

GROUP DISCUSSION

First conversation

American:..... there's nothing wrong with material abundance, as long as everyone has it.

Girl: Have you ever seen such an ideal society?

American: I think they are evolving one in China right now. I think there are contradictions there now - you won't reach a static stage of a perfect state, it's a continuous thing. I think there's different contradictions that keep on popping up in different situations - some things you think you've got rid of first, but then after a while you find out that they crop up again. CUT

American: well, if they want it, yes. CUT

American:..... why can't one person, working on a machine -

Englishman:..Because he gets bored with working on a machine - if you touch a machine for all of your life, you're going to hate that machine, because it's cold, it has no growth about it. But if you touch a plant, you can love that plant, because it's going to grow and assist your survival.

Girl: You can't love a machine. CUT

conversation.

Englishman: Very basically, why man is aiming at that, is that he is working in a factory, in technology, and he can't finally get out of it, because he still needs to do this in order to get food that he can't produce himself. This is when James is talking about the peasant revolution, he is very close to the truth here, because he says that this is going to be the real revolution in the underdeveloped countries, because of the way it has been done by Mao and the Long March by Castro and his peasants, (more about peasant revolution)

Small group

Mustache man

Mustache man: ...terror on a very high scale, far beyond the bounds set by Mao. I don't use terror -

Other: No, of course you are not using terror, I wasn't accusing you.

Mustache: N^o terrorism of consciousness - revolution of the psychedelic.

Other: What I really think is, that this Congress tries, however ineffeciently, to deal with the ???? which is also very important for the things you are trying to do. But then, it is no use, just at that moment, to use it for an experiment irrelevant to what is being discussed. You are just using it for an occasion. If I have a group of people concentrating on something else, what aggressions do I unleash. It is a very interesting experiment, it may be a useful experiment, but it would be very much better if you used a different occasion, not one of the very very rare occasions when people get together which might be really effective -

Third: I think you're oversaying it, I don't like his interruptions I think they are a bloody bore, but he has the right to interrupt

Other: We all have a right.

Third: And he's not disturbed anyone

CUT

Jane: What do I think about it? I think I came expecting greater intellectual clarity, you know, dealing with phenomenological psychiatry, and phenomenology and social science, but this hasn't happened at all. Intellectually, one's been very broken down and made aware of the pedantic stances of intellectuals, and the superficiality of it. So then you find you're making not intellectual responses but very emotional responses, and you find you're becoming completely ? ? ? to everything that's said, and all these contradictory ideas. And you feel that Laing has got these people together because of this, but there seems no convergence. Also, they're all allowed to get up there and just say their discrepancy, and also there's no bringing together, there's no dialogue with the other people. And this leaves you carrying on an internal dialogue, because it's never made overt, and you just don't know what's happening, you're completely wallowing in confusion. I just felt out of my mind, I just didn't know what was happening, I wasn't relating to anything. And then today's speaker did in fact bring a convergence - Marcuse obviously had the advantage of speaking last and of knowing what came before - and had a synthesis and convergence of ideas, and then you realized you couldn't pinpoint what it was. You listened, it was therapeutic, he was referring to the discussions, bringing them together, but you couldn't articulate it, you couldn't say, Well, what's he done to make everything clearer? You just couldn't. And now I'm piecing it together, and I'm not sure how much clearer it makes it. You see some of the alignments, and then some of the holes in what he was doing, and then there's no time to come back.

(Me: any lines?) Jane: Throughout the conference? No. Except confusion. Massive confusion.

(Me: What about the theme of Revolution?) Jane: No, because you have your Goodmans, you have your Gerassis, you have people who take quite different spectrums. And Laing too, who, when heckling Gerassi, with Paul Goodman, was in fact committing himself away from this to individual realization, to some sort of institutional front. But then on Saturday night this didn't come out at all. And hasn't come out. The anti-psychiatry debate, you saw it was just an anti-nicotine thing, within psychiatry. is where they are exploding. as professionals. true

professionals, in the Goodman sense, but this isn't revolutionary. And nobody seems to have touched on that. Stokely so hit you with the idea of white liberals and in fact the way they do dance around like this, but we haven't come to anything else. You know the premises of the white liberal, and you've been harrowingly aware of this, but you don't know then what else you do. They sort of throw up the Hippies every now and again - and there doesn't seem to be any solution.

Ginsberg beautiful dance of death.

(Me: I think G. is the dance of life.) Jane: Yes, but he's dancing to that. A dance of life to death, because the Third World doesn't join in his dance. He'll have to go. Or I suppose you could have Marcuse's idea, that through teaching you break people's conceptions, you try to make them aware. Not make them aware, make them sensitised. But that's too confounded in ???? to be successful.

Outside girl:If I had on the right kind of shoes, I'd do that too. I'll tell you, but I'll babble on. I think that the Dialectics of Liberation, as this thing was called, had actually been taking place on many levels. Some of these levels are invisible to some of the people, and other of these levels are invisible to others of the people, but as a matter of fact, in the organized chaos, or dissolution of the organization, of the Congress itself, the dialectic has in fact taken place. The people who came to hear ~~xxxx~~ Stokely, some of them have stayed to hear Marcuse, and have in the process been meeting each other. So that out of the chaos - because the Congress deteriorated - the platform has dissolved into the audience, and actually everybody's been meeting everybody else, which is the whole point in the first place.

(Me: line?) Her: Yes. It seems to me that everyone - although it seems that everyone is talking about Revolution, as a matter of fact there's been a great plea from even the most violent elements for brotherhood. And this is Evolution. I think that, beginning with Stokely, even, what seems like violence, from his part, he decreased in violence, from the position of Malcolm X and those who came before him, into a position of a people insisting upon the right to exist, as themselves, in a social structure which actually taught them someone

else's history, someone else's literature, someone else's philosophy. Which is what happened in the States between the white and black. Well, this takes a kind of violence to overthrow it, if these people are to be proud of themselves, and there's going to be race-rioting and things like that. That's fine. You can see that this is less violent, for example, than what's going on in Vietnam. And this I learned from listening to the Vietnamese talk, how absolutely this war is not their war - the Americans were fighting a white war, as Stokely would call it, in their land, not the kind of war they would fight at all. And so that it's absolutely absurd. If Stokely's people can put the violence in the streets, then we are getting rid of a greater violence - the violation of a whole nation, by our techniques, our bombs, and everything else, and we're getting it back into American, where it belongs, and on the street, where a lot fewer people get killed than get killed with bombs. This is a decrease in violence. Stokely made his plea for violence really as a plea for brotherhood between a certain vast group of people - the coloureds. So that I see this dialect, which seems to burst almost into violence, is actually a kind of movement, even in its most violent elements, toward brotherhood. And this again from Marcuse, and from everyone that I've heard speak, but each person was speaking to a certain level or group of society - you can't speak to ~~xxx~~ everyone at once. Stokely was speaking to the young, to the hot-blooded, to the black. Marcuse was speaking to anyone who can understand a muscular philosophical mind. And who can wait for the revolution that comes always a hundred years or so afterwards, when that kind of mind's influence filters down and is accepted or rejected, by the social structure. So that everyone has been in a sense talking about the same thing, and the people who came to listen

CUT (is on tape)

Coloured chap.

CP: To be honest, I'm not in a position, to give an opinion on the last 2 weeks, because the only thing that brought me here was to listen to Stokely Carmichael - and I've been attending some of the seminars and some of the group discussion. But one thing I felt - despite all of these curicaities, and the things that brought different people here from the continent of Europe, U.S., and other parts of the world, the only thing I felt has been accomplished so far, without people realising it, people are beginning to sit down, and a certain amount of understanding has been established. Whether in what Stokely Carmichael stands for, or talking about any particular thinking that a particular group might like to ~~summarize~~ communicate - people have come together and tried to sort something out.

(Me: relationship between the riots and the Congress?)