Domination and the Flight from Being

DOUGLAS KIRSNER

The contention of this chapter[1] is that Australian society is ruled in a vastly different way from that asserted by either the simple marxist approach which sees owners manipulating workers in subtle and not so subtle ways, or the technocratic approach which views capitalism as having been superseded by advanced industrial societies ruled in everybody's interest by scientists and managers through technostructures.[2] I wish to sketch this society as one where technology itself has become an ideology which extends domination over individuals further than ever before, so far indeed that the system itself is no longer necessarily consciously oriented towards simple exploitation of workers by capitalists – the goal being profit – but rather towards the preservation and extension of the ongoing system. Development is now an end in itself irrespective of whether it brings about a greater individual realization. The use of technology has pervaded the system to such a degree that in recent decades the system itself has tended to become self-regulating. Major stresses within the system are dealt with internally; this has the net effect of advancing the system as a whole. (I do not want to say that contradictions

1. For many of the ideas in this chapter I am indebted to the work of Marcuse and Habermas. See especially Herbert Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1964; and Jürgen Habermas, *Toward a Rational Society*, Heinemann, London, 1971, ch. 6.

2. See J. K. Galbraith, *The New Industrial State*, Penguin Books, 1969.

9

within the system, such as economic and ecological crises, may not be causes of instability; however, I am focusing attention on an area which I believe is particularly significant.) Domination over the individual exists externally through informal as well as formal institutions, in cultural as well as narrowly 'political' ways, and internally, through intrapsychic forces which have been conditioned by the society through its agencies in the service of domination.

How is Australian society to be characterized? There is no golden path through the enormous number of facts which will lead to an adequate characterization. What is or is not adequate will of course depend on the task at hand, but it is obvious from a survey of the literature that, on any account, nothing nearly complete has been produced, so far as an understanding of our society is concerned. There is little reliance on a sound theoretical framework that might ground the empirical. Sometimes, narrow scientific criteria implicitly exclude much that is significant in the selection of facts; frequently, the empirical evidence is presented as complete in itself, as though there is no valid framework beyond what is presented. These approaches both tend to give an aura of pure objectivity to facts which, at least in part, are subjectively selected. Further, a multitude of undiscriminated facts can obscure a real hierarchy. A positivist approach, which takes the facts chosen (as chosen they must be, given the infinite number of facts) as the validation of their own significance and importance, does not go past the first step.

There are people at the other extreme who do not bother about empirical facts except when these happen to fit their own preconceptions. Such people think they are in possession of an ultimate truth which does not need to bear examination. They believe that Australia is a lucky country, an egalitarian community where everybody can do basically what he likes; or else they think that Australia is under the absolute domination of U.S. imperialism through its lackeys, the Australian bourgeoisie, and that the workers would be seething with discontent and full of revolutionary fervour were it not for treachery among the purported leaders of the working class. Both these types of slogan-throwers select only those facts which validate their personal or group wishes. In short, their models are wish-fulfilments.

Facts should not be used for myth-making, and an adequate theoretical framework is one where all presuppositions are challenged. It is one which allows the social life-world to disclose itself without any blinkers being imposed. The experience of this world must communicate itself. Whether or not this is completely possible in practice, an approach towards real objectivity is possible – something which positivists and other myth-makers ignore. They do not grasp the social nature of reality.

The facts are not eternal – they come to be and pass away, though the social foundations of the facts may reveal an immanent structure to things. The present, as the study of history proclaims, is revealed through the past, so that the roots of the Australian tradition illuminate modern Australian reality. Again, the facts are to be disclosed phenomenologically.

Australian society should be viewed as a totality. Such a statement implies an approach quite different from previous ones. Not only must the economic basis of our society be investigated, but also the context within which economic factors operate. Why take economic factors as the fundamental ones, anyway? In the last century, the critique of capitalist society was primarily the critique of political economy, but it is contended here that the modern form of rule is basically a political one, with the economic structure as part of the domination of man. The term 'political' does not here refer merely to the machinations of parliamentary parties or of cabinet ministers, nor is it confined to what is normally circumscribed as politics; rather, it refers to an historical mode of existence. The narrow definition defines the social structure itself *out of* politics, and leaves only certain activities within it counting as political. Most people do not view the fact that they work for a boss as a political fact, a particular historical

arrangement, but as a natural or given one; the situation only becomes political for them when, for example, a factory goes on strike and the government or court intervenes. Conforming to the norm or the way of life of society is not regarded as political; only when there is some transgression of the norms is the situation seen as political – whereas, in fact, these two states are merely differing political stances. Intrapsychically and interpersonally, the fact that people are socialized by others does not seem to rank as political, although this is perhaps the most political of areas.

A general recognition of the omnipresence of politics is beginning to exist in Australia, and the 'cultural' approach to politics is gaining ground among Left theorists.[3] It recognizes that what is wrong with society has to do with the domination of people – their living in prescribed ways – and their lack of communication. Society is not ruled through simple institutional violence but through all sorts of legitimating agencies, from the family and school to the mass media: the culture is their way of life and their way of life is an unfree one. Undoubtedly, there is a group of people – those who own and control the means of production – who benefit financially from controlling workers, but this does not entail that institutions are consciously run by them; all that is implied is that the system works in their interests. The system works in the service of the performance principle, a principle devoted to the fulfilment of the end of achievement, irrespective of its nature, of whether it serves human or inhuman ends. Our society is geared to what has motivated profit since the inception of capitalism – the slavish quest for more. Development for the provision of 'more' is viewed as value-free, an end in itself, while the entire societal framework lauds achievement for the sake of achievement. With the institutionalization of rapid technological change there occurred the elevation of means to ends, or rather the entire dethronement of ends.[4]

3. The Melbourne-based journal *Arena* in particular has recently moved markedly in this direction.
4. Max Horkheimer, *Eclipse of Reason*, Oxford University Press. New York, 1947; see especially ch. 1.

Technology seemed an independent power, one which favoured not one section of the human community but all sections. This was the dream: no longer would some suffer so that others could thrive.

The coincidence of the development of capitalism with that of technology tended to ally the two. Capitalism – or a reformed version of it – was legitimized as the system which would allow the greatest and freest development of technology, and technology could be used as a solution to some of the problems encountered by capitalism. Technology could provide the appearance of rapid change and improvement – and, indeed, a feature of capitalism in advanced societies is its relatively rapid ameliorations, the continued promise of slightly better conditions and slightly different goods. This is what is behind the success of the capitalist use of technology, and is psychologically addictive. The search for a better reality is translated into terms which are comprehensible to the person who appreciates only concrete reality, that to which his senses (particularly that of vision) can immediately respond. That is to say, the search for a better life takes the form of a search for greater material satisfaction. Where this should be least so is in the area of sexual relationships, but even here the great emphasis on the mechanical aspects of sex, and the relatively minor emphasis on the communicative aspect of love, testifies to the ubiquity of a quantitative attitude which aims at smooth running without hitches. Emotions are not allowed to interfere. The very emphasis on social conformity exemplified by antagonistic public reaction to non-conformity (e.g., demonstrations, homosexuality) is evidence of the evaluation of function over freedom.

Most people in modern society suffer some form of psychological disturbance.[5] This may be treated either as a symptom of a wider disease of society, or – what is far less threatening to the individual psyche – as indicating a condition which can probably be treated by sedatives or alco-

5. See for example Ronald Conway, *The Great Australian Stupor*, Sun Books. Melbourne, 1971.

hol[6] to bring the person concerned to an 'adjustment' with his environment. By providing the latter sort of relief, the individual may mobilize his defences against any painful and threatening changes, and the 'efficacy' of symptomatic treatment of this type itself legitimates the state of affairs in which the neuroses appear. Adjustment is effected and all is well since this is seen as a supremely valuable condition. The axiom that a man should lead his life to the full is doctored to mean not that there should be realization of the individual's being, but relatively frictionless interpersonal relations and a conformist style of living.[7] This is the ideal of 'the good bloke'.

Very much related to this is the widespread authoritarianism to be found in Australia,[8] even on such political issues as demonstrations, conscription and censorship. From the beginning of white settlement, the state has played a particularly important role, and the population's reliance on the state to make many decisions and to overcome problems has contributed to this factor.

Authoritarianism is the interest in crushing individuality, in imbuing people with the 'right' attitudes and concepts so that they will function well in the system and not challenge it. Authoritarianism denies the validity of the individual's experience and power, and takes the responsibility for a man's actions from him, projecting it on to society, the experts, the law, religion and so on. The individual is not in charge of his own activity, and may sense being under the control of a sometimes blind and irresistible alien force. Op-

6. See for example Professor Basil Hetzel, cited in the *Australian*, 15 October 1971.

7. See R. D. Laing, 'The Obvious', in David Cooper (ed.), *The Dialectics of Liberation*, Penguin Books, 1968.

8. See J. W. Berry, 'Preliminary Evidence for Personal Authoritarianism and Ethnocentrism in Australia', *Politics*, vol. V, no. 5, November 1970; Douglas McCallum, 'The State of Liberty', in Peter Coleman (ed.), *Australian Civilization*, Cheshire. Melbourne, 1962; Craig McGregor, *Profile of Australia*, Penguin Books, 1968, pp. 71–92.

portunity is thus created for the ideology of continuous institutionalized technological development to take charge and legitimize the established order. If the individual does not sense his own powers and the validity of his experience, then the reification of technology as omnipotent and by definition beneficial will lessen his anxiety by providing a proxy potency. Attempting to surrender one's responsibility to an external structure is typical of the authoritarian personality, exemplified by the paradigm civil servant, the company man, and the upwardly mobile 'middle-class' worker. The clamour for more and more gadgets, the passivity implied by continual television viewing and the myriad manipulations of the fashion industry – these all mark the placing of the structure of decision-making beyond the individual, as well as indicating a blind faith in the value and necessity of the present social order together with a complete impotence to change it in any significant way. When one's life is pre-structured, so are goals, and therefore also the criteria of success. Such success is relative to the requirements of capitalist technological society, e.g., the socially derived need for increasing numbers of goods, the social definition of attractive personal appearance as the nearest possible approximation to models seen in the latest fashion magazines and beauty contests, or the ability to do uninteresting work for long periods.

It may be objected that Australians are anti-authoritarian because there is a general distrust and antipathy towards parliamentarians but, unless it can be demonstrated that this distrust applies to other areas of decision-making, it would fail to prove the point. Apart from the fact that parliamentarians are for the most part far from the image of those well-educated and efficient experts who are supposed to reign in most areas of power (e.g. top company directors and public servants), it is generally accepted among social scientists at least that parliament has little to do with major decisions and running the country. Even where decisions are ratified by parliament, they are not initiated by it: parliament acts merely as a rubber stamp.

My view obviously assumes the value judgement that this society is lacking in the requisites of individual freedom and indeed mobilizes against it. It is, necessarily, an anti-positivist view to approach this society from a standpoint which is in a sense external to it. This externality need not imply a complete otherness, an approach from the clouds; merely that the validation of norms, the selection of facts and their interpretation are not bound to the peculiar prevailing political organization and ideology. My standpoint is external in that it does not assume conventional appraisals as a final validating context, yet is internal in that it is most cognizant of the possibilities inherent in the individual and his associations and products. In modern times, as Marcuse points out,[9] the possibilities of a utopia on earth are real from a technological standpoint, but what is preventing this utopia from being realized is an anachronistic social organization – capitalism, with all its implications. This approach is grounded firmly within the tradition of Western civilization, in its hopes, its philosophy, its achievements and, in general, its history, as representing a process of man's recognizing and sometimes realizing some of his possibilities for good and evil. The possibilities are determinate, issuing from man's past, his discoveries and his ability to choose and act.

The greater the potential for emancipation and the greater the contingency of the present state of affairs, then the greater is the necessity for control over people at the deepest level to keep the present society going. Paradoxically, the more the alternative becomes possible, the more impossible it becomes. The modern discoveries of man (in technology, psychology, etc.) are used in the cause of domination and succeed in destructuring and restructuring the personality. What may be a magnificent vehicle of progress – technology – may be the very means of impeding it and reinforcing the present. Instead of producing food for starving millions,

9. Herbert Marcuse, *Five Lectures*, Allen Lane The Penguin Press, London, 1970, ch. 4.

man lands on the moon; the immense expenditure on modern packaging, apart from producing a great amount of pollution, makes frivolous and useless commodities attractive. These facts illustrate the ways people are caught up and manipulated into a definition of progress which succeeds in hiding the fact that an alternative definition exists, and in so doing tends to bolster the necessity of the present society.

The standpoint I am adopting, then, is against the present society, in terms of man's better possibilities. It is not the purpose of this chapter to sketch the alternative definition, but rather to disclose the present as social, historical and specific so that the subversive definition may begin to be articulated. Domination must be investigated in order to be overcome. The veil of necessity over the present having been lifted, the future involves the transcendence of the present by means of some of its immanent possibilities.

As I have indicated, my own approach modifies considerably the classical marxist position while nevertheless taking full account of its ultimate characterization of this sort of society. At a basic level it is true that private utilization of capital precipitates a founding description of our society; in other words, one group of people owns and controls the means of production and exploits another larger group of people who work the means of production. But my point is that this theory is not adequate. Even though it is true that capitalism began in such a way, we cannot ignore the effects that the structure itself has on the underlying population. The ideology of capitalism gains a wider field as the economic system itself grows larger: economic relations are legitimized culturally, capitalist values and its particular construction of reality are internalized increasingly so that these values and perceptions tend to dominate more and more institutions. These mediations in turn reinforce the ongoing structure of social relations. If man, as Marx so pointedly argued,[10] alienates himself through his work, and

10. Karl Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1961, pp. 67–83.

if his relations with other people become property relations, his world becomes an alienated one. Production relations define human relations. Work and worth are evaluated in terms of the market-place. Even in the family, the economic aspect becomes dominant – the woman in the monogamous middle-class family makes it possible for the man to pursue economic activity. This alienated existence means that the definition of reality, of what is real and what is not, is a complete function of the alienation of men from themselves. In these circumstances, that which a man defines as real will be generally that which is unreal, and vice versa. His experience will be alien to him, his hopes and fantasies will seem utopian and unrealizable. In the given world, which is regarded as natural and one of necessity, where the self is lost in activities which are not its own, where the activities do not constitute an expression of a man's whole self, but conform to a pattern of imposed wants (first externally imposed on the self, then emanating from within), these wants will be characterized as real. Our type of society has been characterized as a 'society of the spectacle'. The bread and circuses of ancient Imperial Rome exist today on a far grander scale. Under the reign of the spectacle, the entire environment becomes a pseudo-world. The image becomes reality. The total social reality becomes a spectacle.[11]

The transition from the inner-directed to the other-directed man marks a change which represents an acceptance of the system and its goals, and involves the co-operation of the people in furthering it. The alienated world is the only world that people know – this world is so alienated, so other, that people do not recognize it as split off from them, and they do not recognize their aims and goals as false ones because

11. The themes of the above paragraph are explored particularly well in Guy Debord, *Society of the Spectacle*, Black and Red, Detroit, 1970. See also Jean Hyppolyte, *Studies on Marx and Hegel*, Basic Books, New York, 1969. Hyppolyte argues that Marx held to a firm distinction between essence and appearance. Related are the writings of R. D. Laing and David Cooper who argue against conventional definitions of sanity and insanity.

they are not false within the system, but false only in terms of their possibilities outside the system. There is no need for an enormous police force to protect private enterprise; the issue of challenge to the present system arises seldom in comparison with the constant affirmations and reaffirmations of it. Politics is not a vital affair. Normally it focuses on relatively peripheral topics or personalities, and at no time is the structure within which it takes place questioned. The two major parties vie with each other for what is termed 'political power', but this only involves decisions which do not affect the basic structure, decisions of administration of certain fields within the society. Although the impression exists that the decision-making powers of the people are very great because they can choose between parties every once in a while, the system merely provides conditioned choices within its structure, and these choices are between basically similar items, jobs, parties, activities, etc.

The capitalist system, then, is not only an economic system. The many mediations which occur mean that the people of a capitalist society reproduce capitalist attitudes and values in their daily life activities. Although capitalism remains a contradictory system, many of its contradictions are considerably blunted by the cultural violence I am describing. What was a system of political economy has effected enormous cultural transformations. It is not only sheer physical exhaustion which makes the workers unfree when they leave their work-places; alienated capitalist economic relations are found in people's lives as a whole, for they have introjected an ideology which keeps them oppressed. The promise of technological progress maintains their approval of the existing social structures, and commands their almost complete attention. Development – that is, economic development – being an acknowledged goal of the system, there is no need for ruling-class direction. Whilst appearing impartial as regards benefits to particular groups of people, discriminating against no one and producing 'more' for the entire population, the very nature of the social structure means differential rewards. The system is

geared to a definition of development which favours acquis-itiveness, the foundation of capitalist values. Indeed, if the system functions smoothly, there is no need for conscious control by the capitalists; the 'rules of the game', while being neutral as regards individuals, are themselves weighted. The system has become self-regulating.

However, there are inequalities besides those that are structured into the system. The persecution of draft resisters and others connected with demonstrations are cases where the system comes down hard on certain people instead of leaving them alone. Other instances might exist where white-collar crime is often not punished or where sentences are lenient in comparison with the brutality meted out to many working-class people by the police and the courts. I am not, however, suggesting that these types of discrimination are what keeps the system going.

The self-regulating model allows a seemingly independent role for the state and other institutions. These agencies are not necessarily manipulated by capitalists, though some may be in fact. The law may be administered fairly or equally, recalling Anatole France's famous remark that the law prohibits both rich and poor alike from sleeping under bridges: since the rich have no need to sleep under bridges, 'fair' administration of the law in an unequal situation discrimin-ates against some and favours others.

The courts may even overrule a legislative decision aimed at limiting the freedom of those interested in undermining the system, e.g. the Communist Party Dissolution Act was declared invalid in 1951 by the High Court. On occasion, the legal system may act against established interests, but this is offset by generalized benefits, e.g. testifying to the elasticity of the system for reform, demonstrating the 'equality' of the system. But even without these advantages, the system functions through the generally shared values and assumptions of its members. This must allow for varia-tion within the independently functioning component parts which are linked mediately, not immediately. Similarly, the government may introduce anti-inflationary 'credit squeezes'

which for quite a time hit many individual capitalists, or even most capitalists. At a particular time, the state may be the object of businessmen's rancour, although it should be borne in mind that the state has always appeared to be 'above' society, even to the vested interests it has sustained.

The model I am using does not deny individuals a certain freedom within the system to act in a manner contrary to its interests, for as I have argued above, the system operates through most people reproducing activities condoned by it most of the time – through a common, often implicit as-sumption of the general direction of the system. This direc-tion ratifies the overall structure which achieves a relatively stable continuation of the system itself thanks to the concur-rence of the underlying population. Objectively, the system delivers the goods for the capitalists. There is no real need for them to intervene further since important structures are not under serious challenge.

There is no point in dividing the system up into different parts, some of which seem in favour of reform and others in favour of reaction, and then reifying these sections without regard to the effect on the total system. This type of segmentation mystifies the system since certain sections looked at only in relation to other sections give the appear-ance of independence. For example, the courts may appear independent from the group of big businessmen, and, looked at in immediate terms, these sections are independent; but if they are studied in relation to the whole system and its productions, a different view may emerge. To postulate divi-sions within the system on the basis of direct appearance without regard to the function within the system as a whole is to engage in reification, in compartmentalization, putting things into boxes and allowing them to take on a discrete existence. Thus, for example, to regard the decisions of the courts as necessarily related to the needs of business, or as unrelated and therefore independent, is to abstract these two parts from the whole in an unreal way. Similarly, to necessarily relate the actions of a government, whether Lab-or or Liberal, to the needs of the capitalists in a direct way

is to engage in a similar reification. I am not suggesting that there are no links. Indeed, there are strong ones,[12] particularly between the Liberals and some sections of the capitalist class, as demonstrated for example with the sacking of Gorton. Nor am I suggesting that there would be no intervention if a government were to spurn the wishes of a significant number of businessmen to a great degree.[13] What I am suggesting is that a positive correlation between the needs of the 'economy' and the needs of business is usual, but that on occasion governments may act against the needs of business as seen by most businessmen, particularly those interested in short-term benefits. Only in a situation where the government acts in a revolutionary direction, by legislating against private enterprise as a whole and initiating measures such as workers' control, could such a danger exist. In a situation where there is much discontent among the people, the government may serve the system by diverting attention from its real basis and not interfering with it. In any case, the interest of the economy as a whole – and thus of capitalism in the long run – may well be served by the government nationalizing certain industries and legislating, so that the workers obtain a slightly better share of the cake. The welfare state may, in the present circumstances, serve big business extremely well, even where individual employers are riled. A Labor government without interest in a total revolutionary transformation may help keep the system stable in a way no Liberal government could. The concentration on the issue of state control by some members of the Left may, by ignoring the effect on the system as a whole, help the system itself by reifying certain parts of it as transformative in themselves, whereas these may actually serve the system through more adequate planning.

The nature of domination by capitalism has changed radically to the extent that knowledge in the form of technical

12. See Playford's chapter in this volume.
13. Ralph Miliband, *The State in Capitalist Society*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1969, ch. 4.

innovation and activity has itself become a vital force of production. Although it is true that many workers produce a surplus which is appropriated by the capitalists as profit, it is not only in this primary way that domination occurs. Domination goes well beyond the realms of work conditions and pay, obtruding into areas outside work-time. It takes the form of manipulation of needs (e.g. the need for certain gadgets that could easily be foregone, the need for a new car when one has a perfectly good one already, and, in general, planned obsolescence), and the appropriation by the system of the individual's life in the form of a pre-structured existence. In the absence of spontaneity and imagination, life is reduced to monotonous routine. Watching television, cleaning the car, unnecessary housework and spectator sports are instances of general life-patterns in our society; by adopting these patterns the individual submits to a uniform life fashioned from outside, a pseudo-life in which the question of individual self-realization does not even figure. People live conditioned, unconscious lives, reproducing the values of the system as a whole.

Conventional politics does not touch this key area. The way people live their lives is a function of the system and its values, and is thus political. Anthropological studies demonstrate an enormous amount of cultural relativity. The social organization and norms of Western capitalist society are not the only ones in the world, but result from its particular history. To challenge these modes of living in a political way is to challenge the system itself; it reveals present life-styles as a contingent form of social organization and as part of a larger system. Conventional politics is politics within the system, and deals in the administration of it, not in its subversion. The kind of politics that exists is a product of the kind of life led, and, in our society, this is pre-structured, a life of domination. Our domination is effected under the aegis of technology, of modern science and expertise which defines what is needed and how to get it or do it. Everyday life, the most political of arenas, is defined as free individual choice.

We may conveniently divide the modes of domination into the categories of technical, social, institutional and instinctual domination. Viewed in this way, it may be seen that domination is not only overt, external oppression, but that people are willing participants in their own oppression. Conditioned by an authoritarian socialization, people aim at its prescribed goals, adopting its values and finding it difficult and agonizing to overcome this domination. It is often easier to conform with one's past – the views, perceptions and actions of others, and one's conditioned urges – than to challenge them, even where they are recognized as oppressive. In brief, people find fundamental change painful.

The question of how most Australians live their lives ought to be the subject of intense investigation. It is here, in their everyday lives, that most domination exists.[14] The basic structure of domination does not consist merely in the extraordinary activities and events (the mishaps, accidents and particular circumstances of some people), nor in the effective proscription of certain activities (e.g. staging demonstrations, or reading what one wants to read). When the system is functioning normally, we can look to ordinary life to provide us with prevalent forms.

We may ask what is significant inside and outside people's homes. Is there any real distinction between public and private affairs? Television provides an example of the amalgamation of public and private worlds. During a significant part of their waking time at home, people are imbued with the societal values and messages: the individual is conditioned to react rather than act by the form and content of this unilateral communication. Even the domestic comedies provide a normal style to which home life may be fitted. The world is now in the loungeroom, and there is nothing the viewer can do to change it. The world is also mediated, and reality becomes to an extent a function of the programme.

14. Henri Lefebvre, *Everyday Life in the Modern World*, Allen Lane The Penguin Press, London, 1971.

Outside their employment, the interests and activities of most Australians centre around television watching, football watching, the beach in summer, pop music, the car, fashion, beer drinking, the house and renovations to it, the kids and some close relatives, gadgets and the garden. In general, the lives of most Australians, in common with people in other advanced capitalist societies, consist of doing rather than being. That is, they spend most of their lives in doing things, the nature of which they rarely question – but they must always be doing something. These pursuits are not the expression of the individual, but are often the expression of the emptiness these people would experience inside if they were not so frantically involved in activity.

In a society which crushes non-conformity, which encourages passivity which includes doing initiated from outside and ritualistic and conformist activity, where gratification comes from external sources rather than inner resources, individuals try to adapt by recovering their lost selves through more welfare, more consumption, and deeper non-reflective, automatic involvement in things they 'should' or 'have to' do. No wonder people find solitude uncomfortable and are threatened by silence when their being is so much constituted by outside presences. The ubiquity of turned-on transistors with their loud pop music drowning anxiety matches the ever-increasing use of muzak which breeds efficiency by eliminating thought. Genuinely human emotion would interfere with the smooth and efficient production and consumption of goods, and, unharnessed, might threaten the system which allocates to feeling a position subservient to the instrumental rationality of scientific management – reasoning which worries only about how to get somewhere without bothering where. Most people lose themselves in endless activity which constitutes the 'flight from being' which is a major characteristic of late capitalism.

This 'flight from being' involves a quiet adjustment to a reality which prizes material achievement above all else. People have little sense of self-identity, except in so far as they see themselves playing a role. Role-playing may be very

convenient for administrative purposes, but indicates a lack of integration of the self. People are 'ontologically insecure',[15] their lives not being experienced as continuous or whole. People have little awareness of, or contact with, their roots in the past,[16] and have no concept of the future. They live a day-to-day existence in which they 'get by'. No sense of individual growth is felt.[17] Instead, there is a stunted existence where the 'aim' is not the positive one of some active engagement but the negative one of avoiding misfortune. Being has been degraded to survival. The main contention of this chapter is with the flight from being that is manifested in a loss of self, resulting from the violent encroachments of the capitalist system on the individual.[18]

May says [19] that we live in a 'schizoid world' where we are immersed in achieving, yet removed from our feelings, where outwardly a lot is happening, but where this hides apathy, withdrawal of feeling, and a detached lack of involvement in what is happening. In this way, the claim of many people to be 'happy', apart from the obvious denial involved, is compatible with a continuing withdrawn state where feelings have been all but eliminated.

This schizoid state of affairs has, as I have argued above, its own rewards. The subject as object enjoys many material satisfactions which, when the yearning for wholeness is systematically anaesthetized and perverted into the wish for more and more goods, ensure the people's loyalty to the system. Employees become more and more adapted to their state of existence. Their conditions have improved

15. R. D. Laing, *The Divided Self*, Penguin Books, 1965, ch. 3.

16. Anthony Storr, 'The Concept of Cure', in Charles Rycroft (ed.), *Psychoanalysis Observed*, Penguin Books, 1968.

17. Rollo May, Ernest Angel and Henri F. Ellenberger (eds), *Existence: A New Dimension in Psychiatry and Psychology*, Basic Books, New York, 1958, ch. 2.

18. R. D. Laing, 'The Obvious', in David Cooper (ed.), *The Dialectics of Liberation*; David Cooper, *Psychiatry and Anti-Psychiatry*, Tavistock, London, 1967, ch. 1.

19. Rollo May, *Love and Will*, Souvenir Press, London, 1970; see especially ch. 1.

markedly in most areas, and the quantitative demands of the trade unions for higher wages and the like are being slowly accepted. With the development of automation, difficult manual labour and the most tedious mental jobs are gradually being eliminated. Employees increasingly satisfy themselves that better prospects are ahead. Typically, they classify themselves as 'middle class'. There is no identity here to contrast with the established order; even when they characterize themselves as 'working class', this by no means implies a dissatisfaction with the system as such.

One of the major characteristics of Australian capitalism is that it is inextricably linked with other advanced capitalist societies.[20] Economic ties with the U.S., Britain and Japan are documented not only by other contributors to this volume,[21] but also by the financial pages of any daily newspaper. Economically, Australia is a colony for foreign investment. Significant areas of economic life are increasingly beyond governmental control because the headquarters of the multinational corporations are overseas. The advent of these organizations reflects the powerful economic forces leading to a significant acceleration in the concentration of economic resources, fewer self-employed people and a hierarchical company structure whose head is in another country. Politically, Australia has no independent foreign policy and its domestic policies are certainly not basically different from those to be found in the U.S. Culturally, Britain and the U.S. have had strong influences.[22] We have only to switch on our television sets to view American programmes interspersed with American-style commercials. The influence of outside forces should not be underestimated in view of the fact that, so far as communications are concerned, the world has shrunk to a 'global village', and the multinational corporations are taking over many key sectors of the Aus-

20. See McFarlane's chapter in this volume.

21. See contributions to this volume by Wheelwright, Rowley and Evans.

22. See McGregor, op. cit., pp. 54–60.

tralian economy. These corporations bring with them the latest in technology, the use of which has great repercussions on our culture. Further, Australia is not only 'colonized' by other countries, but is itself a 'mini-imperialist' power.[23]

If late capitalism may be characterized by its central use of technology as a means of domination, it is within this area that the negation of capitalism may lie. The ever-expanding technological production, which provides a mainstay of the system by buying the adherence of the underlying population, requires at its heart a knowledge industry which continuously produces innovations. In order for this system to be stable, there must be constant change. As White argues in his chapter in this volume, there is a growing intellectually-trained proletariat which is responsible for the functioning of advanced capitalism.[24] Education is less and less concerned with rote learning of facts, and the authoritarian manipulation of curriculum content is decreasing. This is not because the authorities have become more benign; rather, innovation requires intelligence, and constant change requires adaptability. If students are trained in techniques assuming presently known facts as final, the chances are that, by the time they finish their studies and go into industry, their training will be outmoded. Flexibility, as White points out, is becoming the hallmark of modern education.

This flexibility presupposes a form of rationality, a way of seeing beyond the narrow problem into new areas. Successful research and innovation normally requires imagination, co-operation, and a broad approach. Thus the seeds of the intellectual culture emerge with a glimmer of a transcending rationality which may call the system itself into question. It is no coincidence that the student revolt has become so important of late. This society, in which the his-

torical alternative is silenced through the repressive use of technology to provide the 'good life', may find that the knowledge industry standing at the heart of productive development may be the very source of its challenge.

I do not wish to suggest that authoritarianism is absent from present educational practice. Quite the contrary. Education, particularly at primary school level, acts as an exceedingly important socializing agency; it conditions the framework within which thought may occur, defines reality for students instead of encouraging them to find their own reality in their own time, and similarly promotes an instrumental version of rationality which eschews human feelings. Teacher, *in loco parentis*, is another authoritarian parent.[25] But another strand is emerging within this authoritarian structuring which, while authoritarian in a less overt way, may not be able to be contained within the system. The education system, while producing people in most cases who do not question the system, also produces a growing number who do.

It is possible that education might provide a path towards social transformation – but I do not mean by 'education' what is normally meant by the term. Education should be a means through which man may find himself in a world which is truly his. Education should aim at authentic living, a life in which man, both as individual and as species, maximizes the conditions where he may without social restriction be what he wants to be so far as is possible. Obviously this demands, minimally, a freedom from the present system.

This requires that people proceed quite some distance along the path to autonomy in this present society. To transform the social structure toward a free society, they must first find themselves.[26] They must be able to stand in critical judgement of themselves and their environment. The system

---

23. See Evans' chapter in this volume.
24. See Geoff Sharp and Doug White, 'Features of the Intellectually Trained', *Arena*, no. 15, 1968. See also Warren Osmond's exposition of what he calls the 'Arena thesis' in Richard Gordon (ed.), *The Australian New Left*, Heinemann, Melbourne, 1970, pp. 192–8, and other articles by Sharp and White in *Arena*.

25. See Paul Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-Education and The Community of Scholars*, Vintage Books, New York, 1966.
26. For a discussion of some of the ideas below, see David Cooper, *The Death of the Family*, Allen Lane The Penguin Press, London, 1971, and Herbert Marcuse, *An Essay on Liberation*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1969.

militates against this possibility by its violation and manipulation of the self, so that radicals must achieve some personal autonomy in order to really stand against the system. They must initiate actions rather than just react. Freedom must be sensed as possibility, and the intellectual culture may provide a base for this.

Revolution may be achieved by people with needs which cannot be satisfied within the present structure. They would be aware that right from birth violent incursions are launched upon all in this society, destroying much sensibility and freedom. Radicals must face the consequences of these violations in themselves and, perhaps painfully, personally regain what has been trained out of them – their experiencing and feeling. This new dimension would mean an end to their relatively comfortable existence; it would in some ways involve unhappiness because they would be fully aware of the terrorism inherent in everyday life and its obstruction of the fulfilment of human needs. It is easier to allow incursions than to resist them. The new individual would, however, be at home in himself if not in the world he lived in. Even within the present structure, he would lead a more exciting and real life than those who lead comfortable, detached lives where feeling scarcely exists; he would begin to structure some of his own life.

The new individual would need fellows with whom to communicate (in a manner which would contrast with the prevalent pseudo-communication). Such communication would bring new values, and interpersonal relations would bring new awareness and new possibilities, if only because vulnerability would no longer be punished and silenced. Trust, co-operativeness and openness would be attributes of a relatively non-threatening environment where love would be possible. These values are values of the intellectual culture. Communication requires association, and this means that new sub-cultures and counter-institutions of freedom must arise. Free schools and universities, workers' control, communes, alternative media, existential psychiatry, community work and the like would provide an alternative cul-

ture so far as is possible in the present society. This would provide some alternative to a society which defines its particular culture as the necessary and final one.

What would be the link between such a counter-culture and the intellectually trained? The people of the counter-culture would be 'drop-outs', primarily in the sense that they would not serve the prevailing system and its values. However, this need not imply that they would be inactive – on the contrary, these people would be involved in the sense that they would not be swallowed up by their own and others' actions. Their lives would not be routine or 'secure'. Their goals would be open.[27] The intellectual culture is what, in a sense, the counter-culture is about. The intellectually trained would be that stratum of society most affected by the values of the intellectual culture. The counter-culture would be peopled mostly by those who have been and are being intellectually trained. Although the counter-culture would be outside the system in that it would refuse the present, it would be right at the heart of the system of knowledge. Those in the centre of production would be intellectually trained and perhaps imbued with some of the values of the intellectual culture. The counter-culture would provide a counter-example which would make the historical alternative more real.

Those in the counter-culture thus may spearhead a movement which will help bring about a society in which being and communication are possible.

27. Nietzsche is perhaps the thinker who has best understood the crisis of modern man in terms of a contrast between a society in which the 'last men' lead comfortable, 'happy' lives and one where life is continuous transcendence towards new realizations by 'overmen'. See Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, Penguin Books, 1961, and George Grant, *Time as History*, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Toronto, 1969.