



Set in Cambria 10/11pt and Candara.

Second revision of this Preface.
Copyright © Mike Hales 2017.

Published by Barefoot Documents (Mike Hales),
Brighton, England, June 2017, under Creative
Commons Licence Share-Alike attribution non-
commercial 3.0.

Printed by Lulu, print-on-demand, in
Digest paperback format. Also, a PDF eBook. Both
available at <www.lulu.com>.

ISBN 978-1-326-62765-2

Paid to Think - Preface

Politics of production - Doing things with our work that really are different

THIS VOLUME IS PLANNED AS ONE OF THREE COLLECTIONS of pieces and extracts that were mostly written for public readership during the 90s. The idea is to stand the collections alongside (and to significantly extend the range of) the two books that I made at the beginning of the 80s: *Living Thinkwork - Where do labour processes come from?* (LTW) and *Science or Society - The politics of the work of scientists* (SoS). Some extracts from these books are included within the collections, showing linkage and continuity with later work.

The 90s pieces were mainly written in a professional capacity, as a researcher publishing into a research and development community. There is continuity though, because the earlier pieces, while not written 'professionally', were also written as a 'theory of practice' researcher, contributing to research and development practice in a community: a political community, an activist community, a vocational community - a community of socialist-feminist 'radical professional' organiser-activists.

On one hand the professional pieces were written by someone who is 'paid to think': study, research, design, develop. And on the other, the activist pieces are attempting, in one way or another, to address and develop the politics of the work that is done by those who are paid to think. Hence: *Paid to Think*, as the overall title for this set of three volumes. Hence also, their linking thread: these pieces of work are parts of a continuing attempt - forty-six years old now, and continuing - to develop the theory and practice of class; that is, of class not as a kind of 'thing' or a structure or a relation, but as a *practice* and a performance; that is, of class *formation* (ie an active verb, and an always-continuing process of conscious and unconscious organising and self-organising); that is, of the class that studies, researches, designs and self-consciously shapes the work and life of others: the *professional-managerial class* - the PMC. That is: of understanding and organising the *facilitation of liberation*, from oppressive and humanly damaging economic and cultural institutions, in workplaces and in life more broadly, in 'advanced' societies

Location - Power & landscapes of design

where professional-managerial practice is utterly woven into the fabric of society and the (re-)production of social life.

Looking at the public writing over more than forty years, it makes sense to me to organise it in three collections: *Location*, *Earthmoving* and *Facilitation*. *Location* was the first collection to be pulled out and the most obvious, because 'location' was an explicit line of exploration during a particular phase of my working life, in the early 90s, as I moved into a new professional sphere and looked back at previous contexts. In earlier times I had found myself needing to theorise the practice of work-design and the work of 'organising', in a political sense, as a member of the PMC. In this practice, class geography was a central organising notion. In the new context of the 90s, 'class' seemed a less workable term in the professional fields I was now working in; but 'location', which replaced it, was in fact *class* location. Thus in that regard the work that I was attempting to do was continuous across the shift in context and concepts. The pieces in *Location* explore places in which 'designers' can stand - especially, designers of the work of work-design - in relation to the work of others, the freedoms and necessities of these various locations, and the choices that may be made in practice between them.

Earthmoving was the second most obvious collection. Seeing what had found its way into *Location*, I felt a clear need to assemble pieces which more explicitly addressed the outcomes being sought by working the territory of class geography: that is, not only mapping the territory and becoming able to take up and migrate between and establish positions in it, but also to *change* the form and contours of the landscape, and hence the kinds of journeys and lives that might be articulated in and on it. In this dimension we're having to deal with institutions, with powers, with 'the relations of production' (that is, historically-evolved relations that structure work practices in-the-large); and with transformations - desired, intentional, freedom-motivated, historically self-conscious transformations - of these institutions, powers and relations. *Earthmoving*, then, is the collection in which I've gathered attempts, in print, to address institutional issues in the politics of work design.

A thing that needs to be said up-front is that the personal basis that has been drawn-on in this collection is limited. This is the work of a designer, and a wage-worker who is being paid to think but, by the same token, needs to do something that can (probably, possibly) be traded or exchanged in a professional marketplace that operates on 'career capital'. The institutional perspective in these pieces is in a sense small-scale; the contexts for the work discussed are within (large) organisations and not, generally, across transnational distances, or at the level of entire States and blocs, or within communities founded on anything other than wage-work for a given

paymaster. In a sense, this work has the virtues and limitations of the perspective of a grass-roots activist. But no apologies: we do what we do, I dug where I stood; others will have taken the time to work in and on other landscapes. We have only a certain degree of choice over what we make in and of our lives: this, in part, is what *Location* is about.

With *Location* and *Earthmoving* identified, the aspect that then remained most obviously unaddressed was down in the detail of class-geographical practice: the weaving- and working-together - the 'bricolaging' - of practices, day-to-day, in-the-room, hands-on, as lived practice. These people, this place, immersive, with no time out. Discovering how to make changes and movements stick, give them 'thickness', buttress them and cement them with motivation and identity, satisfaction and vision, intuition and insight. The term I'm choosing to keynote this third collection is *facilitation*.

Facilitation is 'culture work' involving the skilful and disciplined recognising of what people are working with in-here, enabling this to be spoken or shown in a public work setting, arriving at an agreement about action founded in what has - collectively - been made public; and creating and maintaining 'places' in which this kind of work can be skilfully and more readily done. It is PMC work *par excellence*. Facilitation involves the mobilising, assembling and forming of communities of practice: it is a practice of weaving a new fabric from threads of pre-existing practice and identity. Those who do facilitating self-consciously undertake participating and enrolling and promoting and assembling and speaking-of and pointing-to and glueing and stitching and disconnecting and subverting and advocating - in the live flow of interaction. It would be unflatteringly simple to call it just 'working with groups'. Although the work demands extreme mindfulness, a lot of off-stage work in preparation and review, and some well developed and robust prior practical understandings amounting to 'theory', the people who do it are not paid to *think*, but rather, to make-present, make-tolerable and make-negotiable, for the heart-mind, *for the collective*, in the here and now. This is very important work and it is not obvious how to do it well.

Politics of production

The three collections draw together public writing which is all, in one way or another, in the service of a politics of production. At one level this means a 'labour-process' approach, an engagement with labour-process theory (though very much elaborated, to embrace culture-producing labour as distinct from 'manual work'). But whereas that term might be applied to some rather abstract, academic practices, the orientation of the work gathered in these volumes is towards actual production (and reproduction, and significantly *altered* re-

production) of culture and society, in practice, in work in all kinds of settings. Thus the description *theory-of-practice* might be applied to this work too.¹ Again, 'theory' implies nothing academic or abstract, but simply well-articulated and well-situated insight derived from disciplined practice, which actually informs doing and responding in real-world settings. And thus, even if 'strategic' practices are being addressed, there is throughout an intrinsically bottom-up perspective. It is concerned with the *actual doing* (and valuing) of productive and valued work in actual places - and also, crucially, with the actual producing of the conditions of that work and those places of work, in other workers' practice, in a 'back room' or 'off-stage' somewhere.

A politics of production is in the service of socialism. By socialism I understand an expanded version of: 'From each according to their abilities, to each according to their needs.' First: a cultural and economic order of society in which people are skilfully and routinely facilitated in the production of the best contributions that they (drawing on their own specific capacities) are able to make to the lives of other individuals and to the community. I understand, second: facilitated, *in the actual work of producing* - events, objects, services, media, infrastructures, whatever. And I understand, third: people, as producers of and in society, receiving in return the respect and recognition of their community (including but by no means limited to wages) for the quality, appropriateness and sincerity of their contribution.

The title of this present collection-of-collections - *Paid to Think* - is an ironic inversion of a bitter working-class truism that I heard among adults in my childhood world, that bosses' view of you is: 'You're not paid to think'. But the 1944 Education Act made sure that I and many of my generation in fact *were*; and I got the bit well between my teeth, before Margaret Thatcher (may she rot in her grave, jumped-up grocer's daughter) decided - in the generation of my son's childhood - that her governments would renege on this promise of progress and welfare, and make proper wage-slaves of we in 'the new professions' too. The work of *Paid to Think* is my continuing contribution to the world in which proper respect and attention will be given to the work and knowledge and giving-through-making of those people among whom I grew up, and among whom I count myself. Although a lot of it may seem to be about the production of working configurations of technology, it is entirely about the continuing formation of class.

1 Theory-of-practice: I first learned the term from Marxian approaches, but the principle and the value are found in numerous methodologically sophisticated disciplines. Marxism does not have a monopoly on the description. Indeed, as I discovered much more recently, the dharma teaching of Buddhism has as good a claim: more below.



Public issues, private troubles

Living Thinkwork - my first large-scale, unconstrained piece of public writing (discounting a somewhat-constrained DPhil thesis) - contained quite an amount of 'personal' material: from the life of a working-class lad become a scholar and a wage-worker in professional fields. I still have no doubt that weaving-in first-person, in-here, biographical, experiential and imaginative stuff is a valid and significant thing to do (carefully, self-consciously and with appropriate forms of rigour) in public, 'political' writing. However, given the diversity of the post-LTW public writing that is to be handled in the present collections, it seems advisable here to stick quite close to the examination of the 'out-there' business of organising.

It's less than ideal to work them in separate places, but experiential 'in-here' stuff will figure quite centrally in another public work-in-progress: *Activists and the long march home - Class geography, conviviality, melancholy territory* (a prospectus for some libertarian socialist adventures).² To some extent the *Long March* book will be an extension of *Living Thinkwork's* 'personal is political' travelogue. Picking up and developing themes such as LTW's 'time-and-emotion study' in the life of a libertarian-socialist 'organic intellectual' activist, it will recount, and analytically reflect on, adventures in class geography and epiphanies in lands of the heart-mind, that have arisen since the 1980 publication of LTW.

Thus, here in this present collection, I'm adopting a more circumscribed kind of personal focus. The feminism of my political youth, in the 70s, insisted that 'the personal is political', and grass-roots politics of the same era insisted that it was right (and necessary) to 'dig where you stand'. But it was a rallying call from the American sociologist C Wright Mills that went deepest soonest in forming this commitment in my own practice. His approachable and humane book *The Sociological Imagination*³, which reached me in the early 70s, argued for sociology's necessarily dual concern, with public issues and private troubles. I was a working-class kid in retreat from unpalatable and confusing professional-managerial-class experience as a graduate employee in industry, expected to take on corporate global-competitive agendas, and refusing. I was a turncoat engineer,

2 Work in progress on *Long March* will be published on Lulu, from time to time. At October 2017, the two prologue and introductory chapters are available in a draft version.

3 In 1998 the International Sociological Association named *The Sociological Imagination* the second most important sociological book of the 20th century. Mills popularised the term New Left in the USA, through a 1960 open letter in *New Left Review*.

Location - Power & landscapes of design

now taking up residence in the humanities - historian, sociologist, student of political-economy - to stand critically alongside my former occupational sphere (and return to it later, with subversive, deconstructing intent). An emergent 'history-from-below' consciousness, and a worker-writers' movement of the time⁴, were both fresh in my awareness. These all led me, on one hand, to see public issues/private troubles as a call to make public the politics of personal experiences of freedom and oppression in wage-work, and of the production of work and workplaces.

On the other hand it led me, starting in LTW, to seek to put into the same (public) frame, both the public issues of power, hegemony and class that can be discerned in the white-collar workplace, and the private troubles of attempting to live a life of counter-hegemonic, radical-professional, socialist activism: digging where I stood; digging where we - my working-class parental family, my professional-class marital family, my professional community(ies), my activist community(ies) - stood.

In the beginning, in picking up C Wright Mills' dictum as a young man making the first big changes in his life, I understood addressing private troubles to require a sociological or maybe an anthropological process (addressing milieu and biography, as distinct from 'social structure'). I was very aware of massively public and 'social', inescapable, historical, hegemonic, conditions (obvious, to the point of invisibility) and of 'social relations of production' that determined (overdetermined) sometimes troubled private choices. But along the way I've come to accept - as a man still travelling the landscape and changing his living and making, five decades along - that what it really requires is an *emotional* investigation of the forces and resources that are present in-here, in the inner landscape of the social actor: in 'micro-milieu' and the affective foundations out of which biography is *enacted*.

This is not to psychologise powers and politics, but rather, to seek a really radical, historical and materialist politics that can work competently with *hegemony*: addressing what it is that keeps action in society so much the same, prevents us doing more things really differently; identifying and transforming 'emotional institutions' that operate in tandem with - and in the mesh of - the more obviously public economic and political ones. Who knows what we each of us see, as forces and resources in-here; and find ready-to-hand in-here,

4 Notable as examples of workers' writing are the two volumes of *Work*, published as Penguins by New Left Review in the late sixties: forty first-person accounts, instigated and edited by Ronald Fraser. This seemed and still seems to me an important project. It pre-dated Studs Terkel's widely-known work in the USA.

to act with and through, in the out-there? Who knows what cognitive and emotional institutions are moment-by-moment shaping the living and working of each member of society, each participant in the public realms of culture, in our moving-towards each other and imagined futures, in our moving away from or attacking whatever it is that we hate or cannot tolerate in the present? I take it for granted that political and cultural institutions (including economic institutions) - as what we habitually do and are wittingly or unwittingly subservient to - are rooted, in the last instance⁵, in emotional institutions. The political - as action, and thus, as desiring, as motivation - is absolutely founded in the most personal, private, material dimensions of social being, within the body-mind. What, then, do we know of the politics of production of *desire* (perhaps damaging or entrapping); of the alternative production of (perhaps beneficial, and liberating) alternative intention?

We all of us live our lives in differing landscapes, in-here. Consequently, every life is an arbitrary, singular, contingent series of adventures in the out-there landscapes of class geography; and so, there may not be a lot of generalising that can reasonably be attempted. But I felt strongly at the time of LTW, and feel strongly still, that it's time somebody started exploring this in the public sphere: not generalising, but working carefully, contextually, with the public and private detail of a working life, a life of working on 'work' as a member of the PMC and a life of continual emotional work. One thing that this implies in the volumes of the present collection (and in the *Long March*) is attempting to say what public differences - institutions, resources, communities - might have made a difference to the private troubles and troubled choices out of which these singular, contingent, emotionally-fuelled and -grounded collections of written-about work have arisen. In my 70s Marxism we called this the reflexiveness of theory-of-practice - though I think that in those days we meant a different, drier thing by that term!

The (altered) production of emotional institutions

Why don't we do more things more different? It's in this question that 'private trouble' gets really, significantly, *public* and *historical*. For me as an activist-organiser this was a primary issue (a recognisably 'public' issue) in the 1970s practice that sits behind LTW. Moving in the early 90s to another kind of activist community - of designer- and developer-activists - in a different institutional setting (technological and organisational research-and-development), this was the question that again sat behind my self-questioning and

5 This perspective on 'the last instance' is one of the things that makes this labour-process, cultural-materialist Marxism unorthodox.

Location - Power & landscapes of design

exploring: Why do it this new way ('computer supported cooperative work'), what was lacking in the old ('human-centred design'), what are the chances of sufficient, sufficiently deep, change in this newly chosen location?⁶

A few years later in the 90s I met a personal crisis in my R&D workplace which set in motion another deep, powerfully-motivated and seemingly quite different process of 'institutional' change. In the crisis I behaved badly (angry, hurt, feeling marginal and sidelined), people got hurt, trust was lost, and I came out of the situation with a strong sense that: 'I can't go on for the balance of my life, being a person who is capable of behaving like that'. With this, the challenge of identifying and becoming capable of shifting oppressive and damaging institutions (ie 'earthmoving') changed shape, to embrace not only external, organisational ('social', public) cultural-economic ones but also inner institutions: How can I/we stop doing some of the things that are ingrained, how can I/we really do some important things - in relationships, in everyday life - differently?

As I wrote above, this is not to substitute psychology for politics but rather, to make possible a really radical, historical and cultural-materialist politics of production: the production of everyday life. Everyday wanting and intolerance. Everyday displeasure and difficulty and itching. The everyday distance between 'can't' and 'won't'. And now I find, retired from wage-work, no longer having a workplace and a professional community as my everyday context and living alone rather than in a close family, that the out-there institutional setting differs dramatically from what it had been throughout the activist-professional working life that gave rise to my public writing; and that the in-here institutions - the most private of troubles - continue to demand change. What is it that is being learned here, today: of emotional institutions and deep conservatism and liberation from oppressive forces, that would have been helpful to know and use in those other, wage-work oriented institutional settings? With this 'affective turn', the theory-of-practice challenge has deepened rather than diminished, the radical stakes are higher⁷.

6 The question is posed as the starting point of a 1992 piece - 'The location of humans, ordinary people and women', which is included as chapter 4 of *Location*.

7 Long March is written in three personae: Walker, 'm' and Rogers. This agenda of 'emotional institutions' is Walker's. The majority of the *Location* collection - as an exploration of class location and the work of design-of-work - is m's agenda. The theme of facilitation - more on this, later in this preface - is part of the agenda of Rogers, an aspect of the (re)production of the heart-mind, sitting alongside m's agenda of the (re)production of workplaces and working life.

This extension of theory-of-practice has come from a surprising direction: the dharma teaching of the buddhist tradition. I understand the tradition, coming new to it just a few years ago, to be a mapping and a travel guide, in the world of emotional institutions. What I recognise and welcome is the dharma - as theory-and-practice - offering ways of addressing the production (and the changing), in each of us, of what we ourselves *must* get rid of, *must* have, *must* change, *must* hold on to. Our differences, our identities, our insufficiency; our experience of the pleasantness and unpleasantness of life. I've started to learn from and practice in this tradition, not because I'm 'religious' but because I'm deeply interested in practicality and skill, and in the necessary reflexivity of a wise practitioner in any domain of social and historical, liberation-oriented praxis. In taking refuge in the dharma I'm not drawing on any faith except the faith that we may realistically cultivate in ourselves, individually and collectively, as ordinary human beings in the world.

In this context it seems to me that as a hugely rich and flexible body of theory-of-practice, the dharma offers a foundation and resource-base for a politics of the *(re)production of the heart-mind*. In the tradition we would find this spoken of as liberation; which is to say, the learning and the producing of becoming free from stuckness and stereotype, foolish and wasteful action, unnecessary suffering and the creation of unnecessary suffering for others. Discovering this within the dharma tradition was a kind of homecoming, because this ethical and aesthetic yearning always was the politics of production, since way-back: in LTW, in the pieces of the *Location* and *Earth-moving* collections. My socialism has always had in-here, personal, ethical-aesthetic conflicts and struggles and yearnings as its foundation (as distinct from, say, any kind of out-there, public-sphere, belief in democracy or justice, or in 'rights of man'). What does it feel like, in the heart, here in the world? Is it beautiful? Does it move with grace? Is the heart uplifted and well balanced; and is the self-making of the uplifted and well-balanced one universally given legitimacy, and facilitated? If not, why not? While I do what I can about it in-here, what shall we, collectively, do about it? Who is in opposition, pulls the other way, is holding on to privilege and power? What shall we do about them and the hegemonic force of *their* kind of heart-mind? It was this hope for collective responses to 'private' trouble that produced the work in the 70s that produced *Living Thinkwork*; that made me a socialist.

There is here, in the dharma, a new dimension of insight and action. The difficulty that this poses, in a retrospective collection like *Paid to Think*, is to 'feather this in' to the 70s, 80s and 90s thinking and practice which gives rise to most of the pieces, and to show how

Location - Power & landscapes of design

those actions and insights have deeper foundations and more radical possibilities. Tackling this as a personal story is something to attempt elsewhere: in the *Long March* book. But here in the present collection I need to attempt this as a public story: what kinds of work (in the sphere of the production of work) potentially contribute to liberation, seen through a dharma lens? In what ways is this agenda present in work that has in fact been done by activists in the present generation; in what ways are there new things needing to be done, which were not understood by us, or for which the forms were not to-hand?

Design activism, Self and the landscape of PMC work

One of the obvious and challenging and intriguing ways to attempt this is to go back to some of the conceptual roots of LTW: to *class*, and to the (Marxian) notion of *relations of production*: systems of order within everyday working life, which stand in the way of liberation and which utterly permeate activity, organising in the smallest detail the mundane, ready-to-hand 'forces of production' out of which we weave our economic and cultural lives. In LTW the relations of production in capitalism were understood - from received Marxism - to be wage-labour, private ownership of the means of production and the extraction of surplus value from the mobilisation of labour-power under the rule of wage-labour and private ownership. What I added to this pantheon in LTW, as a work of neo-Marxian labour process analysis oriented to 'white collar work', was another relation that also deeply organises working life in 'late capitalism': *preconceptualisation*. Ugly term, I'm sorry, too late now.

The term refers to the material separation of the designing and resourcing of work from the executing of work. (Specifically though not exclusively, the concept helps highlight the material organisation of the forces of production - working life - through configurations of technology.) Preconceptualisation refers to the thinking-about-in-advance of work-practice, behind the scenes of the live performing of wage-labour. This is where 'paid to think' comes from, as the pivot of a politics. This is where the practice of the professional-managerial class becomes pivotal. As capitalism has 'advanced' - let's say, with the dual emergence of Fordism and of public administration - the PMC has emerged not just to produce work (and reproduce the separation of 'design' from 'work') but to produce *culture*. Culture is understood in LTW as 'the subjective totality of labour power': our collective capacity to think about things that are made and might be made. And as capitalism advanced further - with consumerism and the increasingly skilled production of forces of desire and perception, through the labour of the post-war advertising and media sectors - the hegemony of capital has been increasingly cemented by the

professionalised production of (inauthentic, purposely- and maliciously, third-party skewed) Self.

Indeed, it was probably Vance Packard's lid-lifting book on Madison Avenue, motivational research and 'compelling needs' - *The Hidden Persuaders* (1957) - that gave me my first powerful sense of revulsion at what I later understood to be capitalism. My developed, activist sense of class was thus, from the first, rooted in a first-person sense of outrage at being intimately and daily violated, by vast, self-interested forces of wealth-making, wealth-mobilising, 'truth' production and desire-mongering. Rooted also, in a deep resolve to find protection for all of us who are indiscriminately subject to this violence: this PMC violence. Complicated stuff; because there's also, deep in the mix, a need to expunge the collective shame of this uncaring action by what has become 'my' class. This mix of outrage and confusion is where Walker's story starts, in the *Long March*.

If we're up against the systematic production of Self, as the in-here dimension of culture, the dharma is then wonderfully relevant as a practical guide to relations of production of *desire*, the roots of hegemony and the production and reproduction of emotional institutions at an individual and a collective level. Rather than class, at this level of social reproduction what we have, it seems to me, may be 'tribes': image-mediated, desire-driven and largely consumption-mediated collectives of 'people like us' who do what 'we' do (own what we own, want what we want, see what we see) standing in opposition to 'them', who do things some other way, which we, more or less, don't like or approve of, and wish to stand apart from, put down - or destroy. This is hard stuff to understand, to grasp and to change. However, it seems to me that alongside wage-labour, private ownership, surplus value and preconceptualisation, as relations of economic and cultural production in globalist-capitalist society, the dharma offers us candidates for relations of production in the desire-and-aversion-driven *production of the heart-mind* in global-tribal society: hard-working teams of constructs like greed, hatred and delusion.⁸

This is not stuff that I have thought right through. I don't have enough lifetimes (just the one!) to think this through! And it probably would be a mistake, in danger of being a merely intellectual exercise, to seek strict analogues of *class* and *relations of* (economic) *production* in the sphere of the heart-mind. But it's worth exploring, to see what it gives us to think with.

8 This threesome is one of many hard-working 'buddhist lists': *rāga*, *dosa*, *moha*, the roots of 'unskilful' action.

Location - Power & landscapes of design

I don't by any means intend to imply that the dharma is the only frame for deeply engaging the relationship between emotional institutions in-here and out-there, and producing real liberatory change. However, my experience these recent years says that the dharma is profoundly wise, truly flexible from person to person (that is, from one inner landscape to another) and fundamentally oriented to liberation - that is, to liberation in-here, where all out-there institutions and tribal communities are founded and fed. Liberation in-here, arrived at and guaranteed by self-mindful action by the collective out-there, always was my socialist agenda. But it seems to me that my public writing has directly addressed liberation *per se* less than would have been proper. Thus at this stage of the game, engaged in retrospect, I feel bound to bring to bear whatever resources are available; and anyway, bricolage - jury-rigging a workable arrangement, with what's to-hand in prior practice - is a principle with me! So, dharma it is: it will repay this investment of time and trust, I'm sure.

A lot is written about culture in the public sphere (though often hawking it or trading on it, as *papanca*⁹, rarely facilitating mindfulness of the *force* or addictiveness of its movements). Compared with this there is relatively little about culture in the privatised social sphere of wage-work practice within organisations, once we set aside the large body of managerialist stuff, concerned with how we can be brought into motion as 'teams' or mobilised in the service of 'total quality' or have our creativity 'set free' for market-competitive purposes. For example, within my chosen professional sphere of activist-allies in the 90s (CSCW) we didn't professionally write about liberation, delusion, aversion, clinging, pleasant-feeling experiences, compassion and so on. We wrote about hands-on methods and tools and system- or conceptual-architectures. In a coded way, we addressed liberation and the production of the heart-mind while exploring negotiations and interactions in the workplace between people and people and things, in the interests of 'skill' and the 'support' of skill and 'cooperation'. After all, our professional world was laced with managerialist expectations too, and there wasn't that much of a market for writing on the pragmatics of liberation: Socialism in One information-systems design Project? We too - PMC radicals - had to get on with it, tote that barge, lift that bale, publish that paper, get that grant.

Liberation and the production of the heart-mind generates the deepest questions for facilitative practice. How may the changing of

9 *Papanca*: a key term of dharma insight, translating roughly as 'blather': pointless, wasteful mental and verbal traffic; churning of the mind; self-boosting monologue of the unaware, insistently-separated Self. We do it all the time, much of the time it passes for sociability.

work be done through the cultivation of open-hearted mutual recognition, through stepping outside the bubble of prejudice, habit and easy comfort? How may it be possible in practice, in actual settings and actual projects, to really operate, with skilful intention, under substantially different, safeguarded, presuppositions and agreements; and - as designers and facilitators of work-practice - to enable this? To what extent, in our repertoire of human-centred or participatory design and development practices in the 90s, were the positives of dharma-insight being cultivated and enacted: open-hearted kindness and regard (*mettā*), compassion (*karunā*), the capacity for joy and beauty (*muditā*), equanimity and resilience and moderation (*upekkhā*), the cessation of clinging (*upādāna* - 'fuel')?

Please don't imagine that I'm simply advocating buddhist ethics. Certainly, my own socialist politics is an ethically- and aesthetically-grounded one. But what is normally taught as ethics within buddhist traditions (one of the eight divisions of the 'eightfold path', which presents a number of precepts) is not what I mean to draw on most in the present context of theory-of-practice. I'm not so much concerned with encouraging people, in the context of reconfiguring wage-work, to be kind to one another and refrain from doing bad things. I'm concerned with organising liberatory practice, 'in the room', live, as we work together, so that greed, aversion and delusion are - as far as possible - not reproduced in the course of that action and its outcomes; and indeed, are systematically undermined and defended against, as steps towards the end of suffering. I'm addressing the dharma as a repository of facilitative 'organising' insights, and guides to skilful real-time doing.

This feathering-in of dharma insight is the most fragmentary thread of *Paid to Think*. I must stop minding about whether it looks bitty or half-formed (it does); the path must be opened and explored. Being a wage-working, professionally-publishing person myself through the 90s, there is relatively little in my public writing since LTW that works this territory. There is none that draws on dharma insights. So in this area - the field, especially, of the *Facilitation* volume¹⁰ - much of the necessary work lies in the new writing that will have to be done to 'wrap' the earlier, published stuff. Work is in progress, some of it here, on this page. Watch this space. Have hopes for the 2nd edition! Have hopes for the next generation . . .

*Seven Dials, Brighton
June 2017*

¹⁰ At the time of the present revision of this Preface, the *Facilitation* and *Earthmoving* volumes have been put on ice, and the facilitation agenda has been taken up by Rogers, as new writing, in *The Long March*.