

issues, in fact, Aarons and Dewey are interchangeable. Dewey expresses Aarons' main problem as follows:

*The problem of restoring integration and co-operation between man's beliefs about the world in which he lives and his beliefs about the values and purposes that should direct his conduct is the deepest problem of modern life. It is the problem of any philosophy that is not isolated from that life.*

[*The Quest for Certainty*, New York, 1929, p255]

Aarons captures in a line Dewey's emphasis on the philosophy of education, when he asserts

*To change the school, is to change society.* [p22]

So where does that leave Aarons? We are facing him with that dilemma which socialists are duty bound to take seriously - reform or revolution? - and he looks to be firmly impaled on the wrong prong. However much a socialist might disagree with Marx, one would expect his even more total opposition to such as Dewey.

I dare say Aarons has a ready answer to my criticism, but, whatever this is, it isn't readily derivable from the book. There are passages where he appears not insensitive to possible allegations of reformism -

*If all great social changes involve, and in a sense are brought about by, a revolution in philosophy and values ... this would have a great bearing on the conceived model of revolution.* [p151]

On the same page there is just a hint that he might think the issue to have been superseded - yet another consequence - apparently, of contemporary society's incredible rate of change. But even if it were possible to remain simply on the level of values, some similar problem would still arise. Aarons nowhere indicates how one is to distinguish a values-revolutionary, like himself, from a values-reformist (whatever that might turn out to be). And, of course, it isn't possible to remain just on the level of values, for, whatever else values might do, they must,

sooner or later, result in action.

In conclusion, let me mention a few things in the book's favour. It is easy to read. This encourages the reader to have a few thoughts of his own along the way, instead of, as too often happens, having to expend all his mental energy on just trying to understand what the author is on about. Also, and to his eternal credit, he neither mentions Lukacs nor Gramsci, and Korsch only gets a few lines in a footnote. Apart from this the book is recommended mainly for some good quotations he has dug out. My favourite is the anguished cry of the Philosophy Lecturer, in a letter to the *Sydney Morning Herald* -

*There has been a noticeable decline in the ability of philosophers to distinguish between what is philosophical and what is not...*  
[quoted p34]

Rob Gill

## NEWS

### Summer school in Korcula

Last August, I participated, as an invited contributor, in the tenth annual Korcula Summer School, sponsored by the Yugoslavian Philosophical Association. It was my second such participation in the school, the first having been in 1971.

I shall attempt to relate, with all possible brevity, some of the principal significances of this gathering under the following headings: Recent historical background; Socio-political import; Theoretical orientation; Aftermath and conclusion.

I want immediately to stress - I cannot do so enough - that post-war Yugoslavian philosophy has by no means been monolithic, and that in fact the view that it has been so is one of the most detrimental misconceptions of the Yugoslavian scene that have been prevalent among American radicals. For one thing, the non-Marxist contemporary philosophical currents that have affected the style and thought of some of the best-known figures in Yugoslavian philosophy have differed greatly; to indulge in a gross over-generalization for brevity's sake, it could be said that the Zagreb philosophers, such as Gajo Petrovic, have on the whole paid more attention to recent Continental philosophy, whereas Anglo-American currents have been somewhat more influen-

tial in the formation of some of the Belgrade philosophers, such as Mihailo Markovic and Svetozar Stojanovic. As a matter of fact, the post-war burgeoning of Yugoslavian philosophy as an important, internationally-recognized phenomenon was only made possible by the fact that, as I have already noted, a certain degree of diversity of thought came to be regarded as healthy and desirable in Yugoslavia during the 1950's and 1960's. On the other hand, certain traits were common to all the figures who dominated the Yugoslavian philosophical scene during this time and still dominate it up to the present: a deep interest in the thought of Marx, combined with the view that Marxism required re-thinking in light of the new social and economic situations of the mid-twentieth century: a strong belief that philosophy, to be at all valuable, should be de-esotericized and applied to current social problems, though not at the expense of rigorouslyness of thought or with a loss of a sense of the history of philosophy; and a commitment to abetting the development of a more fully socialist society in Yugoslavia, a task in which the philosophers could best play some part by calling critical attention to evidences of opposite tendencies.

Although the above catalogue may read like an idealization, I do not consider it to be at odds with the gross historical facts. Documentation of them is readily

available, among other places, in articles that have appeared over the years in the philosophical journal, *Praxis*, published under the auspices of the Serbo-Croatian (now Yugoslavian) Philosophical Association. The same general rationale lay behind the establishment of the Korcula Summer School. One additional, but perfectly obvious, consideration should be noted: the post-war Yugoslavian philosophers have been very anxious to share their insights and activities with like-minded, or even potentially like-minded, foreigners. Thus, the International Edition of *Praxis* has enjoyed a wide circulation, and the Korcula Summer School attracted intellectuals from both the political 'West' and the political 'East' - at least until 1968.

In retrospect, that year can be seen as the single most important turning point. Intellectual retrenchment was already proceeding apace in the USSR and other Warsaw Pact countries. However, prominent younger philosophers from at least one of those countries, Hungary, were still in attendance at the 1968 Korcula sessions, which were under way when the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia took place. The members of the School formulated an official protest. The Hungarians returned home early, never since to go back to Korcula; in their own country, they have been the victims of a still-on-going repression (censure, deprivation of passports, cessation of contacts with students, and even-

tual loss, for at least some, even of research appointments). (So, for different but by no means completely opposite reasons, has one of the American philosophers who attended that year's session, Ken Megill, whose name is familiar to most readers of *Newsjournal*.) Since 1968, as I understand it, there has been no participation in the Korcula Summer School by any philosophers resident in Warsaw Pact countries (with the possible exception of one or two Romanians, and not even of any of them in 1973), and the 'Praxis group' has been subjected to exceedingly harsh and sustained criticism in certain Soviet publications.

Over Yugoslavia itself, the clouds have blackened and for the moment are still blackening. There has by now come to be fairly widespread agreement in the country, I think, that the dominant co-operative spirit of the early post-war years (if indeed it really existed even then!) has been pretty much dissipated. For many, perhaps especially in Croatia, this is a good thing; there are strong currents, including some that would fall under anyone's definition of 'Fascism', favouring a return to capitalism and to an extreme regional nationalism.

It is presumed, on the basis of past experience, that no eighty-year-old leader is destined to live forever; accordingly, political jockeying proceeds apace. The threat of a Russian invasion, particularly in the wake of Brezhnev's declaration of his right to invade any would-be socialist country that has become guilty of intolerable deviationism, as Czechoslovakia presumably was, cannot be discounted; although this threat has been somewhat allayed by the twin tactics of shoring up internal defenses and making significant concessions to the Soviet leadership, it was felt very strongly during the summer of 1971, when massive Warsaw Pact military manoeuvres were being conducted near the Yugoslav borders, and it would have been revived instantaneously if Yugoslavia had rejected the Russian request to permit round-the-clock overflights of its territory by airplanes re-supplying Arab forces during the recent Mid-East war. Meanwhile, it is my personal impression that Yugoslavia now faces a threat of an even more severe economic recession than most of Western Europe: as stagnation sets in in the Western economies, Yugoslavian workers are going increasingly to be asked to return home, and an unemployment situation of staggering proportions is likely, at least under the present economic institutions, to result.

The principal official answer to all these hazards has been, at least up to the present, to call

for a tightening of the ideological reins. True, efforts have also been made to combat some of the most salient excesses of the present economic system, presumably by clipping the wings of a few Yugoslavian socialist millionaires. But the main thrust has been to call for a return to Marxist purity and for the elimination of ideological deviations of the right and left. It is in this context that Yugoslavian philosophers have come under the glare of official disapproval; some of them are said to be leftist deviants. In particular, eight members of the Belgrade philosophy faculty, including Markovic and Stojanovic, were officially singled out as undesirables by the highest Party leadership in fall, 1972.

## Yugoslavia

In RPB we reported on the threat to fire philosophy teachers at Belgrade University. The *Guardian* now reports that the faculty council (half academics, half lay outsiders) will probably cancel the moves now. In a speech Tito alluded to the professors as 'black sheep' but said 'we must remain more calm towards such excesses. We should not react too nervously to such things or with measures which would do more harm to us outside our country'.

CA

As of this writing (January 1974) they still retain their teaching positions, for a variety of complicated reasons. (Among other things, a respect for socialist legal forms still exists, and the faculty workers' councils that would have to vote for their removal have until now refused to do so. Moreover, there are important differences of political orientation both within the Serbian League of Communists, whose leadership has the responsibility of applying pressure against the Belgrade philosophers, and between that league and those of the other Yugoslavian republics. (Yugoslavia has, at least in theory, no single federal communist party.) Finally, the Yugoslavian authorities are forced, by virtue of their delicate political and economic situation, to have some concern about Yugoslavia's 'image' abroad, and considerable attention has been directed to the 'Belgrade Eight' by some elements of the Western press and by some Western intellectuals. It is one of my hopes, in writing this article, to broaden the scope and to heighten the information level of this attention in the United States.) But several important developments of the last two months, most notably the implementation of a change in the rules, highly unfavourable to the philosophers in question, concerning

the methods of removing university faculty members, have cast even greater doubt than before on the chances of at least some of the 'Eight' to remain university teachers.

A wide range of the intellectual spectrum was represented. In addition to philosophers, there were also numerous journalists, some of them well steeped in political theory; there were sociologists and political scientists and economists as well. Branco Horvat, a prominent Yugoslavian economist whose scorn for the majority of radical theoreticians, whom he considers doctrinaire and unpragmatic, is equalled only by his admiration for the measurement techniques of the contemporary Western social sciences, had nevertheless returned once more to Korcula to match wits and try to find as many areas of agreement as possible with his misguided old friends among the Yugoslavian philosophy professors. Franz Marek, who has shunned the university world for a life of active political organizing, but (or should it be 'and therefore?') whose work on Marxist theory and practice has always been first rate, was there. So were such leading Marxologists as Robert Tucker and Shlomo Avineri. So were some philosophers who are known for their work in quite different areas, such as Abraham Edel and G. H. Von Wright.

However drastically Yugoslavia may, by the admission of its own national leadership, have diverged in practice from its announced goals, the original effort by some to achieve these goals was, it seems to me, thoroughly admirable. To a large segment of the socialist movement, particularly in Western Europe, the Yugoslavian self-management model has seemed to provide a genuine alternative to the authoritarian and statist model that has evolved in the USSR. Despite the obvious reality of the New Class and the inherited problems stemming from vast inequalities among the various federated republics, many of the country's citizens have appeared committed to work towards the achievement of a more egalitarian way of life. Self-criticism has seemed to be encouraged: when in the 1960's, for instance, Yugoslavian philosophers wrote about the forms of alienation still prevalent in their new society, the political authorities did not loudly denounce this claim as being an unacceptable contradiction to the conclusions of genuine Marxism.

Some such thoughts as these, it seemed to me, were on the minds of most of my Korcula colleagues in August 1973. They are clearly irreconcilable with the image of Yugoslavia that I sketched at the beginning of this report. They

may also, it must be acknowledged, become irreconcilable with the future political reality of Yugoslavia. For, although the kinds of trends that I have categorized as being, hopefully, 'aberrant' would be similarly described by the present national leadership, at the same time much pressure is being brought to bear, in many sectors of the national life, to increase conformity of thought.<sup>1</sup> It is in the context of this campaign that the attacks upon some of the Yugoslavian philosophers must be understood. These individuals were, in fact, among the first to articulate the now-widespread concern about anti-socialist trends within their country. But they did so within an intellectual framework in which the maintenance of an independent critical stance and the maintenance of a commitment to building socialist were considered compatible. Now, that entire framework has once more been put into question. The ultimate socio-political import of the 1973 Korcula Summer School lay in its continued and principled adherence to the old framework in the conduct of its affairs.

However, the 'affairs' of the Korcula Summer School are by definition primarily theoretical. Most of the participants discussed, and a few lectured on, political philosophy and related forms of theory. Far more than any APA gathering ever could, the Korcula Summer School provided abundant material for re-examining the question, 'What is (or could be, or should be) philosophy, from a radical perspective?'

For the record, the general topic of the 1973 sessions was 'The Bourgeois World and Socialism'. This, of course, provided few, if any, guidelines for speakers. Among some of the best-known Yugoslavian philosophers who lectured, a preoccupation with clarifying basic principles of social organization whereby to judge the success of a socialist program in any country, but most immediately in Yugoslavia itself, was more than usually evident. This was understandable, particularly in light of the educational aspect of the school's mission: despite subtle social pressures against their attending (and no doubt even against their continuing their studies in the field), Yugoslavian students of philosophy still constituted probably the largest single bloc of participants. Among some of the non-Marxist Westerners who spoke, the usual proliferation of exotic technical terms was to be discerned.

Most surprising of all to me, at first, was the occurrence of at least two or three lectures and comments of a pronouncedly non-Marxist cast by some of the

less internationally well-known Yugoslavians. (By 'non-Marxist', I mean of a sort that concerned itself with problems of interest to Marx (i.e. not symbolic logic or similar matters that were more or less irrelevant to him) and yet failed even to take account of his approach; I do not mean simply uses of Marxist theory that I would consider mistaken or misguided). I recall in particular a discussion of aesthetics that went along these lines. My original inclination was to think that this type of approach was based on a comparative ignorance of Marx on the speakers' parts and hence to harbour doubts about the current level of philosophical education in Yugoslavia, particularly among some of the younger faculty and graduate students and at universities other than Belgrade and Zagreb. But later, while I was still on the island, I came across an article in *Praxis*, written by an individual whose comments (implying that Marx was irrelevant for certain contemporary issues concerning revolutionary change) had particularly irked me and had elicited some counter-comments from me, which showed him to have a very sophisticated familiarity with Marx's writings. Then I understood. If one wishes to continue a philosophical career in a country in which Marxism is supposed to enjoy some special pride of place, but in which a trend towards harassing those of one's colleagues who are best known for attempting to do creating work in a Marxian framework appears to have set in, then it is probably safer for one to avoid alluding to Marx altogether. The sense of despair accompanying this practical conclusion seemed as yet to be confined to a small minority of the Yugoslavian participants at Korcula, but it was detectable. Should it gain ground, then indeed radical philosophers elsewhere would have good reason to turn their backs on Yugoslavian philosophy, as some have unfortunately done for the wrong reasons in the past, for then Yugoslavian philosophy would have ceased to be of any interest.

On the whole, the 1973 Korcula plenary sessions failed to inspire great enthusiasm, even though, for the first time, they benefited from a simultaneous translation arrangement (as opposed to the mixture of German, English, French, and a smattering of Serbo-Croatian with which the participants, who usually were at least somewhat bilingual, managed to get along at other times), and even though some of the papers were of quite high quality. As usual, it was the informal, private contacts that proved most fruitful for most of us. But I should mention two working groups, one planned and the other spontaneously organized, that were widely regarded as great

successes - the former on Western working class strategy, presided over on most occasions by Franz Marek, and the other on the problems of women. The latter group could truly be said to have been planned by 'no one in particular', but its first meeting drew a crowd of totally unexpected proportions. The Yugoslavs were dramatically underrepresented in that group, although there were a few noteworthy exceptions; from some hasty remarks, however, there emerged a picture of a decline in the importance accorded to women in the more public aspects of Yugoslavian society since the immediate post-war period, and of a concomitant increase in the pressures and the blandishments offered them to redefine themselves in their traditional roles as homemakers. (These claims were not supported by statistics, other than some recent newspaper articles and letters to editors concerning proposed changes in statements about the rights of women in drafts of a forthcoming new national constitution, but they sounded all too plausible to most of us.) The intellectual level of the first and subsequent sessions of this working group was generally extremely high and informed, even though it was not difficult to find, even among the school's organizers, those who would shake their heads upon being told this and would declare that such sorts of problems did not lend themselves to genuine *theoretical discussions*.

The same was never said, at Korcula, about the sessions on working class strategy;<sup>2</sup> such sessions had received official sanction in advance. I think it was more a function of the times than a happy accident of planning that provoked the widespread enthusiasm felt for this series of meetings. Most of those in attendance had long since emerged from the fly-bottle of artificially generated, purely theoretical puzzlements about the nature of the universe and had familiarized themselves, to at least some degree, with the complex economic and political mechanisms whereby structures of dominance and subordination are maintained and intensified under modern capitalism, as well as under certain forms of state socialism. But to be content with understanding these mechanisms is in one sense to remain within a theoretical bottle, albeit a much larger one than the first. Small wonder, then, that, during a period of general retrenchment and loss of hope, those who have reached a certain level of awareness about their social world would cast about eagerly for any clues concerning the possibility of bringing theory into practice. A long series of recent events has served to refocus attention on the working classes of the advanced

Western nations as potential agents of future progress. If some professional philosophers deem such interests 'impure' and unworthy of their consideration, then so much the worse for professional philosophy.

It is precisely the constant insistence, on the part of some leading Yugoslavian philosophers, that we face up to the existence of close links between social theory and social practice - links that can be concealed by a theory or politics of mystification, but that continue to exist nevertheless - that may be the most basic cause of their present difficulties. One of the most frequently-heard charges against the journal *Praxis* is that it has permitted articles in the nature of political criticism (especially on the nationalities issue) to be published under the guise of theory.<sup>3</sup> But if one takes seriously the totalistic Marxian conception of the social world, how can one possibly draw a rigid line between the two types of activity, political criticism and theoretical analysis? One may be likely, if one is a philosopher, to concentrate more of one's energies on analysis at a higher, rather than a lower, level of generalization, but in this tradition it is impossible systematically to shut out all consideration of salient features of the everyday world on one's own era, and still to do worthwhile philosophizing.

My friends in Yugoslavia thus stand accused, in some powerful quarters, of doing precisely what they ought to have been doing, and of doing it with some effectiveness. They also stand accused, at least some of them, of being left deviationists and even anarchists in their teaching, potentially dangerous to the morals and the politics of those under their tutelage. (I have not, unfortunately, invented this language). Finally, some of them are alleged to have solicited the support of foreign anti-Communist elements who have invited them to teach abroad, it is said, not because of their theoretical acumen, but because of their potential usefulness to the cause of reaction.<sup>4</sup>

A diverse, important, and highly fruitful movement of radical philosophy, which has hitherto been too little understood or appreciated in this country, now stands in mortal danger, as does the future of a nation that once furnished a great deal of hope, in spirit if never completely in practice, for the development of a non-statist model of socialism. It is tragic that some of the highest political authorities of that nation have failed to appreciate their philosophers' positive contributions to augmenting the esteem in which that model has come to be

held by so many informed and sympathetic non-Yugoslavians. Work needs to be done to try to avert still greater tragedy.

Bill McBride  
Purdue University

#### NOTES

- 1 See, e.g., *Le Monde*, January 20-21, 1974, 'Le marxisme fait un retour [sic!] en force en Yougoslavie', ppl and 9.
- 2 By way of comparison, however, amazingly similar arguments were invoked at the recent Atlanta APA meetings in an effort to defeat the Radical Caucus' very modest proposal to include, on future APA programs, one session concerning alternative possibilities for collective bargaining for college teachers. Such matters were said to be non-theoretical, and their official recognition to be a profanation of philosophical professionalism.
- 3 See, e.g., a report of a meeting of the party members of the editorial board of *Praxis*, in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, January 7, 1974.
- 4 See *Le Monde*, January 8, 1974, p8.

## Hiring philosophers in the US

If any group can be expected to hire its faculty according to 'standards of excellence', it should be the philosophers. Do not philosophers, far from petty concerns, seek Truth, Beauty, and the Good? But the fact is that hiring practices in philosophy are similar to those described in *US vs Local 46, Lathe Workers* where the court found a 'deep-rooted and pervasive practice' in the lathe workers union of giving out jobs through their own network 'on the basis ... generally [of] "pull".'

As with the lathe workers, so with the logicians. The philosophy hiring network is revealed in a document issued by the officers of the American Philosophical Association:

*[we] have for some time been ashamed of the way in which we force young philosophers to ... encounter ... the profession ... Candidates for junior positions, no matter how able, can ... probably expect ... serious consideration from only a few departments, ... in a great many cases, departments having some special tie with [their] own. These conditions, together with the spectacle of the annual smoker... [where job interviews occur] can hardly ... instill ... pride in our profession.*  
[APA Bulletin #4, February 1971, emphasis added]

This 'special tie' is known in every profession as the 'old boy' or the 'buddy' system. Paul Seabury's claim that American administrators seek 'the best the world of scholarship could offer' is misleading. (*Commentary*, Feb 1972). Typically, a department chairman asks his former graduate professor to recommend a candidate. For example, colleges in New York City employ a large number of Columbia PhDs. Did New York college administrators just happen to find the best available candidates from 'the world of scholarship' studying right in their own neighbourhood? The fact is that a local phone call often fills the job. This 'old boy' system tends to exclude talented people outside the closed circuit.

Seabury does offer one fact about academic hiring practices. The hiring 'skill pool' used by 'top universities' is 'the top 5 per cent of graduate students in the top ten universities.' But hiring among top institutions itself exemplifies the 'old boy' system. A bright graduate student who didn't attend a top university is usually barred from a place on their faculties. In a merit system, such institutions would reasonably recruit, in good measure, from top universities; but no candidate would be denied a chance merely because of the status of his or her graduate school. The fact is, however, that a student's choice of graduate school (often made naively or ignorantly or because of family obligations) 'has a determining effect on where he ends up.'

*Just as a person's eventual position in society depends on the class he was born into as well as on his own talent, so his eventual position in higher education depends on the standing of ... his PhD institution... as well as on his capabilities...*  
[R. Berelson, *Graduate Education in the US*, McGraw-Hill, 1960, ppl09-113].

The 'halo effect' conferred by a PhD degree from a high-status school is an advantage regardless of merit. But that halo does not brighten a mediocre PhD's own classroom, where generations of students may languish under incompetent instruction. In today's tight academic market, mediocrities with high-status PhDs can still expect decent jobs, while bright, lively candidates from minor universities may worry whether they will ever get to teach a class. As the APA document reports, job candidates have a 'desperate sense that one could find out where the jobs are if one could only be introduced to the right people.'

A resolution by young philosophers describes hiring procedures:

Something must be done about the degrading and humiliating process of [conventional] interviewing ... the inhuman rush for jobs and candidates... How are we to take philosophy as a great enterprise of the human spirit, when it becomes a scene of speedy uncaring encounters with recruiters and a race from interview to interview.  
[APA Bulletin #4]

Philosophers refer to the APA Convention, where 'degrading and humiliating' job interviews occur, as 'the slave market'.

Gertrude Ezorsky

[from 'Fight over University Women']  
Reprinted with permission from the  
*New York Review of Books* (16.5.74)  
Copyright © 1974 Nyrev, Inc.

## Lampeter RPG

St David's University College, Lampeter, was once described in the *Times Higher Education Supplement* as a typical Oxford College, tucked cosily away amidst the rolling hills and valleys of mid-Wales. The RPG was fortunate in being able to contribute to the shattering of this Tory drawing-board illusion, and eagerly awaits the next visit of the above Rag Mag's blue-eyed cub reporter.

The RPG has been running for six months, and in that time we've held several successful meetings, useful discussion groups and managed to 'modify' the examination structure of the philosophy department, only failing to achieve our full demands in this last venture due to the god-fearing gentlemen of the University of Wales Examination Board, who seeing a dangerous precedent viz staff-student agreement on demands, decided that this kind of definition of 'democracy' was unacceptable.

During the coming academic year we are planning to hold regular meetings (we'd appreciate more group members coming here to speak) and weekly discussion groups where we encourage students from other departments to take an active part, especially important at Lampeter where the differences in departmental policies are very pronounced, two departments qualifying for a grammar school lower sixth title! In the near future it is hoped that an RPG will be set up in Aberystwyth, where Professor Aaron and the 'Mind Mob' have a clear field. This will benefit Lampeter and Wales as a whole, giving the Group a far wider scope for the dissemination of radical views and providing a linkup with Bangor and Cardiff.

**John Coggins**

# REPORTS

## Radical Totality

The name 'Radical Totality' may be silly but seems likely to stick. It refers to the co-operation between various 'intellectual liberation armies' which began at a meeting organised by the Radical Philosophy Group at the end of June. Apart from RPG, the Conference of Socialist Economists, the Women's Studies Group, and groups producing the magazines *Critique of Anthropology*, *Radical Science Journal* and *Radical Education* are all involved.

The groups differ considerably, and so do the aims of their publications. *Radical Philosophy* concentrates on students, especially philosophy students, though it also aims at a wider audience of left intellectuals. *Critique of Anthropology* and the *CSE Bulletin* aim at a smaller and more specialised, basically academic, audience; *Radical Education* is for teachers; and the Women's Studies Group is for women in education. *Radical Science Journal* tries to get outside all these academic/intellectual/middle class audiences and reach scientific workers in industry. But what all the groups have in common - and perhaps what is historically most interesting about them - is that each of them has a very definite target audience - they do not try to address themselves to 'the working class' or 'the intelligent layman'.

All of the groups seemed to experience some tension between process and product. *RSJ* attached great importance to finding new ways of working together. RPG, in contrast, were willing to subordinate the exploration of new ways of working to getting the magazine out.

Several concrete proposals emerged. The only things to be settled at once were that the groups would publicise each others' activities and publications, and that they should meet regularly. Arrangements for a Radical Totality conference on the divisions between academic disciplines, and for co-operation on printing and administration were placed on the agenda for another meeting, to be held in London on 5 October. Information from Richard Norman, Keynes College, University of Kent, Canterbury.

## Open meeting

The 'Radical Totality' meeting described above ate into the time allotted for the last RPG Open Meeting, which therefore could not complete its agenda. The meeting had time to con-

sider a worrying report on the financial situation, prepared by Noel Parker, and to approve raising the price of the magazine. The suggestion that reliable (i.e. paid) secretarial/clerical help could improve the financial situation, by increasing our efficiency in reaching new readers and in recovering money owed for sold copies was sympathetically discussed; but it was agreed that in the present situation such a step would be far too risky. The next Open Meeting will be held on Saturday 11 November at 11 am at 53 Spencer Rise, London NW5 (near Tufnell Park tube).

## RP day conferences

### 1 Sexism and Academicism

This was an informal and smallish group meeting which discussed both the institutional and ideological aspects of sexism in higher education. We looked, in particular, at figures from Cambridge University where only 6.8% of total university appointments are held by women, and only 2.6% of total university appointments are held by married women! Reference was made to the causes of this as including the lack of ambition, or low expectations, of many women and the unconscious devaluation of women's work, as well as the traditional social expectation that women will forfeit careers for marriage.

Answers suggested at the institutional level included tighter legal requirements on sex ratios. We discussed the legal situation in the USA where management can be required actually to go out and find enough female employees to satisfy sex ratio quotas. It was suggested that laws of this kind at least usefully extend and delimit the considerations normally entering into the debate.

An underlying current of much of the discussion concerned the possibility of there being critical differences between men and women either in the experiencing of the stuffy/repressive aspects of academic institutions, or in the talents which either could bring to further academic liberation. I had the impression that this was an area involving some deep disagreement which was never fully discussed.

From a slightly different viewpoint, we also discussed the problems encountered in academic studies of women. The problem of sources was raised with relation to Ancient History. And problems were indicated in Anthropology both of talking to women who will not talk freely to men and, relatedly, whether women anthropologists can most fruitfully appear as honorary men (the usual, undesigned, effect), so losing any

special relationship with women, or as 'women' possibly hampering them in other respects without being a fully effective camouflage.

## 2 Psychoanalysis and the Left

This meeting was very well attended and seemed to attract people with a variety of backgrounds and interests, and rather diverse expectations as to what the meeting would be about. There were people with a mainly theoretical interest in the exploitability of psychoanalytic theory in the explanation of various socio-ideological problems, including sexism and false consciousness; people who came for a (theoretical?) discussion of on-going radical psycho-therapeutic practices, such as co-counselling; women active in consciousness raising groups; people merely interested in psychoanalysis; psychoanalysts who hoped for a radical vindication of their trade, and radicals who hoped for a quick demolition trick to be played on psychoanalysis.

This mix of people seemed to lead to what was best and what was worst about the meeting. Because it had not been expected that so many people would turn up, it had been hoped to keep everything very informal and only a very loose programme had been arranged, with people agreeing to open discussion rather than give papers. But in the event, probably very few people discussed anything that they had come along hoping to discuss.

The most recurrent theme was group discussion, but even that really just floundered round the inability of advocates of various institutionalised groups, such as 'encounter groups', to see much difference in what they were doing and the activities of groups whose existence implies at least a minimal social criticism, such as women's groups.

JV

## RPG

### THE BUREAUCRACY OF RADICAL PHILOSOPHY

Over the last two years we have evolved procedures for running the magazine, most of which has been discussed and agreed at editorial and open meetings. This paper is a summary of the resulting situation as I understand it.

- 1 The ultimate responsibility for the magazine lies with the Open Meetings of the Radical Philosophy Group. They can alter the administrative machinery or the personnel. They hand over the work to an editorial group whose responsibilities are detailed below.
- 2 In order to allow people who cannot involve themselves in production to take some editorial responsibility, production is to a large extent separated from editorial work, but as a rule members of the production

group are also members of the editorial group. The production group is responsible for everything from marking up articles accepted for publication, getting them typeset, pasting up, and negotiating with the printer, to getting the finished magazines to the person responsible for distribution.

- 3 Distribution is the responsibility of one or two members of the editorial group.
- 4 Finance is the responsibility of a member of the editorial group.
- 5 Advertising, both in and of the magazine, is the responsibility of a member of the editorial group.
- 6 Editorial decisions are taken by the editorial group as a whole at an editorial meeting, of which there is normally one for each issue. (Not all meetings of the editors are editorial meetings, of course). But some decisions, particularly concerning small pieces and space fillers and late news have of necessity to be left to the production group which gets to work after the editorial meeting.
 

The procedure for reaching editorial decisions as follows:

  - 6.1 The co-ordinator receives every incoming article, acknowledges it, files it, and sends a copy to a member of the editorial group, who acts as editor (see 6.3) for that article. The co-ordinator circulates a list of editors, authors, and articles to members of the editorial group, in time for the editorial meeting.
  - 6.2 The review editor has responsibility for getting books for review and getting reviewers for them, for compiling a 'Books Received' list and for sending complimentary copies of reviews to publishers.
  - 6.3 An editor - a member of the editorial group - sends each article for which he is responsible to several referees (see 6.4); deals with all further correspondence with the author, and, where appropriate, does picture research and sub-editing. At the editorial meeting, he presents a report on the basis of which the meeting can reach a decision about the article.
  - 6.4 Referees, from whom an editor gathers opinions of the articles he is responsible for, are normally selected by individual editors and are not necessarily members of the editorial group.
- 7 These procedures, it seems to me, distribute responsibilities in a fairly definite manner without centralising them, and

are sufficiently firm to allow new people to be absorbed, or old people to fade away, without the machinery itself being threatened. They allow a fairly large number to be involved in various ways and degrees in running the magazine. I do not think we could have a more democratic system.

Jonathan Rée

## Letter to readers

*Radical Philosophy* is not supported by any wealthy well-wishers, by an academic body, or by a publisher. Financially, we depend directly and entirely on our readers, and all the money we get from sales goes straight into the production and distribution of the magazine. Up to now, we have managed to keep more or less out of debt; but, with rising print, paper and postal costs, and with the increased number of pages, we are finding it harder and harder to keep this up. (The printers' bill has gone up nearly 2½ times between RP6 and RP8). That is why with this issue the price is back to its original £0.35, instead of the £0.25 we kept it to between nos. 3 and 8. This still makes RP quite cheap, but we would like it to be cheaper.

How can we keep the price down? The main thing is to increase our sales - which, of course, we want to do anyway. Our immediate sales have been stationary at about 2,000 for a year or so, though the steady stream of requests for back numbers makes it reasonable for us now to have a print order of 2,800.

We know that there are plenty of possible customers we don't reach - including many who have never heard of RP. For instance, we sent some spies to the Joint Session of the Mind Association and the Aristotelian Society in Lancaster in July, and their seventy copies of RP8 were sold out in no time, and, apparently, avidly read by those whose minds were not already rotted by the boredom of the Session. We can only reach new customers with the help of our supporters. Why not become a local seller, or, if you are one already, see if you can't sell a few more. And if you are a seller, please send us the money you get as soon as possible (some sellers still owe us for No.1). Also send back your unsold copies; we need the backnumbers. You could also make sure that your library has a subscription and that your bookshop makes a regular order. If you are already a subscriber, you might consider getting an extra copy to sell to a friend; and please make sure you renew your subscription when it is due. If you are rich, then perhaps you could add £0.50 to your cheque

or postal order when you subscribe? And if you do not have one already, please take out a subscription: this way, we are sure of the sales, and we get the money in advance, instead of a year or two late.

\*\*\*\*\*

Meanwhile, we, the editors, are trying to make our own procedures more efficient. The paper by Jonathan Rée on our bureaucracy, printed above, represents our first attempt to actually fix the way we operate in a written description. As regards distribution and exchange, the magnification of the task as a result of having backnumbers to deal with - and of having (temporarily) run out of several of the earlier issues - took us rather by surprise. If you are still waiting for a reply to a letter of a few months ago, please be patient: we are clearing up the backlog now. Over the last few months, Noel Parker has valiantly imposed some order on our distribution system. He is now leaving in order to teach in France. His work will be done jointly by Michael Erben in London and by the Brighton collective. Correspondence about distribution should, as before, be sent to us at our printer's London office (Radical Philosophy, Larcular Ltd, 30 City Road, London EC1). And we would be very glad if, when you write, you add a note about who you are, how you heard of the magazine, what you think of it, and how it could be improved.

\*\*\*\*\*

We have also had problems about despatching issues of *Radical Philosophy*. Our printers tried using a carrier who counts in years rather than days; and our attempts to get large orders properly packed have failed repeatedly, with the result that the packets have burst open in the post, that hundreds of copies have gone astray or been damaged or been desperately delayed. We really won't let this happen again. If possible, one of us will drive round the country, personally delivering the large orders.

\*\*\*\*\*

The physical production of the magazine uses up an incredible amount of our time, and, in the case of the last two issues, it took a few weeks longer than we expected - which meant that the magazine was not available at the beginning of the academic term, which hit our sales rather hard. This time we have decided to go and live with the job for a week or two until it is done; so we hope to get this issue out quicker. And starting with the next issue, we will allow longer than our customary five weeks between the editorial meeting and

the target publication date. This means that our deadline for the next issue is soon: November 15: and if you could send any material before that, it would make our life much much easier.

\*\*\*\*\*

We are very concerned to improve the appearance of the magazine. Anyone who can help - by doing drawings for us, or making suggestions about design, or by helping with the paste-up - would be fantastically welcome.

\*\*\*\*\*

We have heard some bad news about freedom of speech. *Ideology, Social Science and Freedom of Speech* edited by John Mepham, the book about the Huntington affair at Sussex, was due to come out about now. Harvester Press has advertised it widely ('What every academic needs to know'), and extracts have appeared in the *Times Higher Educational Supplement* as well as in *Radical Philosophy*. The book was to unmask liberal lies about freedom of speech; but Harvester have accepted their lawyers' advice that they should not publish.

\*\*\*\*\*

Worrying allegations have reached us about the Radical Philosophers on the East Coast of the US. A correspondent tells us he has 'encountered a very snotty attitude from them, to the point of their claiming that it would not have been appropriate for me and my political comrades to attend their conference in Phila last fall, since we were not philosophers. Fuck them. Let them keep their goddam "philosophy". We hope these allegations are unfounded.

\*\*\*\*\*

In the current issue of *Philosophy* Professor Anthony Flew defends himself against criticisms by O A Ladimeji, complaining that they are 'in the authentic accents of *Radical Philosophy* - those of a People's Prosecutor in a purge trial'.

\*\*\*\*\*

Heard on a late-night radio phone-in programme:

- Hello, who am I talking to?  
- Edith.  
- And what would you like to talk about, Edith?  
- Marxism.  
- ... Oh well, I don't know much about that, but ... fire away.  
- I was wondering how you felt about having someone very near and dear to you who went to university and got his degree and his PhD and ... well, he's very clever ... and now he lectures in international relations ... I don't think I should say the name of the university ... and, well, he's a marxist ... and I was wondering...

- Well, Edith, if he's a university lecturer he must be a very responsible person, and I don't suppose he'd let his personal opinions influence what he said to the students.

- Oh!...

- NN at Oxford lectures in politics and he's a conservative MP, so the students hear both sides ... and I think most students hear both sides and settle down somewhere in the middle ... which is what we all want, isn't it?

- Yes ... I suppose.

- How's that, then? ... Anyway it's not on the syllabus at LBC.

- Oh ... good!

- OK ... Let's have the next call please.

\*\*\*\*\*

With a few notable exceptions, local Radical Philosophy Groups are not what they used to be. Is this a temporary lull? Or have they outlived their usefulness? Are there not still plenty of people who need the help of such groups in order to get out of the dreadful hole which is academic philosophy, or in order to work out some alternative? Please write to us (c/o Richard Norman, Darwin College, University of Kent, Canterbury) if you want help or advice about setting up a group.

\*\*\*\*\*

Contributors to this issue include: Alfred Gell, an anthropologist at the University of Sussex, who is at present back in New Guinea doing fieldwork. Andrew Collier teaches philosophy in Bangor and is struggling to complete a book on R D Laing. D A Wilson, who reviews Wincott's account of the Invergordon mutiny, is a life long militant. He got to know Wincott when Wincott came to support a local strike immediately after the Invergordon affair. They renewed their friendship on Wincott's recent visit. Grahame White is a second year student in Art History and Theory at the university of Sussex.

\*\*\*\*\*