

COMMENTS

- a) The summarising paragraphs are a pretty thorough misrepresentation: unless this is the author's intention, I can only suggest that he read my article again. The central point I make is that theory operates on a number of levels, ranging from the 'philosophical' to the exercise of concrete and immediate organisational strategy. Thus work on any of the levels or with any of the concepts has implications for all the others: an analytical approach which only recognises strategic issues is as flawed as one that confines itself to rarified philosophical debate.
- b) 'Laboratory conditions': a peculiar idea. I agree that the area of testing of analysis is the kinds of strategies it implies for struggle. A main point of my article is to discuss what is meant by 'scientific theory' for the purpose of analysis: it would be interesting to get a response on that level.
- c) One interesting point: "this inadequacy can only be located in the material, that is, class position of the respective authors." Yes and No. One cannot simply base a discussion of any individual's work on his material derivation; e.g. Marx or Lenin might be categorised petty-bourgeois in terms of their material class derivation. This by no means determines the orientation of their thought and its strategical implications. (Visions of debate: "Your problem is that you are petty-bourgeois." "No, I'm not." "Yes you are", etc.) It might be more instructive to point out with what type of movement a particular analyst identifies himself/herself by the strategical implications of their work (e.g. Lenin against Kautsky).
- d) A fruitful area for constructive discussion is 'academicism', and the position of intellectuals in general. Academics, whether seen as petty-bourgeois or intellectuals, occupy a position within ideological state apparatuses. This tends to structurally impose the separations I criticize: between theory and empirical work, between analysis and strategy, etc.
- e) 'Heresies'? This implies a notion of 'true and false consciousness'; that for the earnest seeker there is an 'objective line' somewhere to be found. The difficulty with this is that the materialist considers ideas and positions as they are formed

by the context of the economic/social class struggle. How then can a heresy, an offence against the 'true', exist? There are no super-historical referents: rather, theoretical and ideological positions grow out of the parameters of one's time and the choice of possibilities the class struggle defines. Those in search of an absolute point of reference, an ideal and pure 'line' not subject to change, should rather choose religion, where such solaces are offered.

Susan M Brown

