theories guiding and justifying social practice and political struggles and we want to carry material which is more directly related to these.

Please keep sending in stuff for future issues. Not just articles and reviews: we also want material on courses and attempts to change them, exams and the struggle against them (we regret that we have nothing of this kind in this issue). And replies, notes, letters, cartoons (use black ink), nice quotations etc., etc. are all needed.

Since one of our main complaints about recent British philosophy is that it has been written to be of interest only to a small clique of professional philosophers, we are concerned that RADICAL PHILOSOPHY should aim at a wider audience. Our readers are not just professional philosophers. Please bear this in mind when writing: try to speak to as wide an audience as possible; do not feel obliged to make your ideas look "respectable" by dressing them up in unnecessary technical language and superfluous scholarly apparatus. Put your points as simply and as clearly as you can: avoid academicism!

Starting this issue, the size of the journal has been increased to 44 pages. We have used the increased space to enlarge the type - at least it will now be readable. We have also standardised the price at 25p - we have reluctantly abolished the student reduction, mainly because bookshops will not operate it. For many readers, however, these changes will mean more pages for less money. Those who have already subscribed for future issues at the original higher rate will be compensated when they renew their subscriptions.

Issue no.1, which twice sold out, has now been reprinted again and copies are available; and there are still some copies of no.2 left (at the original price: 35p or 20p for students).

#### Deadlines for contributions:

RADICAL PHILOSOPHY 4 : 1st December, 1972

RADICAL PHILOSOPHY 5 : 23rd February, 1973

(Please send material typed in triplicate if possible).

*"The weapons of criticism obviously cannot replace the criticism of weapons. Material force must be overthrown by material force. But theory also becomes a material force once it has gripped the masses. Theory is capable of gripping the masses when it demonstrates ad hominem and it demonstrates ad hominem when it becomes radical. To be radical is to grasp things by the root. But for man the root is man himself ... The criticism of religion ends with the doctrine that man is the highest being for man, hence with the categorical imperative to overthrow all conditions in which man is a degraded, enslaved, neglected, contemptible being."*

(Marx)