1. Yugoslavia: philosophers sacked

According to press reports eight philosophy teachers have lost their jobs at Belgrade University as a result of political pressure. Nikola Markovic, Ilijomir Tadic, Djordje Stevanovic, and the others, formed the Belgrade wing of the philosophical tendency associated with the journal Praxis. The Zagreb wing has also come under fire but the major repressions have occurred in Belgrade.

The background to the affair is as follows (according to information collated by Chomsky for the New York Review of Books early this year). 1964: Praxis founded by Zagreb and Belgrade philosophers and sociologists. Gradually it moved from abstract humanist criticisms of Stalinism to critical analysis of Yugoslavian reality - which alarmed party officials. It discussed such issues as the meaning of the socialist perspective, bureaucratic and authoritarian tendencies in party organizations, advantages and weaknesses of self-management and the rights of minority opinions.

1968: Student occupation at Belgrade University - Tito reportedly concluded that philosophers were responsible because through their lectures they 'corrupted the students', and that they must be ousted.

1969-72: Stalemate - because all power was in the hands of faculty councils of professors, assistants, and students, and the sole criterion for positions was scholarly qualification. 1972: In the autumn the University Committee of the League of Communists (after suitable expulsions) drew up a list of eight to be fired. Foreign protests slowed up the process.

1973: University law now requires professors to be politically acceptable (equated with active support for the programme of the League of Communists) and the composition of the faculty council agreed with the given Federal Republic government. The Faculty of Philosophy charged these changes were unconstitutional.

May 1973: Belgrade University League of Communists demanded of the Faculty of Philosophy that the eight be sacked. The Faculty solidly refused this, including the students and even the party organisation in the Faculty. October 1973: The various faculties agreed to allow half the management council to be appointed from outside the University. The Faculty of Philosophy resisted this, but after a violent press campaign, with threats of closure, it agreed.

1974: The newly reconstituted council dismisses Markovic and his colleagues.

The issues raised here occur in the more general framework of an increasingly intense Stalinisation of public discussion of the country's condition, and primarily in the campaign, with threats of closure, it agrees.

1974: The newly reconstituted composition of the faculty council agreed with the given Federal Republic government. The Faculty of Philosophy claimed these changes were unconstitutional.

May 1973: Belgrade University League of Communists demanded of the Faculty of Philosophy that the eight be sacked. The Faculty solidly refused this, including the students and even the party organisation in the Faculty.
As for Solzhenitsyn himself, let us examine his recent 'Letter to the Soviet Leaders' (Sunday Times 3 March 1974, to be published in book form by Fontana). The Sunday Times absurdly announced this text as 'one of the most remarkable and eloquent documents of our time ... a testament of astonishing power, with uncanny relevance to our own problems in the west'. In fact the only remarkable thing about this document is that anyone has taken it seriously at all. The ludicrous elevation, by the Sunday Times and others, of Solzhenitsyn to the rank of Prophet of our time has more to do with sensationalist money-making and cynical mind-bending than it has with a concern for the truth. He is certainly a man of great courage, and a man who has suffered hideously, and no doubt he does see himself in the tradition of the great Russian novelist-Prophets. It would be worth examining at length the way in which the Sunday Times employees the whole range of journalistic technique to endorse and as it were authenticate this image.

The text is printed beneath a bold heading: 'SOLZHENITSYN SPEAKS: WORLD EXCLUSIVE'. The 'world exclusive' is fascinating - a mixture of commercial pride and cosmic pretention. It is said to be 'world exclusive' because this is a way of announcing that there follows a message that the whole world is waiting to hear. The speech of Solzhenitsyn is an event in world-history and the reader in Sidcup knows that he has the privilege of being the first to hear the Prophet's voice. For only a Prophet is it true that the very act of speech is an event that demands the whole world's attention. For, as Kierkegaard pointed out, the Prophet has authority, whereas the ordinary mortal has only reason or power to legitimate his speech. In news jargon the politician discusses, acts, announces, condemns, decides, accuses etc. But Solzhenitsyn speaks. And there they are, these contrasts, spread out across the page below the headline. On top a thin, elongated photograph of nineteen rather anonymous but powerful and unsmiling women - the 1973 Soviet government, the photograph printed too dark so that one gets the impression that these men prefer to work in an underground basement, that they fear exposure. Immediately below them a bigger picture, head-and-shoulders, of the writer, a background of trees and air, a mysterious half-smile on his face and a blursed hand upraised in a motion of benediction. In reality, of course, at that moment when the camera froze him, Solzhenitsyn might have been giving a fist at the press photographers and telling them to piss off. But a photograph on the page of a newspaper is not a straight-forward representation of real reality, it is a message carefully composed of visual space, text, captions, quality of print etc. The effect of the composition is, in this case, the message 'This man is a Prophet', all the more powerful because those words are not open to anywhere to be found. For this page says of the Soviet leaders what Allan Ginsberg said of Lyndon Baines Johnson and his gang: 'They open their mouths and lo they pour forth cement'. Not an implausible thought, of course, but what it helps to create is the contrast. Solzhenitsyn the uncanny, Solzhenitsyn speaks.

Can it be that there really is at the Sunday Times an editor who agrees with Solzhenitsyn here, that there really is nothing more to be said? If there is such a man he must be not only malchauvinist but also extraordinarily blind to the facts about women's labour, both domestic and industrial, in the West. Because the message be stressed is that the whole system of women performing arduous labour has come about in Russia because it is a country dominated by the monstrous tradition of Marxism-Leninism. This is confirmed both in the text itself and in its presentation by the newspaper. The latter is shown by the photograph immediately below the quote - a photograph of Russian women apparently repairing or painting curbing stones, with a truck nearby which one woman is sitting in and another climbing into, as if to emphasize the 'maleness' of what they are being forced to do. And just in front of the women, dominating the whole scene, an enormous hoarding carrying a picture of Big Brother himself, V. I. Lenin, without whose oppressive gaze no these women would have the nerve return to where they belong among the dishes and the kids. Only in Russia, then, are women forced to work.

In the text Solzhenitsyn gives his own version of this thesis.
He repeatedly explains that it is only because the Soviet government squanders national resources in its support of far away revolutionaries that women are forced to labor in mines. Immediately following the sentence headlined by the newspaper the author says 'Who would hesitate to abandon the financing of South American revolutionaries in order to free our women from this bondage? This expenditure is not only judged immoral because it conflicts with Solzhenitsyn's intense nationalism, it is also said to be completely unnecessary. 'Let's leave our soldiers - arms all rigidly and synchronously in movement, heads in line. But don't all armies look like this? So, what is the point? Well, this is not a representation of the army at all, but of the Chinese people. The caption is another quote from the author: 'One aches with sympathy for the ordinary Chinese... They are held in such a strait-jacket.' Who is the most ludicrous, Solzhenitsyn with his ignorant and foolish remark about the ordinary Chinese, or the Sunday Times which decides to represent these regimented looking, rifles on shoulders - arms all rigidly and synchronously in movement, heads in line. Is this universal, obligatory force-feeding with lies is now the most agonising aspect of existence in our country - worse than all our material miseries, worse than any lack of civic liberties.' That I do not have the presumption to dispute. What do I dispute is his explanation of why this is so. The root cause, according to Solzhenitsyn, is Marxism. Marxism is an ideology which is crude, discredited and bankrupt. The only way in which it can be maintained as the dominant ideology is by systematically denying reality, by a continuous campaign of falsehood and evasion. The Soviet censor excludes anti-Marxist thought because this is the only way in which Marxism thought has any chance of survival. This thesis, however, ignores an essential feature of Russian censorship, and indeed of the whole policy of the Soviet government in the field of education and culture. The point is not that socialist thought is imposed while non-socialist thought is excluded. It is that, when it comes to thinking about, investigating and understanding the history of the Russian revolution, the development of Soviet political and administrative organizations, the division of labour and the control of production, i.e. the whole history of Russian society since 1917, that in relation to all this socialist thought is also excluded. What is brutally prevented by the State apparatuses is any open, scientific investigation, and therefore any understanding, of Soviet society. And since this is done in the name of Marxism there is clearly a situation in which culture and the intellectual life are dominated and deformed by this most outrageous contradiction. It means that 'Diamat' can survive in Soviet schools in a condition rather like that of religious instruction in our own - a sort of appendage to formal education which is not intended to be taken too seriously when it comes to the production of social self-knowledge, which indeed comes to have the function precisely of an obstacle to knowledge. Thus Stalin and Stalinism, for example, are not posed as problems demanding a scientific investigation, but are evasively obscured beyond the non-Marxist concept 'the cult of personality'. And the pronouncement by the 22nd Congress of the CPSU that, with the disappearance of the class-struggle, the dictatorship of the proletariat has been 'superceded' is only because the Soviet state is the State of the whole people - these doctrines are not the products of socialist thought; they are in effect orders - do not ask questions about the bureaucracy; do not attempt to understand how it is possible that in a State of the whole people there is no recognisable form of democratic control; do not analyse the distribution of the surplus, the privileges and the differentials... The specific oppressive nature of Soviet society is that it is a repressive classist society in which socialist thought, discussion and criticism of this very society, socialist self-understanding, are disallowed. If the Soviet authorities need to ban Solzhenitsyn it is in part because they have themselves created the intellectual and cultural conditions in which his work becomes a threat. So it is worth remembering that there are also socialist dissidents in the USSR. It is worth reading, in this connection, the article by Roy Medvedev mentioned above, and the essay about two of Medvedev's books by Ralph Milliband in Socialist Register (1973). Just how very efficient are all of the obstacles to knowledge in the Soviet Union is suggested by Medvedev: he remarks that 'most of our students and senior school-children know nothing of Stalin's crimes'. Yevtushenko has provided us with an instructive anecdote (in his books by Ralph Miliband in Socialist Register (1973). Last year in Siberia, around a camp fire, a young girl, a student about eighteen years old, proposed a toast to Stalin. I leapt up and asked her why. 'Because in those days everyone had faith in Stalin, and because this faith enabled us to win great victories.' 'Do you know, I asked her, 'how many people were arrested during the years when Stalin was in power?' 'Well ... perhaps twenty or thirty.' There were other students of about the same age around the fire. I asked them the same question. 'About two hundred' said one boy. 'Perhaps two thousand' said a girl. Only one, of the fifteen or twenty present, said 'I think there may have been about ten thousand.' When I told them that it is necessary to count not in thousands but in millions they did not want to believe me.

J.K.M.
Chomsky and Herman have written a monograph called Counter-Revolutionary Violence: Bloodbaths in Fact and Propaganda. This monograph investigates the way in which atrocities committed by American forces and by the forces of client regimes are systematically covered up; and the way in which myths about alleged atrocities by revolutionary forces are created and perpetuated by the 'information' services of the US Government and by the Press. The text was printed by Warner Modular Publications but has not been distributed. In a letter to a French magazine editor Chomsky has given an account of how it has come about that this text has been, in effect, suppressed. We asked Chomsky about the affair for RP. He sent us a copy of his letter to M. Faye. We print it here.

Dear M. Faye
You raised the question some time ago about publishing some remarks on the censorship of 'Counter-revolutionary violence', and I recall being rather reluctant. Since, I've discussed it with Ed Herman and also with the director of Warner Modular, since fired, and I think it is all right to give the background, as long as it is presented as report or rumor and not attributed to specific individuals in the firm. The actual story, as reported to me, is as follows.

Warner Modular is a subsidiary of the Warner Publishing Company, which is itself a subsidiary of Warner Communications Inc. The latter is a big conglomerate, including Warner Brothers Motion Pictures, Warner records, Warner Cable TV, and other outfits. Warner Modular was set up simply as an independent publishing house. Our dealings were solely with them, just as when I publish a book with Pantheon I do not deal with RCA (or whoever it is that ultimately owns them).

A few days before our monograph was to be published, an executive of Warner Publishing Company came across some advertising copy, demanded to see the manuscript, and ordered the publisher to stop publication. Later, apparently realizing that the publicity would not be too good if the news got out, he agreed to permit distribution of our monograph, but only on condition that another monograph would be published to 'balance' the picture. He also insisted that there be no advertising for our monograph. One ad did just appear in the NY Review, before all of this took place, but since that time there has been no advertising, and the copy that appeared in the NY Review has since been modified, in later publication, with our monograph replaced by something else.

At my suggestion, the editors at Warner Modular approached Thiel Pool to ask him whether he would let them publish several articles of his on Indochina and related matters as 'balance' to ours. Frankly, though I of course would let them publish several articles of his on Indochina and related matters as 'balance' to ours. Frankly, though I of course would let them publish several articles of his on Indochina and related matters as 'balance' to ours. Frankly, though I of course was a bit taken aback at the censorship attempt, nevertheless I was not unhappy to see Pool's things appear. Pool is a miserable apologist for imperialist violence who works within a framework of academic respectability, and I would simply regard his articles as an illustrative appendix for our own monograph. As far as I know, they did go ahead with the publication of Pool's articles, as an antidote to ours.

However, at this point the director of Warner Modular was simply ordered to close down the operation entirely. He and most of the other members of his staff were fired, and now Warner Publishing Co is attempting to sell the remaining assets of Warner Modular. It is very difficult to find out what the status of our monograph is, whether it is indeed on sale, or in fact, anything.

As for the decision to close down the publishing operation, I doubt that what was simply a reaction to our monograph. However, it is not entirely obvious what other considerations might have played a part. The company seemed to be making money. I assume that there must have been other considerations, and that our monograph served to trigger the decision to phase out the operation.

I suspect that what really lies behind the hysteria over this issue is the matter of cable TV. Warner Communications Inc. is attempting to move into the cable TV business, which requires approval by the Federal Communications Commission. They are probably worried about FCC reactions to their publications.

This account is, I am convinced, quite accurate. I've left out the names of the individuals involved, and, of course, it would be difficult to prove any of it, unless those individuals wanted to tell the story themselves. I've never heard of anything like this in the field of publishing. It is, however, the sort of thing that many people feared when big conglomerates began to take over the publishing industry.

If you want to use the information I think it is quite all right.

Sincerely yours,
Noam Chomsky

Reports

Marxist Activist Philosophers

A group of philosophers calling themselves Marxist Activist Philosophers (MAP) have organized in the United States and have held two of the three conferences thus far and are planning a third. They come from diverse philosophical (and political) backgrounds, but most of the participants are working themselves out of a background in analytic philosophy. They see their goal to be the development of a constructive Marxist philosophy and a Marxist critique of bourgeois philosophy. Their aim is not to 'take over the academy' (as if that could be done within capitalism) but to contribute to the development of a serious and vigorous alternative to academic philosophy both within and beyond the academy. They are interested in reaching beyond the confines of philosophy departments to people in other disciplines who share a similar perspective and they are also interested in getting a Marxist alternative to the bourgeois world of academia to a broader audience outside the university. Most of the participants in MAP are or have been involved in political activity and some are in socialist organizations. All of the participants, however, are convinced of the necessity of connecting their intellectual work with their political practice.

The first of the conferences was purely organizational. The second, held in September 1973, had papers on a Marxist approach to the mind-body problem, the fuller realization of human nature as a justification of revolution, the function of intellectuals and a Marxist critique of Quine. All the papers produced full and lively discussion. There was disagreement as to what view on the mind-body problem Marxists are committed to, whether a fuller realization of human nature is a reasonable justification of political struggle and whether Marxists should let it to be, just who intellectuals are and what their function is and the connection of trade unions to this, and what a Marxist
theory of truth would be like. The disagreement seemed to be due to the different philosophical views of the participants and the absence of clear answers to many of these philosophical questions in Marx. Thus, the need to hold a constructive Marxist philosophy was necessary. Although the debate was vigorous, it was constructive and (largely) uncontroversial - qualities that are rare in philosophical discussions in the university.

The third working conference, to be held in the spring of 1974, will have papers on the following topics (as well as possibly others): Marx as a political theorist; a Marxist critique of Popper; Free Will and the Falling Rate of Profit.

Papers are not read at the conferences but are circulated in advance and people are encouraged to send comments to their authors, thus getting as much cooperative work in advance as possible. About 25 people were at the last conference - mostly from the Northeast, some from the Midwest. Many more are expected at the next one, due to a somewhat broader orientation and better publicity. People coming to the conferences are all expected to participate. A travel pool is used for the conference so that each participant shares equally (according to income) in travel expenses.

Inquiries regarding MAP can be addressed to Professor Marlene Fried/Department of Philosophy, Dartmouth College/Manover/HK/ASA.

**Association of Teachers of Philosophy**

The context in which philosophy is being taught has thrown up a new organisation. The explicit aim of the Association of Teachers of Philosophy is to bring together teachers and 'all those interested in the teaching of philosophy', to talk, and to act as a pressure group in respect of academic boards and the Council for National Academic Awards, whose personnel unite, I understand, the cosiness of the British philosophical establishment with that of the British Civil Service.

But at its first conference, held just before the beginning of the summer term, one glimpsed the changes and uncertainties in institutional philosophy. The conference was dominated by polytechnic teachers, who are feeling their way outside the atmosphere of independent university philosophy departments where they studied. But they are keen to swap experiences and ideas of institutional philosophy, desiring courses almost exclusively for non-specialists.

I suppose it was the spirit of that which Mary Warnock was trying to put into words with her resolve to 'go to the stake for "philosophy plus something else" courses'. Mary Warnock is chairperson (though she insists on being called 'chairman') of the C.N.A.A. Philosophy Panel. Hearing her speak I can glimpse some (though not perhaps very much) of the histrionics that have to pass to gain official approval. She confessed her personal orthodoxy but gave us to understand that it did not represent the views of the committee, what did appear to represent the views of the committee was the criteria questions: Was it clear precisely what the students were going to do (especially read and write)? Were they of a standard to achieve it? And what graduate courses would they be ready to do at the end of the course that they could not have done without it. Ms. Warnock said she opposed the dismissive notion of Language, Truth and Logic, but her impromptu list of possible introductory reading that covered only Plato, Aristotle, Locke, Berkeley, and Hume, Russell, itself seems rather dismissive.

Three speakers described course innovations. All sought to introduce content that did not stem from the restricted field. Themecentred courses which display their high ideals on their faces; 'packs' of material from newspapers and books for critical examination; relevant seminars on some modern 'classifications' (educationindoctrination, male-female). But the discussion suggested how little certainty there was about what was being taught in teaching philosophy. On the one hand it seemed that philosophy was so promiscuous it had to be a study in the matter of valid argument; on the other hand contributors felt that they had something very specific which had to be communicated. But what was it and how could it be communicated? Even accepting the apparently generally held view that the professional pressure to claim expertise was no longer so intense, I still felt that few of the teachers could find any ground between the arrogance of philosophy as selling proper modes of argument to anyone who'd buy and the exclusiveness of philosophy with a content of texts and disputes never bearing on that beyond. Now, one contributor asked, could we keep deliberately quiet in seminars when the students know we are being paid £2-3,000 per year to be there? And we not even knowing when to speak and when to keep silent.

At one point a contributor challenged the predominance of epistemological classes (remember Mary Warnock's introductory reading list). This aroused almost no comment. Yet it is the medium by which philosophy students develop the prejudice that they are learning about learning, not learning anything in particular (which other subjects naively assume): Scant opposition was heard either to Mary Warnock's statement that at the start between the teaching of philosophy and the teaching of the history of ideas. But history, as the context of all human activity, offers some alternative to the aridness of prior epistemological solutions. If epistemological philosophy as first separating philosophy and the student from the subject in the institution, prior to getting our feet wet in anything actual. The 'relevant' topics of innovative graduates have been given only the instruments of a timeless epistemology. Their search for relevance represents merely the unhappy consciousness of the philosophy specialist who has lost his faith. Why has the feeling that philosophy should send students out into any understanding of why ideas are relevant when they are? Perhaps because philosophers have been too quick to the questions to the more accumulative minds of historians and sociologists. One who did believe the history of philosophy to be inseparable from philosophy itself thought of history only as that which is past - a notion itself based upon epistemological criteria of the object of historical knowledge. What philosophy (and much else of intellectual life) tries to avoid is that history is not first and foremost something we study but something we live in.

But all that is under the surface, and for the future I hope, I was glad to be there because the association will have to be a focal point for the expression of these uncertainties and perhaps their resolution in practice. Philosophy is changing in all the new circumstances of education in this country; and in periods of crisis we may hope for exciting solutions.

Membership of the A.T.P. is £1.50 a year. The secretary is Peter Caldwell at Bolton Institute of Technology.

Noel Parker

**Counter-Course Conference**

Canterbury, March 22-24

Publicity ballups restricted attendance at the Conference, though about 50 people came from all over Britain. Extreme diversity of perspective, involvement and experience ensured a modest discussion. In one way this had a positive lesson: that each institution, because of its traditions, structure and geographical location, presents different problems and possibilities.

Susoar is liberally pluralistic, making it easy for radicals to get
into an academic-left ghetto. Bangor is straight and lecture/ essay banks are suggested as ways of developing struggles which (a) subvert the bourgeois academic routine and ideology, (b) do not simply compete with academic work-time to become spare time activities, and (c) involve us in practical-investigative activity in areas of oppression and resistance. In this connection a number of suggestions made at the conference are worth recording. At Manchester students have moved off the campus and, in the context of resisting demolition of buildings for university purposes, have set up an 'educational exchange'. The goal seems to be to end the dichotomy of educational struggle and mass-political struggle. In addition, students are returning to their courses and demanding radical changes, in form and content. Essay banks, lecture-note banks, exam cribs etc, were suggested as ways of developing a collectiveist approach to work, and as ways of jackling up on the system to force it to change.

The Radical Philosophers decided to organise a number of popular pamphlets debunking import- and ideologies: 'Law and Order', 'The National Interest', 'Extremism and Moderation', 'Reasonableness and Violence' were among the topics suggested. (Anyone interested contact Mike Dawney, Middlesex Polytech, Crouch End Hill, N8.)

In some universities, e.g. Sheffield, critical seminars track- ing and attacking the mainstream course set on a week by week basis are going on. This, unlike the abstract Warwick topic, encourages struggle to deal very concretely with the alienation and mystification brought on by their courses, while it adjusts to the institutional necessity for students to 'follow' the course.

Courses, exams and assessments were discussed in the context of the functions for capitalism: to produce routinised personnel with certain skills and attitudes. It was suggested, on the basis of industrialists' complaints and on the basis of high figures of voluntary and involuntary unemployment among graduates, as well as on fiscal indications that the State is seeing educational expenditure as low-priority, that severe contradictions were getting revealed in this function. In particular, the narrowness, passivity and impracticality of examination courses was often seen by major industrialists as responsible for the unsatisfactory character of graduates. Hence the inconsistent needs of capitalism create space for major reforms of the colleges.

There was an argument over examinations; in particular over how to replace them without, in effect, putting the student in the position of depending on a character profile from his teachers. Various suggestions were made: (a) they depend on this at the moment, through references etc, (b) [shades of Warwick files] students and teachers should have access to their files and right of complaint; (c) essays, projects etc should be able to be sent [by the student] outside the student's college, to be 'assessed' by people of the student's choice. Lists of possible readers and their fields of interest and competence should be available; (d) students and teachers should be more mobile between colleges. Several arrangements were circulated, and are available. Write to John O'Leary, Students. UKC, Canterbury.

TP Open Meeting

The latest Open Meeting took place on Sunday 24 March, at the end of the Canterbury Conference.

There was some discussion about whether to do a further reprinting of Nos.1 and 2, which were almost all sold out. Richard Norman had made enquiries with the Printing Unit at the University of Kent, who said that they would not be able to do the job until the summer. It was agreed that he should get an estimate from them.

Jonathan Kee explained that the editorial arrangements had been slightly re-organised, so as to relieve pressure on the coordinator and give more responsibility to the editors. This left the coordinator with more power, and Jonathan asked whether this was desirable. It was generally agreed to be acceptable, since the work of the editorial board remained open.

Book

Richard Norman suggested that as contributions for the book were still coming in so slowly, it might be a good idea to publish some of them initially as a series in the magazine, as they came in, and to aim at producing the book when enough contributions had accumulated (say in a year or so). This was agreed.

Pamphlets

There was some further discussion of the idea which had come up at the conference of producing a series of pamphlets attacking current ideological concepts and slogans (see report of Counter-Course Conference).

It was decided to work in the following way: small groups or individuals would select a topic and get producing a short critique or demystification by November 1974. Provided sufficient material was available, editorial meetings would then be held with a view to production in some form - books, pamphlets, leaflets - in early 1975.

To avoid too much duplication, the work will be coordinated by Mike Dawney, Middlesex Polytech-Nic, Crouch End Hill, London N8. Any groups who want to start work should check with Mike first. Groups should try to meet as soon as possible to discuss this, and to start work.

London Day Conference

The London group had decided to organise a number of day conferences, on 18 May, 1 June and 29 June, and to try and get well known speakers to join in discussions on the subjects of 'Sexism', 'The State' and 'Ideology'. It was decided that the one on 29 June could usefully be combined with the next Open meeting, which Janet Vaux agreed to chair.

(Please send items for agenda to: Janet Vaux, 53 Ramillies Road, London W4 1JW.)

APOLOGY

Radical Philosophy 6 contained an article under the heading 'Terror in Cambridge Tripos' which made unjustified allegations about the integrity of the Cambridge University Union examining system and of an external examiner, L. Jonathan Cohen. The editors of Radical Philosophy completely withdraw the allegations and do apologise for the pain and inconvenience caused to the individuals and bodies involved.