Against this apparatus, which does not merely reproduce bourgeois relations in the form of ideological representations but controls access to knowledge and the instruments of power, the subordinate social groups have, traditionally, little to offer. However, two things can happen or be made to happen. One is that the hegemonic apparatus, so massively and yet so precariously maintained, can crack under the accumulation of its own internal contradictions; and the other is that the subordinate groups can offer a sustained challenge to this crumbling hegemony. In a complex society the challenge will not in the first instance by monolithic but will take the form of an alliance of forces, but according to historical materialism it is the working class which will have to take a leading role if the result of the process is to be the establishment of socialist relations of production. How this role is to be construed remains problematic, but Gramsci, for one, saw the process in terms of the development, on the terrain of economic relations of production, of an organic intelligentsia of the working class, capable of giving political form to a proletarian way of interpreting the world and of attracting within its orbit strata of unattached petty bourgeois intellectuals together with representatives of other subordinate and oppressed groups.

There is much that is speculative in Gramsci's picture and much that is not fully worked out theoretically and requires further interpretation and maybe correction. In conclusion I should like to make one or two points based on a reading of Lenin and Gramsci which it seems to me is well founded theoretically and can be consolidated in social practice.

Bourgeois hegemony is not static. It depends for its survival on an equilibrium of forces which the bourgeoisie cannot guarantee, and it has to be constantly renewed and protected against the appearance of new contradictions through a process of reproduction of existing ideological relations throughout the superstructures. (Althusser's concept of the reproduction of the relations of production through the ideological state apparatus. Also through the processes of reproduction themselves) [2]. There are two particular points to be borne in mind in the struggle to prevent the existing order from functioning hegemonically: the first is that the struggle is already happening, and we are part of it; we are not outside it nor have we invented it. What we have to do, however, is to define and consolidate our position within it. Secondly the class struggle (which is what this is) always has an ideological aspect, which must never be under-rated.

Theoretical struggle and political struggle both operate on ideology. There is also a struggle within ideology itself, which has forms as diverse as artistic activity and consciousness-raising. Many Marxists have traditionally been scornful of wide-ranging forms of political activity which did not appear at first sight to have 'class' content - for example activity around slogans like 'fighting the system' or 'building the movement'. But these are very important aspects of the struggle. They concern struggle against the materialised ideological apparatus and in favour of a strengthening of the opposition at the ideological level. As such they involve hegemony directly and bring the distant goal of revolution a step nearer.

implies that the counter-practices I suggest within the context of radical occupationalism cannot substitute for a broad political movement directed against the prevailing structure of ownership, control and class. In the past, this recognition has allowed political revolutionaries to remain professional conservatives - a divorce of practice and practice as unacceptable today as the politics of the Communist Parties which saw nothing wrong in such a divorce.

Today, there is an opposite danger: radical professionalism without (Party-)political engagement.

The conventional definitions of teacher, journalist, psychotherapist etc refer to the intention, object or function of the communications peculiar to each occupation, as well as to the context of operation of the persons involved (school, newspaper, clinic). Thus, a teacher teaches, a journalist informs, a psychotherapist heals or cures.

What is wrong with such definitions is that they overlook the distinction of ideal and reality - that is to say, overlook that teachers miseducate, journalists misinform etc - and also that they take no account of the other functions performed at the same time these defining functions are being well or badly performed. These other functions are, for me, most importantly functions of social control. Both sets of functions come under Althusser's heading of the reproduction of the relations of production.

In most cases, and perhaps in all, the two sets of functions are performed simultaneously. They can be separated analytically, and I think in practice.

What I think are most relevant to us are the ways in which the communicational functions and the social control functions come into conflict or contradiction. Two examples to clarify what I mean:

1 In journalism for the journalist it is part of his definitional function to inform. This is relevant in nearly all cases (it ceases to apply with a paper like France Dimanche where the paper is self-consciously engaged in pure fabrication).

The actual performance of this function is encouraged by some features of the context in which the paper/journalist operates - e.g. competition from other papers/journalists - and inhibited by others - e.g. the social control function of keeping people politically passive, making them vote Tory etc, connected to the ownership, control and ideological function of the paper.

2 In education, meeting changing requirements of the production process can require (and, I would argue, does not require) changes not only in the 'content' of what is taught but in the 'methods' of teaching - 'methods' are equally relevant to the reproduction (and transformation!) of the relations of production, despite the fact that Althusser seems to see them as purely instrumental in the transmission of chunks of science or ideology (a point of view relatively justified if you teach in the École Normale Sup; but most teachers teach working class children in schools, where method makes all the difference).

Thus, the author of the Introduction to Counter Course (Penguin Education, 1972) writes:

official society is hidebound by forms of learning and discovery that do not even meet the needs of its own most advanced sectors. Planning and research for Modern Industry require that knowledge is fluid wherever education is frozen. It innovates where education copies the obsolete, subverts where education obeys, integrates and generalizes where education is parochial, subverts where education sets individual against individual in a meaningless competitive and professional race.

(p.11)

But the competitive and professional race whilst - on this analysis - meaningless from the standpoint of the development of production, is very meaningful from the standpoint of social control - more accurately, from the standpoint of reproducing the existing relations of production, though not so much at the workplace level but at the social and political level, where fragmenting people is a crucial instrument of control (Divide and Rule/Unity is Strength).

In Britain today, I think we could understand many struggles in terms of the kind of contradiction I have illustrated above. It is not novel: it is merely an application of the general theory outlined in Marx's 1859 Preface concerning the contradiction between forces and relations of production.

But this contradiction is not being uniformly resolved or dominated by the forward march of the forces of production. The conflict seems to me to be very unevenly developed, a fact only surprising because we have been taught a unilinear notion of historical time. On the one hand, I think one can find instances in which an institution is implicitly preparing people for transformed relations of production - here 'consciousness' is ahead of 'reality': in others, one finds the same sort of defence of crumbling relations, a defence which, I think, can only be conducted in increasingly totalitarian fashion.

At the level of the contradiction between communicational and social control functions, I think the Press and possibly TV are areas where 'totalitarian' tendencies are clearly apparent. This affects the syntax, semantics and logic of the actual communications - valuable critiques have already been provided by George Orwell (the whole of 1984, for instance) and probably even more so by Karl Kraus (relentless critic of the Austrian Press and decadent bourgeois culture from 1899 to 1936; it is probably worth learning German just to read his largely untranslatable work).

In education, I am inclined to think that the opposite tendency is dominant and I regard education as a favourable 'site' of struggle.

In psychotherapy, the experience of Laing and his associates does not encourage one to think that healing and curing is or can be in the present situation a liberating practice, but rather that it is dominated by control functions (the 'engineering' or 'soft police' approach to the human mind). Strictly, psychotherapy is concerned with the maintenance rather than the reproduction of the relations of production, and one could say that antipsychiatry had the same sort of meaning as industrial sabotage.

And so on. Each institution or apparatus clearly requires a separate and detailed analysis which is obviously beyond the scope of these notes.

II

Some people would say that professional functions (or specialised professionals) are necessarily instruments of social control and that therefore either function or role or both is to be rejected. I do not accept this position. I think it derives from a failure to distinguish the two aspects (communicational/social control) which I have separated, and from an equation of any form of differential knowledge with actual domination rather than the possibility of domination. (The absurdity of this position is that while rejecting some special forms of knowledge - e.g. anything produced in a University - it is forced to accept certain professional skills and ends up having to postulate an arbitrary cut off point - thus, in a recent pamphlet Who is in Control? conventional
Madness and the Family

Control

"Education is not neutral. It is either a means for liberation or a means of oppression."
(Paulo Friere)

"If society at large suddenly resolved, in the manner of what used to be regarded as progressive schools, completely to dismantle all machinery of coercion, there is plenty of reason to apprehend that things on the whole would go rather worse as a result than they actually do." (G.J.Warnock: The Object of Morality)

"In its struggle against these conditions criticism is not a passion of the head but the head of passion. It is not a lancet, but a weapon. Its object is an enemy it wants not to refute but to destroy ... The criticism dealing with this matter is criticism in hand-to-hand combat, and in such a combat the point is not whether the opponent is noble, equal, or interesting, the point is to strike him. The point is to permit the Germans not even a moment of self-deception and resignation. We must make this actual pressure more pressing by bringing to it the consciousness of pressure and make the shame more shameful by publicizing it." (Marx)