

EDITORIAL

Intelligence testing has come to occupy a central place in emerging materialist critique of mainstream psychology. Against the tester's insistence that the IO test is the best, the most polished example of scientific rigour applied to the management of human beings, is counterposed the notion that IQ testing consists in a set of social practices which are fundamentally oppressive and exploitative. Adrian Tyghe, in this edition of Psychology in Society, draws out the substance of this critique: IO tests, he argues, amount to a sophisticated legitimation of the deskilling process which is so central to modern capitalist development. Furthermore, they do much of the ideological job of convincing people - workers, managers, and various natural allies of both - that the order of things is inevitably the order of things. Melvyn Freeman, in the second article devoted to questions of IQ, counterposes this reductionist conception of human intelligence with a materialist conception of cognitive life, and argues that activity must become the central concept in any account of thought which is to overcome the blindness of traditional notions of IQ testing.

Johan Muller provides a penetrating revies essay of <u>Changing</u> the <u>Subject</u>, yet another neo-Althusserian contribution to recent debates concerning subjects and subjectivity. His wrestling with the individual-society dialectic along the way provides an understanding of the importance of this book. In another revies, Jacklyn Cock finds much of importance for critical feminist thought in the often caricatured latest offering from Germaine Greer, <u>Sex and Destiny</u>.

The kind of vigorous debate which we hope will become the hallmark of Psychology in Society emerges in the contributions by Michael Cross and D A L Coldwell. Taking issue with some key arguments put forward by contributors to the previous edition of the journal - Cross in the realm of "African" culture and Coldwell on radical critiques of Industrial Psychology - these pieces provide the to-and-fro debate which we must ensure becomes part of the future editions of this journal.