PARATAXIS: MODERN WRITING

Parataxis: modernism and modern writing is a new journal devoted to the critical rethinking of modernism and the publication of contemporary writing.

At a time when the concept of modernism has come to seem merely historical, and when the critical vocabulary of modernism itself has been collapsed into that of postmodernism, Parataxis aims to aprovide substantial discussion of the legacies of modernism, while refusing to characterise modernism as that which is simply past.

The journal will appear three times a year: the first issue in Spring 1991.

The editors welcome ideas for potential contributions. These and other enquiries should be sent to the editors:

Simon Jarvis, Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge CB2 3HU

Drew Milne, Department of English, Edinburgh University, David Hume Tower, George Square, Edinburgh EH8 9JX

RIGHTS IN CHINA WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

An International Conference on Rights in China

Friday and Saturday, 21-22 June 1991 at

The School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London

Organised by June 4th China Support Group and The Contemporary China Institute, SOAS

Sessions on: The Concept of Rights in China; Censorship and Propoganda; Eastern Europe, the USSR and China; Chnia and the UN.

For further details, please write to:

Rights in China Conference c/o The Contemporary China Institute SOAS Thornhaugh Street Russell Square London WC1H OXG

RESIGNATION FROM THE COLLECTIVE

Because of pressure of work, Martin Barker has resigned from the *Radical Philosophy* Editorial Collective, on which he has served since 1977, including a long stint as reviews editor.

Readers may remember his articles on 'Kant as a Problem for Marxism' (RP 19); 'Racism: The New Inheritors' (RP 24); 'Empiricism and Racism' (RP 33) and 'Mass Media and Ideology' (RP 46).

Martin's editorial skill and energy is now being focused on the new Magazine For Cultural Studies.

Members of the editorial collective will miss his incisive and sometimes controversial interventions in our debate. And all of us are grateful for his many years of hard work.



Dear Radical Philosophy,

I suppose a book as consciously against the stream as my Socialist Reasoning can expect hostile and tangential reviews, and perhaps I should not expect that, in a single paragraph on it, any of the three main arguments of the book should be mentioned - viz. that the analysis of capitalism is the argument for socialism, that this is logically kosher since facts can imply values, and that classical Marxism must be revised to show the vital place of issues of peace, ecology and thoroughgoing democracy in that argument today. But David Archard's claim (in 'Friends and Enemies of Liberalism', Radical Philosophy 57, p. 32) that the book is 'mainly directed at the left' is grossly misleading. All its criticisms of the left are to be found on about 10% of its pages, and, I hope, couched in language a good sight more comradely than that habitually used by post-Marxists against those of us who believe in class politics.

Andrew Collier Department of Philosophy University of Southampton Dear Radical Philosophy,

I regret but am not too surprised that Andrew Collier objects to my review of his Socialist Reasoning. He does himself describe two of his six chapters as 'mainly aimed at utopian currents on the recent left' (p.175). However, my main argument was not so much that his book argues with the left, as that it argues on the left. In choosing to show how we should argue for socialism Collier presupposes rather than presents a case for socialism. My own feeling—which is not necessarily rooted in 'post-Marxism' or a scepticism about class politics—is that this kind of attitude is a luxury political philosophy cannot at present afford.

David Archard
Department of Philosophy and Politics
University of Ulster at Jordanstown

Dear Radical Philosophy,

Thank you for the obituary of Louis Althusser, written by Gregory Elliott in *Radical Philosophy* 57. Lyrical, short and profound. I would dedicate the following lines from François Villon to our 'doux mâitre à la science pure et dure':

Je congnois que pauvres et riches, Sages et fous, prêtre et lais, Nobles, vilains, larges et chiches, Petits et grands, et beaux et laids, Dames a rebrassés collets, De quelconque condition, Portant atours et bourrelets, Mort saisit sans exception.

Pretentious maybe. But there are more people around who deeply feel his loss than one might imagine.

Andrew Coates Ipswich, Suffolk