

tially pragmatic form. However, he does insist that normative assent is often surprisingly widespread, and that a shared belief in *reciprocal service* between dominant and dominated lies at the heart of symbolic consensus. It is not clear whether Godelier holds this to be true transhistorically, or whether he thinks that there must always be some material advantage involved if dominated groups are to accept their oppression. On neither point is the argument fully established: neither seems intuitively right. Here as elsewhere there are (for the non-specialist) fascinating examples drawn from anthropological literature showing that the exotic rituals and myths through which forms of dominance are secured are never mere exercises in delusion or rationalized subordination. They often involve (perceived) material benefit.

In this strand of discussion Godelier seems to me to under-emphasize the brute force which often lies behind the rituals of consent, but he does bring out the complex intermingling of symbolic and material modes. More generally, he has managed to concede some standard objections to vulgar Marxism – rejection of base superstructure, centrality of symbolic forms – whilst retaining a minimal but basic commitment to historical materialism in its classical sense. A more contentious issue, touched on at the end of the book, is whether the very term ‘class’ itself can be validly applied to pre-capitalist societies. Godelier thinks not, on the whole, but again sees no drastically upsetting consequences for historical materialism. Whatever the resolution to this question, Godelier’s thoughts always strike me as extremely valuable, representing a satisfying blend of theory and empirical detail, openness and orthodoxy.

Gregor McLellan

Jeff Hearn, *The Gender of Oppression: Men, Masculinity and the Critique of Marxism*, Brighton, Wheatsheaf Books, 1987, xv + 239pp, £28.50 hb, £7.95 pb

In this book Jeff Hearn attempts to construct a general theory of gender relations in contemporary societies. The central aim is to present gender relations as separate from but articulated with capitalist social relations, and this involves a deep and wide-ranging critique of the concepts of reproduction found in *Capital*. However, Hearn wishes to retain a concept of reproduction in which to ground his theory of patriarchy. Reproduction includes at least six different types of social practices: biological reproduction; the reproduction of labour power; ideological reproduction; the organisation of sexual practices through sexual reproduction; physical reproduction including violence and generative reproduction through practices of nurture and regeneration. These provide the material bases of patriarchy around which the class relations of patriarchy are constructed to form men who oppress and exploit women through the direct appropriation of ‘surplus human value’. This involves the appropriation by men of women’s various reproductive labour powers which may be accumulated by individual men. Since there is no recompense involved, patriarchy ultimately hinges on the potential or actual violence of men towards women.

I think there are two main problems with Hearn’s theory. The first is his account, or rather lack of it, of the relationship between capitalism and patriarchy. This is simply not elaborated in any detail, although there is an interesting and potentially useful suggestion that patriarchal social categories such as ‘women’ and ‘men’ systematically obscure capitalist class relations, and that capitalist social categories such as

labour systematically obscure patriarchal class relations. However, this implies a sort of functional ‘fit’ between capitalism and patriarchy, whereas there can in fact be considerable tension and contradiction between the two systems. Secondly, the account rests far too much on the concept of reproduction.

The second half of the book contains several practical, empirical and political essays applying the theoretical framework to professionalisation, the management of reproduction, and the politics of fatherhood and childcare. For me these chapters are the least satisfactory in the book. Specifically I think that Hearn over-generalises his concept of patriarchy by seeking to use it to explain hierarchies amongst men principally in the state.

Despite these criticisms I think *The Gender of Oppression* is an extremely valuable text, frequently provocative, and at times quite original.

Paul Bagguley

NEWS

Raymond Williams (1921-1988)



Raymond Williams’ writings in the late 1950s and 1960s offered a formulation of socialist ideas which shaped many people’s way of thinking, including my own, for probably a whole lifetime. The conception of the socialist project which he advanced as one of extending democracy made socialism seem a natural and logical culmination of British social traditions to which (at that point at least) it seemed important to feel oneself related. His identification of the crucial cultural dimensions of emancipation, rooted historically in *Culture and Society*, and developed as a social theory, as a history of various cultural institutions, and, in *The Long Revolution*, as a programme, spoke to the particular preoccupations of those then entering universities or other forms of education, yet not inclined to identify themselves with the dominant class culture. Raymond Williams’ writing had an astonishing reasonableness—I remember

being equally amazed and admiring of his calmness with audiences, at meetings when I and the other students who had invited him to speak would be finding it hard to contain our hostility and intolerance, born of course of uncertainty and inner conflict. I've always imagined that his lifelong practice of reasonableness owed something to the context of adult education in which he worked throughout the 1950s.

Looking back, one can now see that the mainstream Labour tradition in Britain should have embraced Williams as the central figure of his generation, as it had earlier been able to acknowledge G. D. H. Cole and R. H. Tawney. T. H. Marshall's trilogy of citizenship rights—civil, political, social and economic—has its proper extension in Williams's idea of cultural entitlement, and it is an index of the deep failure of British labourism that it has so far been unable to recognise this, or to absorb Williams' work in any significant way into its politics. It is notable that while his death has been widely mourned by intellectuals—and not only of the left—it seems to have been scarcely noticed publicly by any figure from Labour's mainstream political institutions.

Williams' central theme was the emergence and claim by the working class of its proper human entitlement. He set himself to refute those influential versions of bourgeois theory which identified this emergence as a cultural threat or crisis. Instead, he sought to reformulate the dominant account of cultural change as a historic enlargement of the meanings and range of culture. His work, and that of several contemporaries, signified the emergence of working class voice and expression in a culture which had long suppressed or excluded it.

Williams repeatedly rethought and transformed the positions of the radical bourgeois cultural tendency he encountered during his own intellectual formation, that of F. R. Leavis and *Scrutiny*, to insist on the just claims of class, or, otherwise put, full and equal citizenship. The *Scrutiny* view of popular culture as mass culture was reformulated as the deformation of potentially democratic cultural institutions by a commercial culture; *The Long Revolution* being followed in this vein by *Communications* and *Television: Technology and Cultural Form*. The 'great tradition' of the English novel was rewritten to make central the suppressed voices of class represented by Thomas Hardy. Perhaps more important in demonstrating the continuing relevance of realist fiction, Williams himself published four novels, and a final three-volume novel lies unfinished. He offered a critique of idealised versions of a past 'organic' social order in his *The Country and the City*. The tradition of English cultural criticism which had led to both *Scrutiny* and his own work was shown to have its authentic and major socialist development in William Morris. Williams, however, followed the insistence of Leavis and his school that a specific quality of attention was due to cultural forms, and that these could not be viewed reductively as effects of economic or social forces. His most original work probably lies in his deep and subtle readings of the ways in which the pressures for change rooted above all in the experience of class expressed themselves through crises and transformations of literary forms. It is remarkable that Cambridge English should have been the reluctant location of major work in two successive generations to transform the dominant framework of thinking about English literature.

Later, having single-handedly developed (or sometimes improvised) new theoretical frameworks for thinking about these issues, Williams found that he had become part of a wider tradition of theory, mainly Marxist, which had not been available to him during the earlier years of his work. He warmly welcomed the emergence of this more open and international

intellectual community—although not without some reservations about the formalist turns these cultural debates soon took. It became clearer during the 1970s that his writing connected to a much broader development in neo-Marxist cultural theory to the ideas of Goldmann and Gramsci, for example, and he made use of these new theoretical resources in such later work as *Marxism and Literature*. One concomitant of this development was a sharpening and polarisation of conflicts within English culture. While the resources of radical cultural theory were being extended, it was also becoming easier, in the new political context of the 1970s, to isolate, ignore, and even seek to suppress its arguments. The bitter battles of the Cambridge English Faculty were one instance of this hardening of positions, which at times was visible in the tone of Williams' work too. But his recent political writing – *Towards 2000* for example – has the hopeful quality of his earlier work, and demonstrates his continuing openness to younger currents of radical thought: those represented in ecological concerns, for example, and in the reassertion of the different national identities existing in these islands, including the Welsh, with which he felt a deepening identification. Nevertheless, the idea of a common democratic culture which was at the centre of Raymond Williams' political thinking now seems very far from realization, and we sadly lack at this point a political practice which is able to make much use of his ideas. The distance between a vigorous practice of cultural criticism and dissent, on which Williams has had great influence, in education and elsewhere, and a still predominantly utilitarian politics, remains seemingly as wide as ever.

Raymond Williams has always been very solidly and permanently present in my mind, I realise, even though it was relatively infrequently, and mainly on political occasions, that I met him in recent years. He had an exemplary commitment to the socialist movement, which had the quality of being both unwaveringly loyal yet also quite without self-delusion. He has been one of the major intellectual foundations of the left in Britain for over thirty years, and his death is a great loss.

Michael Rustin

Heidegger and the Nazis

The darker side of recent European history continues to haunt the European present. The French historian Faurisson's denial of the holocaust, the trial of Klaus Barbie, and most recently, and perhaps most devastatingly of all, the historians' commission report on the wartime activities of Austrian president and ex-United Nations Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim, have all focused attention upon the unresolved continuities of the European present with the fascistic elements of its past.

It was perhaps inevitable that the renewed interest and concern in the heritage of European fascism provoked by these events (amongst others) should once again turn the spotlight upon Heidegger, and raise once more the question of the relationship of his philosophy to fascism. And it is fitting that this renewed debate, now that it has begun, should again find its centre in France. For France is both the European country in which the issue of anti-semitism remains of most immediate political significance; and that in which, ironically, Heidegger's philosophical heritage has been most reverently, if creatively, preserved.

The focus of the current debate, which has been conducted throughout the French intellectual press with a stridency and vigour unknown in British intellectual life, is the recent publi-

cation of a book by Victor Farias, *Heidegger et le Nazisme* (Editions Verbiere, Paris, 1987). This book collects together for the first time a series of unpublished letters and documents, supplemented by interviews and already published material (for which, see Hugo Ott's *Der Junge Martin Heidegger* (Sonderdruck aus dem Frieburger Diözesan-Archiv, 1984)), which finally lays to rest the claim that Heidegger's association with Nazism can be restricted to the ten-month period in 1933/4 during which he took on the Rectorship of Freiburg University.

The charge of some essential complicity between Heidegger's philosophy and European fascism has been a common one on the left (see, for example, Mark Tebbitt, 'Lukacs, Heidegger and Fascism', *RP* 31). Such charges, however, have often been repudiated on both biographical and philosophical grounds (see, for example, Richard Kearney's letter to *Radical Philosophy*, 'Heidegger Against Nazism', *RP* 33, in which Tebbitt's accusations are challenged on the basis of a series of articles by the French philosopher Francois Fedier, published in *Critique* during 1966/67). The primary importance, and impact, of Farias's book lies in the decisiveness with which it appears to resolve the narrowly historical dimension of the question. The philosophical aspect of the problem, however, has also been posed anew. For the two are clearly related. Quite how, though, remains the central issue at stake in the debate.

In the past, two opposing and equally unsatisfactory stances have tended to dominate discussion of the issue: an interpretation of the fascistic character of Heideggerian philosophy on the basis of the political sympathies of its author; and an acknowledgement of the 'monstrous error' of Heidegger's political affiliation, followed by protestations of its strictly philosophical irrelevance. Neither seems to engage adequately with either the depth or the complexity of the problem; although there is clearly some truth in each of the two approaches.

Following on from the earlier exposure of Beaufret's sympathy for Faurisson (Baufret was Heidegger's main philosophical disciple in France, recipient of the famous *Letter on Humanism*, and a member of the Allied Army which liberated Germany – a key fact in some defences of the politics of Heideggerianism), Farias's revelations have rocked the French philosophical community. Followed as they have been by the recent revelations about Paul de Man's collaborationist past in Belgium (for which see Christopher Norris, 'Paul de Man's Past', *London Review of Books*, Vol. 10, No. 3, 4 February 1988), the debate looks likely to gather force. Blanchot, Derrida, and Lacoue-Labarthe have already added their voices to the throng (the latter two in a manner especially critical of Farias). The spill-over of the debate into the Anglo-American context will doubtless be hastened by the recent translation of Habermas's broadside against post-structuralism, *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity* (Polity Press, 1988), in which its Heideggerian roots are subjected to some close scrutiny.

Readers interested in catching up on the French debate so far should consult, in particular: the special section of *La Quinzaine Littéraire*, No. 496, 1987, and the articles in the subsequent issue of the same journal, no. 499; the dossier on 'Heidegger et la pensée nazie' in *Le Nouvelle Observateur*, 22 January 1988; and the dossier in *Le Debut*, No. 48, January-February 1988.

Peter Osborne

(with special thanks to Andrew Benjamin)

After Chesterfield

Following our report of the Chesterfield Socialist Conference in *RP* 48, it is gratifying to be able to note that the initial enthusiasm generated by the conference has in no way diminished. A wide range of initiatives directed towards the reinvigoration of socialist thought and action in Britain have been undertaken, amongst which we can report the following:

- The publication of a detailed statement of the *Aims and Objectives of the Socialist Conference*, presented as a Consultation Paper.
- A conference with the *Campaign for Non-Alignment* ('Out of Nato and Into the World'), held in Manchester.
- A conference aimed at encouraging co-operation between *Greens and Socialists*, and debating their differences, which will be held in London on May 14/15. (This conference is being co-sponsored by *Radical Philosophy*. Further details may be obtained from Penny Kemp at the Green Party headquarters, 10 Station Parade, Balham High Road, London SW12).
- A *Women For Socialism* group has been formed. It aims to work both within the Socialist Conference (with groups such as Women Against Pit Closures), and outside, with women's campaigning groups on anti-sexist and anti-racist issues. (For further information, contact: Mandy Moore, 89 Woodside Gardens, London N17 6UN).
- The main *Recall Socialist Conference* will be held in Chesterfield on 11/12 June.
- The Conference is also setting up a series of *Policy Discussion Groups* to prepare reports for the Conference. Policy Groups are open and have so far been established on: Economic Policy, International Affairs, Green and Socialist Issues, The State and Democratisation, Women, Black People, People with Disabilities, Gays and Lesbians, The Media and Culture, Education and Training.
- There are also plans afoot to publish a *Socialist Directory* which would contain comprehensive information on campaigns of all kinds around Britain.
- Finally, there are plans for a number of *Local and Regional Socialist Conferences*, the details of which remain to be finalised.

Details of all of the above may be found in *Interlink*, the journal of the C.S.E./Socialist Society. Alternatively, they may be obtained by writing to the Socialist Conference at 9 Poland Street, London WC2.

FRANKFURT CRITICAL THEORY

Readers may be interested to know that Joseph McCarney has written a reply to the critique by Peter Dews and Peter Osborne ('The Frankfurt and the Problem of Critique; A Reply to McCarney', *RP* 45-Spring 1987) of his article 'What makes Critical Theory Critical?' (*RP* 42-Winter/Spring 1986). Copies of this reply may be obtained from him at: Department of Social Sciences, Polytechnic of the South Bank, Borough Road, London SE1 0AA. Enquirers will also receive a copy of a response to this reply by Dews and Osborne; a contribution which brings the debate to a close for the time being.