

Paul Goodman - 25th July 1967

In any activity people tend to notice what they're interested in, depending on how they're in the world, of course. And in all the sciences this is true too. There is a problem special to social sciences however and that's that the experimental part of the social sciences is political action, and when you engage in political action, naturally, you have to get a lot of other people to cooperate with you. Therefore the predictions or noticings which come from ^{how are} you ~~are~~ in the world necessarily have to try to impose themselves on other people.

Now there are a lot of us who are extremely dissatisfied with the state of the world and would like to change it in a very structural revolutionary way. But what we notice as the chief revolutionary lever, and also often what we think wants most to be changed - although we agree that other things should be changed too - is likely to differ from group to group, the way people are in the world. This is I hope a set of common sense remarks. My experience at this conference has been that when certain people disagree with you one method they use is to say "Oh well that's just common sense". And then the fact that they don't pay any attention to the common sense, but do the opposite, doesn't seem interesting to them. That seems intensely interesting to me. But I'd like to give some examples of these revolutionary aims as they seem to different people.

Let's take a rather harmless one - except in its consequences - the fact that to many people the likelihood is that the world will be destroyed by nuclear war within the next 10 to 15 years. This is harmless in the sense that almost everybody agrees with this fact, but it's obviously not harmless as a fact. Now if you've been a pacifist for 40 years the way I have - and I'm not a non-violentist, by the way, I'm a pacifist but not a non-violentist - if you've been a pacifist during this period, one of the things which impresses you extremely much is that, specially since the first world war, which I lived through as a youngster, the potentiality for destruction has been increasing at a rather rapid rate, and it's now obviously

immense. And from this point of view, given this escalation of destructive power, in the world, from this point of view it could quite simply be said that the real We and They in the world, the real enemy in the world, is simply the people of the world against the power structures of the world, whatever the politics or whatever of that power structure is. You know, I'm not saying by this that politically, morally or in any other way the different elements of the power structure are identical or equally culpable or anything like that. But in fact, they are what they are, they think in certain terms because of the kind of people they are, and when they've invested their capital and their brain power along a certain line - such as stockpiling nuclear weapons and so forth - for 20 years, necessarily they are the voices of reason in their own society. They're the decision makers and they can only think in a certain way, no matter what their politics or their morals or anything else, that's how they are. From that point of view of course, to people interested in this problem, that according to most knowledgeable scientists and any, I think, any political scientist, the likelihood of these bombs going off and with fantastic destructiveness is very high. And we see the world drifting in this direction pretty much the way Jews drifted to the gas chambers in Hitler's time. That is everybody, every intellectual Jew, except those who were very canny, and got out, said "But well they can't mean that, that's just too stupid." And that way they drifted right on, and then there it was. Now you can easily imagine circumstances which would lead to such a nuclear bust up. Take my own country. Supposing there were a real rash of bad disturbances - the kind of thing we've been having in Newark and Detroit, you know, are slight little skirmishes - but a lot of bad disturbances on the street, so that an extreme reactionary group got swept into power. And then supposing two months later one of these big S. American countries, say Brazil, went Castroite. That could happen, you know, any day, any day. There's absolutely no question that in a panic nuclear bombs would be dropped. I myself think, although of course many here would vehemently deny it, that exactly the same situation could occur in China. At present I think the

easily imagine circumstances in which the Soviet Block could be right back where it was in ~~the~~ 1954 and 1956, and become also panicky. And you can easily see a set of circumstances in which this kind of thing could Boom! You see that's where this is not politically far fetched.

Now from that point of view - that kind of pacifist point of view - obviously the political slogans get to be, well "Take the power away from people who have that kind of military power". This involves getting rid of national boundaries. Gandhi was right. Gandhi said, for instance: "When a nation is colonialised" - as India was - "it's first goal is to find its identity and shake off the colonial oppressor." Therefore he was an Indian nationalist. As soon as they got rid of the British, he said: O.K. now let us forget India, because if we have a boundary, say with China, we are certainly soon going to be making an army. And in fact India talks all the time of nuclear bombs, and China has the nuclear bombs. Therefore, said Gandhi, the next step, O.K., now we've got rid of the British, is to open the Chinese frontier and let us walk by millions into China and say "We are your buddies". Now obviously Nehru and that crew couldn't see this for dust, and so Gandhi was sent practically into exile. You know, he was kept there as a sort of china saint, a papier mache saint, but was completely without influence.

But take a case of a thing that's come up somewhat more recently. The case of Buber in Israel. Buber said that for historical reasons etc. the Jews have had to go into the Zionist movement and occupy Palestine, and it's terribly unjust, you know, we're ousting a people that have lived there, but it's morally correct because it's psychotic necessity for the Jews who have been hurried and harrassed and they have to find their identity, and their identity means their land, and so forth. But, therefore we make a Jewish state. As soon as you've made the State, however - and he said this as soon as they did make the State - as soon as you've made the State, dissolve the State. See - the next step is to get into a fraternity at whatever cost with the Arab peoples around. Now the American Jews are sending us tons of money, let's use all that money for social

such a way that we can make some Arab-Jewish understanding. Because if you don't do that, then you get exactly what has occurred - see. In other words when it's a point of national liberation or finding national identity and so forth yes, that's the issue. But to have that issue you have to keep in the back of your mind - according to this way of thinking - the fact that the only real revolution is humanity and peace, and you have to keep that in the back of your mind. Now when you keep that in the back of your mind it hurts ~~xxx~~ your rhetoric. You know you can't say idiocies, you see. It's true and truth doesn't help rhetoric much, you know, so you're in that dilemma. But then the question is, who is realistic? Was Buber realistic? Was Ghandi realistic? Or was Nehru realistic? Ben Gurion realistic? Who was realistic? That's the way you could look at that.

Now because of thoughts like this a couple of weeks ago I was in one of the communist countries at a meeting of international - an international meeting of youth leaders and so on, consisting of 20 from communist states and 20 from Spain, Italy, France, England, the U.S. and Holland. And just to test the temper of the crowd I introduced a resolution: that in the face of the imminent threat of nuclear war and because the older people had obviously lost interest in this baby, it was up to the younger people, just to make sure that they had a chance to grow up, to take the issue into their own hands and to form a common front which would transcend national and block boundaries. For instance you would organise a simultaneous picketing in let's say Warsaw and Washington against the four nuclear embassies at that time - you know, the U.S., the Soviet Union, China and France - I left the British out because the British seem ~~x~~ rather mild in this business, you don't want to disperse your forces among five embassies when four will do.

This seemed an innocent proposal. I assured them that if, for instance, you could get 500 picketing in Warsaw, those four embassies, we could get 50,000 in Washington, because we have had a lot of nuclear pickets in America as they have had in England. But they get to a certain point and then comes the cry "What about Them?". And then it's very hard to say What about Them. because they're nothing. so there's nothing about Them.

So this seemed to me an interesting trial balloon to send up. Well what were the results? The Yugoslavs said "Yes, that makes common sense. This is a typical common front, the way we had against the Fascists in 1936. It's a common front against immediate danger, it doesn't pre-judge anything about the ^{politics of the} two blocks, it's a common front." And I said "Yes, that's right, that's my intention." So the Yugoslavs were no problem. The Czech students were - not ^tstudents, they were graduates, one of them was Editor of a newspaper - were for it intensely and when I tried to drop it they would not let me drop it and kept going round trying to get signatures. Because they were intensely mad ~~xxxxxx~~ at the Czech government because the Czech government was ~~xxxx~~ censoring their newspaper and was threatening to put them in jail, and I think they're on their way to London. So that was a special case, but they were for it. On the other hand, from the other communist countries - all the western nations were for it, except the Britishers, who were your friend Robin here and you can understand where he would be, and I'll give him in one of the other groups. The East Germans had the following rather sad complaint: that, well "We have suffered too much. You are right but we simply cannot dare demonstrate, we have suffered too much. And you don't know what it's like." And I said "I don't. O.K." The Hungarians' rather pathetic statement was: "The Foreign Policy is the business of the government, and if a citizen group like a youth group would spontaneously initiate a demand on some point of foreign policy, even if it was a government policy, we would be subversive." And he was a very patriotic Hungarian, patriotic Soviet Hungarian, and felt that that was right, this was none of their business. Understand, even if ~~it~~ was a government policy, if it was spontaneously initiated from below it was bad, they wouldn't do it. The Poles were regular apparat/schik types. They gave the line that you cannot isolate the question of nuclear war, this would be called by people in this group, my proposal was ^{what was} called being idealistic rather than materialistic, you see. That is, you cannot pose the problem of nuclear war outside the context of general political conflict, and I was trying to isolate it. And I said: "Yes but that's what we mean by a common front. That precisely in an emergency situation you do isolate it in order that life can go on, in order that you can settle other problems."

But the Polish apparatchik types felt this was bad. Now I'm sure that the great majority of the young leftists in this room will give me this argument in 32 different forms, and all I want to tell you is that I really have heard it. And I'm not trying to defend this position of mine, I'm trying to describe what occurs. The Italians, at least two of the three Italian students, were Mao-ists, and their argument was a different one. This was a little more on the Robin line: that the important thing at present was for China to develop an atom bomb, and anything which would stand in the way of that was divisive and counter-revolutionary. And it would be better, and I quote literally "if all mankind were destroyed than that 700,000,000 Chinese were disadvantaged." Now I haven't heard this remark in that form since Malcolm X, about four or five years before he died - and during his last years he became more politically sensible I think - but at that time once, we were travelling together on a plane, he told me that he wished the atom bomb would fall on New York even though it destroyed his people - you know, all of Harlem, 1,100,000 Negroes - because it would be the vengeance of Allah, Allah would be vindicated. And because Allah would be vindicated it is much better that 1,100,000 Negroes in New York die, because this hated enemy would also die. Now the Mao-ists said that to me in those literal words - they were Italian.

Now you see there the kind of - you know, each one looking at it from his own point of view, and I too looking at it from my point of view, as a long time pacifist, very concerned about mounting armaments and the fact that they do go off. You know, all different situations.

Now let's take the kind of thing that Gregory Bateson has been talking about here. Supposing you're a biologist, an ecologist, or a community planner - my background has kind of been community planning and education - then the big threat in the world, the thing which looms to us because we see it in every moment of our work, is that the abuse of technology on the new scale, the misconceived urbanisation, which is absolutely international, now, it occurs throughout S. America, N. America, the communist countries, it's an international phenomenon stemming from about the same causes in

But the Polish apparatchik types felt this was bad. Now I'm sure that the great majority of the young leftists in this room will give me this argument in 32 different forms, and all I want to tell you is that I really have heard it. And I'm not trying to defend this position of mine, I'm trying to describe what occurs. The Italians, at least two of the three Italian students, were Mao-ists, and their argument was a different one. This was a little more on the Robin line: that the important thing at present was for China to develop an atom bomb, and anything which would stand in the way of that was divisive and counter-revolutionary. And it would be better, and I quote literally "if all mankind were destroyed than that 700,000,000 Chinese were disadvantaged." Now I haven't heard this remark in that form since Malcolm X, about four or five years before he died - and during his last years he became more politically sensible I think - but at that time once, we were travelling together on a plane, he told me that he wished the atom bomb would fall on New York even though it destroyed his people - you know, all of Harlem, 1,100,000 Negroes - because it would be the vengeance of Allah, Allah would be vindicated. And because Allah would be vindicated it is much better that 1,100,000 Negroes in New York die, because this hated enemy would also die. Now the Mao-ists said that to me in those literal words - they were Italian.

Now you see there the kind of - you know, each one looking at it from his own point of view, and I too looking at it from my point of view, as a long time pacifist, very concerned about mounting armaments and the fact that they do go off. You know, all different situations.

Now let's take the kind of thing that Gregory Bateson has been talking about here. Supposing you're a biologist, an ecologist, or a community planner - my background has kind of been community planning and education - then the big threat in the world, the thing which looms to us because we see it in every moment of our work, is that the abuse of technology on the new scale, the misconceived urbanisation, which is absolutely international, now, it occurs throughout S. America, N. America, the communist countries, it's an international phenomenon stemming from about the same causes in

all the countries; that these things are really going to do us in. Now they might not do us in as quickly as the atom bomb will, but they might do us in ten years after the atom bomb. But that's not so important as that while this is going on the possibility of any kind of preparation or reconstruction of a decent society becomes less and less possible, because these causes are operating to make it impossible. That is, to use the ordinary psychological terms that are common now, the methods of the abusive technology, plus wrong methods of centralised organisation, increase anomie and alienation. It can look very nice on the surface and everybody can pull out Chairman Mao's book, but every time they're doing that the alienation is really getting deeper and the possibility of getting out of that bog gets to be less, and every time anybody goes to one of our great American Universities and is processed for an abusive technology, his alienation and anomie increases. So that from this point of view again we go across national boundaries, and our slogans have to be to give more decision making power below to ordinary people, and that generally requires some sort of decentralisation; to think very seriously about rural reconstruction, as Marx and Engels, as a matter of fact, urged, and Kropotkin of course, and Lewis Mumford and Patrick Geddes and there's a whole line of thinkers, of whom Marx and Engels happen to be one, urging against urbanisation as being, you know as being a poor social policy which cannot lead to a good life. You know Marx said - most Marxists don't seem to like to remember that statement - that the highest condition that humanity had ever reached was the British yeoman in the time of Elizabeth; this was the peak of humanity.

Now, you see, given any kind of background, though, where your day to day work is in ecology, you know where you really look at the figures of smog and water pollution, or in urbanisation where you really look at the fact that certain kinds of congestion clog the circuits, to use that kind of language, and make real communication impossible - you know, when you look at the experiments of John Calhoun with his crowded rats, and this and that. Or if you work in the schools system, the way I do, and you see how the methods of education process - where we process ^{kids} /for other people's goals

with every method of modern technology and modern organisational principles and know-how, produces more and more basic stupidity on the part of the mass of mankind, then will you see, well, I mean this is a very dangerous thing, you know, and any revolutionary programme which doesn't keep that in the forefront is very lacking. So if you come from that kind of background, you surely will reach that conclusion. Now you might think other things are equally important but you won't leave this out. And you have to talk about it all the time.

Well now that makes the slogans very difficult, you know, because you can't say "Up with Chairman Mao" but "Down with the Maoist educational system". You know, it's very unimpressive, you know, as a political slogan.

Now I don't know politically how to handle these things. I'm just saying these seem to me to be the facts.

Now let's get to another revolutionary situation at present, which of course we would all insist on as the crucial revolutionary situation. The fact that a majority of mankind is getting, not relatively poorer, but absolutely poorer because of the abuse of technology, the power plays etc. of the Have-nations. And those Have-nations I would sort of sweep well across, of course, into Asia, and including some sectors of China; but China is not a Have-nation. But it certainly overrides the boundaries between the western nations and the so-called communist nations. Now here you have people who are defenceless and starving, and they're the majority of mankind, and what do we find they do? They lust for the whole package of the western technology, and this is the western technology not because it's white or anything like that, but because in the last 300 years we know who the scientists were, the line of scientists - who happened as a matter of fact not to have been white in their training, they all came out of the University of Padua as it happens, and the University of Padua was a meeting place of the Moors and the Christians, you know, which was where atheist, "Averroist" it was called. That's ~~what~~ Galileo studied, Gilbert, the magnet man, Harvey, the blood-circulation man, I think Copernicus had been there - but you name it, everybody in the early 17th century or late

16th century was from Padua, and Padua was the free school for obvious reasons. That is, it was the only school in Europe, or in the Islamic world, which was not sunk in religious prejudice. Therefore all the scientists came from there.

Well you can trace the line directly from there to where this modern technology, on its scientific side, comes from - I'm^{not}/thinking of the use of the technology but, you know, its scientific potentiality. Now, Stokely the other day was talking about African culture and their own way and so forth, but Gee if you look at the facts you'll find that the people in Ghana seem to lust for this - and naturally their political leaders were all trained in Moscow or trained in Cambridge, or they're trained at Harvard, of course they are, where else would they be trained? But these people lust for this whole package. And from that point of view those of us who I think give it a better look - and naturally I think so or I wouldn't be in that group - we think, well maybe they shouldn't be lusting for that whole package, they should be lusting for this piece of this package and that piece of this package, you know, and they should be very careful. But then of course the argument goes, "unless we soon have dive bombers and ultimately atom bombs, we are defenceless; we are surrounded, ~~with~~ we're going to be swamped" etc., and that's a true argument. But then you say "But then you're in a dilemma. You aren't taking up your own culture, what you're doing is destroying tribal culture." The only one in Africa so far as I have heard who is not in this bag is Nyerere, you know, in Tanzania. He is not in the bag. He sees it clearly and is doing for his people - making an attempt to take them where they are and improve them in their own terms. Every other African leader, so far as I've been able to discover, is doing just the opposite. But, then - well I want to talk a little bit since we shouted about it all last week, about these underdeveloped countries. There's another confusion which occurs in that discussion. A distinction which American sociologists make strongly is continually overridden. We, using the language of Oscar Lewis, let's say, the author of "La Vida" and "The Children of Sanchez", those books - we distinguish very sharply between what Oscar calls "the culture of poverty", and poor nations - poor nations because they are technically undeveloped

in a world where world trade is determined according to the inflated standard of the high technology, and therefore they get poorer and poorer and more and more left out. Those are Africa, parts of Asia, all of Latin America except a few regions, etc. The "culture of poverty", the kind of thing which exists in a place like Puerto Rico or in the ghettos of the U.S., the ghettos in London, is quite a different thing. This is what happens to a group within a high technology when it gets pushed out. That group has no cultural identity, and in order to give them cultural identity I entirely agree with the line, say, of Solelinsky or Stokely Carmichael: This is /Solelinsky's line, that he says the only way to give that group cultural identity is by hostile action which expresses their spite, and then maybe they can find themselves as a group, and then maybe begin to have enough power to deal, you know not equally, but at least as men with the opposition. That's the "culture of poverty" phenomenon.

The other states, the Africans etc., are poor but there's no problem of cultural identity. You know, they're no more without a culture or whatever it is than, you know, the Oxford don is without a culture. Therefore their problems are different problems. But these two problems, for political reasons, get mashed up altogether and I think somebody ought to point out that they aren't the same thing, and I'm just pointing it out for that reason. It's not my subject.

I am told by people who know Cuba well, like Dave Dellinger, who is an editor of Liberation with me, that the Cubans also seem to be coming to their senses, like Nyerere, and are beginning to see that the way the technology and the world trade, if you are in the power nexus, works, is bound for the doom of human beings. And that in the last couple of years they've begun to get rid of their slogans in their mind, begun to look at "Who are we? And how can we live well and happily and with more freedom?" I don't know myself, I haven't been there, but if that's true, grand. But this is a pretty minor little group among these, you know, people pressing, you know, Nyerere and Cuba. All the rest seem to be just sunk in the same error, from one ~~my~~ point of view. But of course from another point of view what they say is

all true: that is, they're starving to death, what ~~can~~ they do except do what they do, or do what some people say they should do. It makes perfect sense. I'm just pointing out that it's not so simple.

Now I'd like to get a little bit towards the sort of thing I am interested in. You see fundamentally, I'm an old Jeffersonian, way out of date, and I think that most political talk is much, much too ambitious. That is where people seem always to be expecting to use some power or governmental means to accomplish some human good. And ~~you~~^{it} cannot possibly do that. What it can do is help guarantee a situation of minimum decency in which maybe some good will occur. From that point of view the great societies in the world at present are probably Denmark, Tanzania, maybe Cuba, and I think even Ireland; because as priest ridden as Ireland is and so on, there is a minimum level of decency and the priests don't bother you. For instance censorship in Ireland is much less - censorship of sex - is much less really than it is in New York or London. You can get things printed in the Irish Times of Dublin which you can't get printed in the London Times, you know, on ~~sex~~ pornography and so forth. It just happens to be the case. Likewise people are well fed because it's a good agricultural country. Now in Dublin - I don't mean to give a pitch for the Irish way of life, but it's very interesting - the average national income in Ireland as a whole is one fourth of the average national income in the U.S. The amount of technology available to the average Irishman, measured in terms of power available, let's say, using that as a measure - kilowatts available - is probably about a seventh or an eighth. Yet I'm damned if you can live in Ireland, as I have for, you know, long stretches and feel that your living a fourth as well as you do in the U.S., Budapest, and so forth, it's ridiculous. You live quite as well - you know, in some respects better, in some respects worse. In other words, something is wrong with this whole way of looking at things.

Therefore I feel that if our political ambitions were much more modest we in the revolutionary movement, we might make more sense. But -

You asked a question? I can't hear you dear- afterwards, you come up and talk into the microphone - ~~xxxx~~(inaudible from hall)

To leave the country? That's of course true, that's right... that's true. Not only by economic reasons but by sexual repression. If you're a lively young girl in Ireland you certainly get out. No that's right, there's no question of that. And if you were a young fellow who wanted to bring up a family etc., you can't make a living, of course, that's right. Therefore the emigration from Ireland is enormous. Ireland is not paradise. I'm saying that compared to the U.S. it ain't bad. (laughter) That's all I'm saying.

Now I'd like to turn to a discussion of my own country. Because I don't think that the stories which ~~we~~ were told last week so much here are very understanding of the U.S. The U.S. in many ways is much worse than anything you've heard, and in many ways it's not bad in the ways you've heard. That's not the issue. What's happened is that because of anger and resentment, justified in both cases, there gets to be a torturing of a Marxist explanation of the present American scene, which really is not relevant to what the case is. It just isn't that way, it's something else which is bad. To put it in one way, you don't have exploitation, in an important way, you have exclusion: it's quite a different thing. You don't have exploitation in the simple sense that we don't want the surplus value from the Vietnamese, and we don't want the surplus value sweated from the hides of Negroes, at present - we did for 200 years, certainly, you know, the whole cotton business and therefore the northern textile business grew on that - but it just isn't that way now and if you look at the actual cash figures, it's quite the other way. There's a continual subsidy given. Now the subsidies in Vietnam take a rather curious form, that is, we are building their infrastructure. The infrastructure in Vietnam happens to consist very largely of large concrete air runways, you know, and docks at which great ships can dock. But it is the case that we have built ports in Vietnam which will, since concrete lasts in a long time, make those harbours some of the biggest harbours in the world, and we're building that infrastructure. Now the subsidy in, say, Harlem, takes the following form: if you take a - I don't know figures for Harlem, I know figures for Spanish New York, Puerto Rican New York,

because some seminar in Columbia that I'm connected with made the studies.-
In a typical slum Puerto Rican region in New York, the city of New York -
with federal subsidies of course - gives to each Puerto Rican family
\$10,000 subsidy every year in social services. Well, first the welfare
money, but that's a small thing, it's \$2,^{2,500}500 depending on the number of
children, say \$2,000. But in terms of remedial reading, youth work around
the block, etc. etc. This is \$10,000 which a comparable middle class
family who lives two blocks away doesn't get. This is hardly what you'd
call exploitation in a certain way, but it's something very funny, because
in fact none of the money gets in the way they can use it. The money is
all used on them - you know, to process them, to push them, to determine
their lives one way or the other. And when the cry "Black Power" arises,
that means fundamentally "For Christ's sake give us the money to use our
own way." And that's a perfectly rational cry, indeed more power to it.
Because they've been right on every specific issue, you know: "Stop
running our school system for us, let us run it." But you see when you're
giving a subsidy of \$10,000 a family, all of which goes into the pockets
of social workers, sociologists, you know, young youth workers from Harvard
etc., but all of the services and the goods apparently go for the good of
these downtrodden people, then you can hardly call it exploitation. It
isn't that, it's something else. You know, and you can't analyse it in
terms of an older economics, you have to analyse it in terms of, you know,
a new conception of domination. Now what is that conception? Let's take
a rough look at the history of colonialising. You know, over the centuries,
millenia.

The oldest kind seems to have been plain displacement and annihilation.
A group comes in, like the Dorians come into Greece and push out the
Pelasgians who live there, you know "Go away, die." And they destroy their
civilisation and they occupy their land and there they are. The way the
Europeans did with the Indians - you know, boom, go away. A much older -
a very old method, but not quite that old I think, was for a strong group
to settle itself like an incubus on the lower group, on the indigenous group,
and exact tribute, taxes. And then you leave behind a little garrison
force, and you go back to Egypt, say, and the garrison keeps sending the

tribute home to the Pharaoh in Egypt. That's a very common form of exploitation. The next step after that, and it's a step which required a higher technology, was the step when you want their labour. You go there, you perhaps import capital equipment, and you get them to work for subsistence or less, and you exact surplus value out of them. Or you need certain raw materials for your own plants back home, and you get them to work to produce those raw materials at your price. Most of the colonialism that Marx and Lenin were talking about were of those last two sorts.

Now by and large, although there's still a good deal of exploited labour...^{only 1-2 words} (inaudible)... from the American point of view in South America, and as John Gerassi has pointed out to you there's still a tremendous amount of taking their raw materials, you know, and that's a geo-political kind of discussion, you know, where the raw materials are and you grab them - this is fantastically exaggerated as a picture of the present situation. Because the fact is, as was shown in the last war, we can do without all those raw materials and at a pinch you do do without them. You know, very little natural rubber, for instance, is used any more; the petroleum the U.S. has, but if it didn't have it it would immediately use nuclear power, it would make no difference whatever. The metals for the most part, except for some very fine metals, some rare metals, are of no importance whatever because more and more they use plastic devices that, you know, do most of the stuff that most of the imported metals use; and the basic metals, like iron etc. the Americans happen to have. So this whole kind of domination of the external world really gets less and less important, although since it exists we keep it going. But that's not what characterises the peculiar character of modern domination.

The peculiar character of modern domination is the following - and this applies both in Harlem and in underdeveloped countries, and it applies with regard to, I'm afraid, all of the big powers - is that they want these people to shut up. You see these people don't belong in this lovely high technological, interesting system. They are unnecessary, we don't need them really, we don't need their labour, finally we don't need

starve, get rumbunctious. See, and why don't they shut up? Why do they exist? I can tell you frankly that the real inner policy of the U.S. upper class - no I don't mean the upper class, I mean the great majority of the people - with regard to the Negroes is not racist at all, there's nothing against the Negroes, if only they would go in the middle of the Atlantic ocean and drown. You see, that's different. It's a different attitude. "What a bore" you know "Why don't they go away?"

Now that's clearly the only possible explanation of the Vietnam war. You know, really, "Why don't they go away?" And this is the American attitude altogether, you know, "You mean to tell me we sent 100,000 more troops, and they still don't go away?"

Now my own feeling, and here I agree with the Chinese critics, is that the Americans and the Russians are beginning to take this very seriously, and they're preparing a kind of Congress of Vienna - which was exactly the same thing. "Why don't these revolutionaries back in Europe, they've gone through Napoleon and all these troubles, you know, Why can't we just have peace and quiet so that we can develop our bourgeois system, it's going fine, I mean industrialism is booming and inventions are pouring out. And then why do these people come - always making trouble?" So the Great Powers of Europe all got in concert at Vienna and made a general agreement that nothing was supposed to happen, ever, ever, ever. (laughter and applause) No but that's no joke, they made that stick for 30 years. From 1815 to 1948 nothing did happen ever ever ever, in an important way. And this is perfectly understandable.

Now my own feeling is we're going to get from that to the next stage, 1984, in which you're going to have this kind of shifting of alliances among the great powers, you know, sometimes the West and the Chinese will be in cahoots, and sometimes the Chinese and the middle section. You remember Orwell's prediction? There will be three great powers, all of them engaging in - he didn't know nuclear war, but the equivalent of nuclear war, with tactical weapons so they don't wipe each other out; you know, they keep each other in being and life gets more and more degraded while these shifting alliances in which the enemy changes overnight, among

blocks

these three great powers/ which all look very much alike - and they are fighting over Africa, the fight's always taking place about Africa, how are you going to divide up Africa. But this hasn't got anything to do with the Africans. You see that's not important.

Now let me go right to the U.S., and I'd like to point out something the English maybe don't think of much - I say it's a society based on exclusion. Now who is excluded in the U.S.? You know, when you've heard a good deal about the Negroes, but this is a fraction of our excluded groups. There are coloured peoples, Negroes and Spanish Americans, a very important group it comes to ^{12-13%} ~~12%~~ of the population, I think the Negroes are about 11%, the Spanish Americans may be 2%, a very important group. A far more important group are the farmers. The rural population in the U.S. is now less than 5%. This means that over the past 40 or 50 years 50-60 million people have been driven off the land and, you know, we're not interested in what they do, nobody could care less; that way of life, what they want, their skills etc. are of no importance. And the settled policy has been: get rid of them because we don't need them, according to /the way we want to run the technology. Obviously if you ran the technology some other way they'd be very valuable. You know, it would be quite as efficient - we could debate that for a long time - but I happen to know, it would be quite as efficient. But we don't want to do it that way. We want to do it in the way that leaves them out and puts chain grocers, processes and packages in. Farmers out, processes and packages in: the power group. Then there are the aged. In the U.S., by 60 in many segments in the economy you have to retire; by 50 you're pretty much out unless you're in a very special groups - you certainly can't get in at that age, if you first have to try to get a job when you're over 40, that's out, you're not necessary. Now all these people are bought off, you know, they're pensioned etc. But as I pointed out, the Puerto Ricans in New York are also bought off. Then there are the insane and the delinquent. Now ~~in~~ in the U.S. - I can't tell you what the total figures of insane and delinquent are, but it's many, many millions, many many millions.- Now most of these insane people, of course, are not insane

at all, I would say, according to any criteria over 90% of the people who fill, say, one of the big State mental institutions are not insane at all but they simply are not competent to live in that system as it's living. Because they would be a danger to themselves or to others. You know, they fall under trains or something like that, they can't cross the street, or they run naked in the street, or something like that. You know, they don't fit this way of living. And so our method, of course, is to clap them into confined places. Most delinquency in the U.S., the vast majority, is perfectly - it's behaviour which in other periods would have been considered perfectly ordinary boyish high-jinks. But you see it doesn't fit such a systematic environment, where every kid has got to do his lessons from age 4 up to age 22 - that's a long stretch of life, 18 years of your life, made to do other people's lessons. Well what normal boy can do that. So that all kinds of delinquency occurs. The youth in general are an excluded group. There is a certain group that is being trained and process to be a major part of the way the system works, but this is 10-15% of the young people. Now we have 6 million people in colleges at present this year in the U.S. - 42% of that youth age group. My own guess, going around the schools, the colleges - which I do I guess more than anybody in the U.S. - is that at least 75% of them are simply there because they have to keep them on ice, because there's nothing else to do with them and the police don't want to take care of the problem. (laughter) No that's not a joke, this is how it is. Edgar Friedenbe^g, who was one of our best sociologists of education, has made^a/very careful study with this kind of questionnaire techniques and so forth, and his conclusion was that by and large, at all the high schools in the U.S. - and this includes poor high schools, you know, blackboard jungles, you know, which are Negro and Puerto Rican, and rich suburban high schools for upper middle class suburban people - that by and large in all of those high schools the chief purpose of high school in the U.S. is to break spirit. That's what it's about. (applause)

And yet you can see, if you're going to run a society this way, this is an excluded group and the problem is how to get them to shut up. You see, that's the issue. No

From this point of view, you see, I don't think a Marxist analysis helps in this point of view at all. Because this isn't what the score is. See, for instance, when Gerassi the other day said that the state can tolerate the Hippies, that American society can tolerate the Hippies because they are no threat to the structure, I don't know whether he was lying or whether he was terribly misinformed and never read the newspapers. Because proportionately the group which is most beat up by the police, most harrassed, most jailed, is this group. The Negroes just go scot free in comparison with the harrassment which they get. If you compare some, you know, the beating up by police of Negroes when the police create a riot - and as I pointed out the police create all the riots, and they really do - with say, the way they set on some Hippies ~~in~~ let's say in Tomkin Square in New York, there was no comparison for brutality. Because their reaction to the Negroes is "Gee, why don't they go away, why do they demonstrate and so on, it's so noisy." But their reaction to the Hippies is a gut reaction. That is, "They are indecent. If they exist in the world, somehow I am threatened." It's not society that's threatened, it's everything that's threatened. And this is a much deeper, you know, understanding by the cops of what the real nature of the situation is. It's a situation that excludes more and more of life, and finally the majority of life.

Now I don't know about China, I've never been there, but my belief, my feeling about the countries, let us say, east of Vienna is that they are in this respect identical with the countries west of Vienna. That is - for instance, if we have a pacifist group that manages to get to, you know, the University of Moscow, the treatment accorded to it is exactly what happens in New York. There's something wrong with these people who insist on talking in this embarrassing way, and then suddenly the students say "Let them speak, let them speak", you know. The Dean says they can have half an hour and no questions, the students ask questions, then come the cops, the cops beat the students. Or when Allen Ginsberg is elected King of the May in Prague, then the whole State structure gets into play to prove that Allen Ginsberg is homosexual

and must be excluded from- ~~KN~~News! And all the students say "Well, what do you know?" In other words the kind of behaviour is - 'it's just that it's all wrong, and it's indecent, and it's disorderly, and what we want is for nothing ever to happen." And the price of nothing ever happening is that more and more of life gets excluded.

Now I submit that as I look at the scene, this is the fundamental picture of the U.S. It's not some other picture. It's a very, very rich country, but that means it can tolerate anything economically. You know, it can buy people off, you know, with quite small amounts of money. But it has to buy them off in a way that nothing can ever happen, that nothing will ever change, and that good order is preserved. But unfortunately, the good order - as we anarchists say, order is chaos. Their good order is what we mean by chaos. And therefore there are explosions.

Alright, now I'd like to - See I've talked a long, long time, but I'm going to say something positive.

What would the programme of myself and my friends be in such a case? Well in the first place we would be terribly interested in problems like what to do with this modern technology. How to select it. For instance the question, what should be automated? What branches should be automated and what branches should not be automated; because it's dehumanising to automate them? And what branches should be automated, because it's precisely to human advantage to automate them? It's a very profound question, and I'm afraid one of the most revolutionary questions in modern times, and in fact different pressure groups want different things. And these are not pressure groups in the U.S. that want different things, these are pressure groups in all advanced countries, because the problem is the same.

There's the question, what should be preserved from technical organisation altogether? For instance, take something like schooling. Would it really be better, in any advanced technological society, if we protected all the children up to, let's say, age 12 or 13 from any processing whatever? And even try to have as little socialisation as

possible? That is, do not train them precisely to be good at that technology, because the effects of that are to take away too many of the potentialities of life, since the structure has become so fantastically complicated and hyperorganised. That's a very important question. But of course if you proposed that proposition in the Soviet Union - this was called progressive education, Lenin thought this was very interesting, and invited Dewey over etc. But since the access of Stalin and to the present time, this is all out, see, because this isn't the development toward communism as conceived in the heads of certain people in an apparatus. Do you understand? Now this then becomes a revolutionary question. Now some people can say this is a trivial question, there are more important things to worry about, but I'm not so sure.

Then the question is, let's say, with regard to technologising a backward area. Every time you do that kind of thing you have, naturally, cultural take-over. That is, it's the technology which constitutes the take-over, it isn't the intentions of somebody in Washington which is constituting the take-over, it's the fact, let's say, that in order to run a certain kind of technical plant people have to have certain work habits. That means they've got to get up at 7 o'clock in the morning and get on the job, because to run that kind of machine it's got to be run to a certain schedule etc. It is then going to take-over the cultural plant. Now then, sometimes it's necessary. Where is it necessary, where is it not necessary? How can we alter the technology in such a way that people can run it according to their local customs, and can understand what they're doing, and not become processed by high-faluting engineering types? No matter what their politics. See, those are terribly important questions. Alright, those are the questions I would address.

Across the world I think - and here I would agree with Ronnie Laing's statement the first day, although I wish he had said "across the world" and not said "in the U.S." - across the world I think a chief revolutionary proposition and a programme at present is to get rid of authority. To loosen authority. Ronnie called it "obedience", he said this is going to do us this obedience. Now I don't know whether he thinks Chairman

Mao's readers - a very good audience he gets, I wish I had such publication - but I don't know whether ~~hh~~ would consider them obedient or not, but I think they kind of look that way when you see the pictures. You know, and it will be said by the supporters of that that of course they're obedient for a good cause - but that's not what Ronnie meant. Ronnie meant obedience as such. Namely that authority relationship. Across the world I'm afraid that that authority relationship is much too accepted, let's put it that way. And a programme would be a systematic loosening of that authority relationship - I think this tends to transcend national boundaries. To accomplish this I think there has to be where possible a good deal more decentralisation of power and of social organisations, and often industrial organisations, where possible. Because unless you have, make it possible for decisions to be made from below, for workers to manage their own plants, for teachers and children to manage their own school, apart from the state apparatus and so forth, they are necessarily trapped in this obedience syndrome. Therefore the only way out of that is to organise things as much as possible - and this is a very important technical question, how much is possible? At what point does the inefficiency get to be so much that, you know, you can't work it. But those are technical questions.- as much as possible so that people can have face-to-face relations, can talk it over and have a say in the decision making. See? That is, democratic centralism just will not do, just will not do, because it is too dangerous for the future of mankind.

Now I want to get to something which the young people don't want to hear at all. A lot of these questions I'm discussing, such as what should be automated and what should not be automated, are professional questions. And it really is quite essential that you know something. A good spirit and a lively heart, courage, pure aims, aren't enough for them. Without those things, nothing is possible. Now the fact is that most professionals, certainly in the U.S., the overwhelming majority, are finks - the overwhelming majority. That is, they are not professionals, they are personnel of an organisation. They don't begin to remember what

it's like to be a real professional who has autonomy, who will kowtow only to his peers, you know, because they know something; Who will fight off bureaucratic control. And engineer who will say when they tell him, you know "We've decided to build a road here and there", will tell them "That's a rotten place to build a road, it's bad for the community. Take your road and fuck yourself." You know, that doesn't exist any more. There are a few of us who will do that, and I know nearly every one of them. (laughter)

But unfortunately the young have grown up with these people and don't believe any more that there is such a thing as a real professional. See, they just don't believe it's possible to be a real professional, or if you are a real professional, to make it. And then you say, well of course you don't make it, you're in conflict. That's alright. You know, if you're in a revolutionary situation, you're in conflict. And it's your very profession that gets you into conflict. They don't dig that this is possible any more. Therefore, you know, I've taught in these schools, you simply cannot convey to them what professionalism is. They're in this dilemma, then, that excluded people are always in: since they system from which they're excluded is obviously an inhuman system, otherwise they wouldn't be excluded, then the system consists of finks. On the other hand, all the knowledge, all the professional know-how etc. the science, the health - you know, because in any society we're going to have problems of health, we're going to have problems of engineering, we're going to have problems of civil justice, you know, these professions are going to be practised no matter what the society is, these professions are what wisdom we have, such as it is - but since in that society all these professionals are perverted and all the professions are perverted, then the students can't learn anything. But of course if they can't learn anything they'll never ~~imax~~ know anything. And that's a terrible dilemma, see?

Now my own feeling is that the revolutionary possibility of the advanced countries, the U.S., the Soviet Union, the European countries, and I think China - the only revolutionary possibility is the following

situation. Where the revolutionary power, the political power comes from the mass of people, from below. They want to live better and they come from below - I'm a Luxembuggian[?] in this sense. But they must be in coalition with, and I don't mean run by but in coalition with, able to hire and fire to use American terms, professionals who feel that they have the future. And with that power we can possibly reconstruct a world. Because you're not going to reconstruct a world ~~with~~ ^{just by} good intentions.

Now unfortunately the young people do not want that coalition. I'll give you two examples. I wrote a book called The Community of Scholars, and at the end of the book was this kind of plea, or a proposal: how easy it is to make a good professional school, you know, we don't need state subsidies, you don't need the University of Berkeley, All you need is ten professionals and a hundred students who have serious professional ambitions, who really want to be doctors, who really build the right bridges in the right places by the right means, etc. And I re-defined the Mediaeval University, that's all it was, with a hundred people and ten teachers. Most of the great universities we here of in history in the Middle Ages were just that. You know, there was an exception like Paris, which had a couple of thousand students, but most of the great universities like Prague and so forth were a hundred students and ten teachers. So I redefined the Mediaeval University and said perfectly plausibly "You can do this". This created enthusiasm in the young in the U.S., and on my model they created the Free Universities. They said, on my model. But the Free Universities aren't professional schools. They're all things which are connected with their political action, or their own youth experience. You know, it's either psychedelic drugs or Castroist Cuba. And those are very important things. But there's nowhere where they ask how to be a real professional. But that's the only thing I was interested in. They can't even conceive of that.

Now then, take the ~~tragedy~~ tragic thing that happened at SNCC a couple of years ago when they excluded the white students from the movement. This had in effect meant that they had cut themselves off

from any possibility of training as professionals. Because these students, who are very professionally gifted, who were the highest academic students in the U.S. for the most part, and were not finks - because you know, if you could easily go on to get a job as an engineer at thirty thousand a year, there's not much reason to go down to Mississippi and get shot at for \$5 a week - but they were really professionals in their potentiality; and taking part in a populace movement, a mass movement. You know, they might then look at their profession in terms of the future reconstruction of society. When you exclude this group, you cut off the possibility of ever learning anything. And I'm afraid it is the case that the kind of thing we heard last week means that they're never going to learn anything and they're not going to reconstruct society; what they're going to do is do what some of the Hippies do, live in some feudal structure in which there are some bright designers, technologists etc. who have the right party line, who are going to run things, and they hopefully will be happy in that framework.

Now let me say one last point. At present in the world there is no such thing as a working class international. I don't think any - that ceased to exist really around 1914, I don't think any Marxist would say such a thing exists. There is however one actual international in the world at present. This is the international of technology and management, which is copies, you know, immediately with interchange of persons and so forth, right across the world. And it is invariably in every major country abused, an abusive force. The technology is abused, the methods of management are alienating. That international exists, you know, the Chinese students study at American universities, they go back to China and make atom bombs to bomb the Americans; the American students take the know-how of Chinese physicists and make atom bombs to bomb the Chinese. But the group doing it is an international group.

There is one other international, which has fantastic potential, and that's the international of the young. Because I think young people, at least all throughout Europe, East and West, and the American countries, all have more in common than any of them has in common with his own regime.

Even, you know, at this conference I just came from, that was agreed by everybody, that a kid in Prague or in Warsaw or in Madrid had more in common than the kid in Prague had with the Soviet Union or his own government, than the Madrid kid had with Franco. That is, there was much more feeling of a common danger and a common interest and a common goal. So that is potentially an international force, and that force I wish would learn the lesson that they must learn something professionally, that professionalism is not being a technician. Marcuse, I think, will tell you on Friday perhaps, or he would complain about what I'm saying, he'd say professionals are just technicians. If they're just technicians, we are doomed because noone will ever give them the right goals because only professionals know goals. I don't mean people don't know goals, but only professionals, acting with the common will, can make things clear. Otherwise everything becomes one stereotype after another. No invention takes place. A professional is not a technician. I wish the young would learn that. O.K.

Laing: I think I feel moved to say that Goodman's speech was one of the very best I've ever heard, and one that retains the intellectual ~~core~~, and sustained serious thinking without cliches, fully engaged at the same time at the most basic level with all our dilemmas, and not skirting any of the horror of our present situation. Secondly, I just want to disclaim the impression that Paul apparently derived from my last remarks in the talk that I gave on Saturday when I referred to obedience. Although the example was drawn from North American society, it was intended to illustrate a world-wide phenomenon, and it was intended to be just as applicable to the Chinese scene and all our scenes where obedience is part of the interlock that maintains the abusive technological system, which seems to be one of the main problems that we're all faced with. And my question is, Has Paul got any specific suggestions to make about how that particular bond - obedience, docility, authoritative bond - could be broken? One footnote to the question, one obvious thing we should perhaps do more of is that those professionals who feel that we are not finks, should be prepared to state our dissent from the professionals whom we feel are technicians and finks more publicly. In my own field, in psychiatry, a number of my colleagues have put to this to me rather forcibly, they've said, they don't mind me talking to professional audiences or writing technical articles in professional journals, but they wish I wouldn't blow the gaff and shoot my mouth off on TV and to the public at large. And this is exactly what I think that any of us who have got dissent within our particular profession ought to do. (applause)

Goodman: My experience with Ronnie as a professional is that he comes on like a real professional. That's it. I think that one way of breaking this dilemma of the young people, who don't know what it is to be a professional is for some of the professionals to come on like professionals, because the young are craving for that. Take my own profession - now, I'm a writer, now I can't understand how the faculty of Humanities at Harvard, our most prestigious school, can allow the American TV to be what the American TV is. Why in the first

Aix
audio

(S)

Aix
audio

(S)

that they cannot teach the Humanities at the same time as the public at large is being debauched by this thing. It's very important, because you cannot teach the Humanities, because in the end, the young don't know what an honest word is, and therefore they cannot understand what the principle of the Humanities is. I think they could go further. I think they should then - I'm talking still about the TV - they should then form a nation wide and possibly world wide organization of professionals who say, that when we get engaged in any technical process, like the running of TV or the building of roads, or anything of that sort, which goes against the true spirit of professionalism, in that field, that we support each other to be able to refuse, so that we can strike. So that we will not appear on the TV for instance, because the TV in the U.S. could not exist if at least some of us did not occasionally give it some semblance of a

CUT

Negro: Speaking as an Afro-American, and a nationalist, I disagree with you on your analysis of SNCC. They are purging the movement of white students. I happened to have been affiliated with the organization at the time, and this move was taken so as to call those the black professionals or the white students to fill the vacancies left by the white students, because the organization was getting to the state where its policy decisions were being made by I would say 75-80% of white students. And therefore the black students were sucked up into the structure, into the 10 or 15 thousand dollar a year jobs. Now, until the black people in the US ^{fix out} can form a ~~sk~~ cohesive force and decide for themselves, what position they are going to take in the revolutionary struggle, they're still going to be puppets manipulated by

CUT

Goodman:....(~~which you would see that this would present a dilemma.~~)

For a culture-poverty group to find its self identity has got to be to make its own decisions. And if you have other people come and make your ~~sk~~ decisions for you, why bother? Because the essential thing is lost. They might not be very wise decisions, they might not be this, they might not be that. but as a matter of fact they don't meet the

Pix
audio

Pix
audio
(S)

audio
only

Pix
audio
(S)

the real problem, which is, how to be oneself. And on that basis, it was absolutely necessary to make this exclusion. The fact is on the other hand, that the result in our society is that the cross-the-board humanity gets lost. Now it happens to be the case, because of the nature of modern society, that the privileged groups don't really have it to that extent, because their professional training has been largely of the sort of how to make good in the other society, therefore they haven't had the luxury - you know, this was Washington's trouble - to be moral, critical, philosophical. That's something that requires being in the In-group, the dominant group, at the professional level. So we have this tragic dilemma. I myself think they made the right choice. ~~I think they made the right choice in the dilemma~~ But nevertheless, it is a dilemma.

Negro: I can agree that it's a dilemma, but just as the Irish came to America, they made their mistakes, and the Italians - so every ethnic group has to come and find their own way. Because only in this can we truly discover, let's say, for me as a black man, the meaning of being black. I strongly feel that although we've been criticized for wanting to get it alone, that this is the only way for black people to achieve their place in this world, where we live together.

Mustache American: Paul Sweezy was talking about this, and he pointed out, that between 1952 and 1963, American investment in the Third World was something like 19 billion dollars, and American profit was something like 29 billion dollars - it's a lot of money. And -

Goodman: By the way, in American terms, this is chickenfeed. Do you know what our Gross National Product is? 750 billion a year.

Mustache American: Your point.

Goodman: I don't mean to put you down -

Mustache American: I've more things to say here. You can look at specific foreign policy decisions, and they seem also to go along with the economic interests of the powers. For instance, Cambodia wants nothing but to be left alone, it doesn't want to be Communist -

Pix
Missing
audio

Pix
audio but
step
S

Pix
audio
S

Pix audio
S

Goodman: But you know I know these things, and I must have taken them into account.

Mustache American: I'm just trying to get to -

Goodman: I'm not trying to fool anybody.

Mustache American: Well, this is the authority appeal. I want you to say how you've taken them into account - CUT

Man: more or less feeling a way. And when Paul reacted to that, and I reacted to that, it was reacting to them as authority figures already. And I thought they were reluctant authority figures. I think though, I disagree with Paul, incidentally, because I think I've learnt a little in this Congress about positions of power, or positions of control, positions of authority. ? ? ? great evil on the people who are in this particular position. Paul, I think, has been in positions like this before, he hasn't been corrupted by them, I think. Because I think he's a free person. I think the person who's controlling this microphone - that's me, right now - I don't consider myself a free person. I'd like to try to be. And I'd like particularly to consider this chair that you are sitting in a throne. I'd like to have another kind upon that throne and see if he acts a little less like a benevolent dictator. And the king that I'd like to have sitting there, if he is willing and more or less go along with it, would be Allen. You're third in line now, and after two more people speak, you can speak, alright? (disjointed interchange) CUT

Goodman: Well, yes. In the U.S. at present, it's impossible in this generation. I'm talking now of American conditions. First of all I'd like to point out that the U.S. is by-and-large a depopulating country. The gross population of the country is rising not terribly alarmingly - I think a conservative figure would be 300,000,000 by the year 2,000 CUT

Nervous Man: and this is (life in, by, and for the community.

Goodman: I agree with a good deal of that. I'd like to comment, though

Pix audio

(S)

Pix audio

(S)

cc no audio

cc no audio

Quinby:

Audio 16