A Noisy Welcome

The issue of Focus attempts to explain, if not the impossible, then at least the imponderable. Yet even if we have succeeded only in part in our aim of explaining how Sussex works we trust the result will be of some value both to those who are about to begin their first term and those who are coming back.

We extend a warm welcome to you all, and make no apologies for adding to the ingredients of this issue one or two meaty arguments certain to be the subject of debate during the coming term.

We print an unsorrowful obituary for Wine Press, the University's student newspaper that until the axe fell at the end of last term, was supported by a Union grant. Elsewhere a Sussex Tory deplores the action of a group of students who, also at the end of last term, prevented a speaker on Rhodesia from addressing a meeting.

Clearly both issues are Union matters and it is not for us to use this column for peddling our views on the rights and wrongs. What we do feel is that clarification of the present Union resolution on the question of visiting speakers is essential. Together with his Executive, the President, who tackles the problem in his article on another page, has the matter under consideration.

As for Wine Press, all we would say is that the loss of a means of communication, however well or badly it was thought to have done its job, must represent some loss to the community. Perhaps Union News will bridge some of the gap. So, too, perhaps, will the proposed internal TV news magazine programme, the successor to In Camera. Meanwhile Peter Brown, who was to have been this term's editor of Wine Press, has spent the vacation fund-raising, and hopes to produce a financially independent newspaper. We wish all these ventures well, along with the variety of publications such as The Mole, Insight and Sussex Student that represent every kind of view. Free speech is, after all, the noise of many voices. The noisier; the better.
THE PRESES FALL SILENT

by Paul Thompson

The last front page

At the last meeting of Union Council in the summer term, Wine Press, the Union’s ‘official’ newspaper, was effectively abolished by the overwhelming vote of 24 to 7. That such a major decision can be made by some 35 students out of 3,500 is an indictment of the Union structure in itself; that so few students were aware of the precise reasons behind the decision is not only tragic, but inevitably and directly related to the role of Wine Press as the predominant organ for the dissemination and processing of information within the Union.

Essentially, Wine Press has been discontinued because Union Council decided that it was no longer worth subsidising such a paper to the tune of £1,650 per annum (or ls. 10d. per copy), Thus it was costing the Union ls. 4d. for each copy even if sold - a pertinent point when one considers the piles of unsold copies which used to fill the Wine Press office. Moreover, costs were continually escalating and a salaried advertising manager had to be employed in order to cajole local cinemas and boutiques into purchasing space. Unlike the "Mole", the paper had consistently failed to break even, which could be taken as a reflection, both of the ‘value’ of Wine Press to the student body, and the dedication of its management. The money now freed will enable Schools to foster activities connected with their new-found identity, maintain Sports Federation expenditure, hasten the development of the Music Federation, as well as providing the financial basis of the Publications Loan Fund.

Aside from the purely economic, its content had developed into a peculiarly boring mixture of advertisements, inaccurate articles, ill-informed gossip, and sterile or highly predictable editorials. Never have I seen any discussion on the functions of higher education in our society, any original or conscious reflection on our educational practice, any attempt to understand the necessity and theoretical basis of our peculiar institution, or for that matter any article which related in a meaningful way to the student in his/her specific situation. Wine Press writers never managed to combine reportage with understanding - they could never fit the particular ‘event’ into the general scheme. Consequently, it became a receptacle for the drivel of social butterflies whose journalistic pretensions far outweighed their talent.

The management of the paper had always been entirely undemocratic, and although reorganization had been frequently suggested, no concrete proposals had emerged.

To 'democratize' it, to represent fairly every shade of opinion on campus, would have proved exceedingly impractical, and would have probably resulted in an exceedingly turgid and expensive publication.

Some have interpreted the iniquity of the "Save Wine Press" Union General Meeting at the end of last term as an indication of support for Council’s decision; others have attributed it to general apathy - itself a subject which would provide ample scope for a separate enquiry. But although it seems doubtful that the decision would have been reversed by a Union General Meeting, it was neither taken with the direct consent of the student body, nor with their participation in a full discussion. Indeed, at no time had the role of all the existing media within the University been fully analysed. The very existence rather than format or organization of the paper had seldom been questioned. Wine Press had become an institution, and its personnel had never been called upon to justify its expensive existence.

The last issue alone certainly justified its non-existence; The lead story ("The Presses Fall Silent") hardly served to enlighten the student masses as to the reasons behind the decision. It was in many ways the epitome of all Wine Press articles. Not only did it concentrate on attacking Dave Hallam, (a favourite target) describing in lurid detail how he lost three budgetary amendments, it managed quite brilliantly to report the Wine Press debate without quoting a single speaker in favour of the motion or giving a single reason why the decision had in fact been taken. The front page editorial provided a fitting and interesting obituary, - even though smeared about the role of "left-wing political groups" in the decision were too predictable to merit consideration. Startlingly naive to the last, Wine Press went down wailing that it was "...the only coherently independent voice on the campus, the only forum for free expression undistorted by the gnawing chains of doctrinaire policies..." - whatever these may be. Like Hegel's definition of freedom, 'independence' may consist of the recognition of its non-existence.

The only other item on the front page was characteristically worthless; after an exhaustive and scientific probe into the attitudes of finalists, (in which three girls and the ex-president of the Union were interviewed,) the reporter concluded that "satisfaction with the present form of course structure seemed quite general." In fact, Wine Press had always maintained a specific political line, a particular brand of pseudo-liberalism; thus it could be relied on to favour our pot, but not sit-ins, which might threaten the political structure of the University. The Wine Press line was sometimes overt and conscious, mostly subdued and implied, - often being reflected in the very selection of material or 'news' as well as the actual treatment of particular items - and was indeed perhaps developed in an attempt to appeal to the widest readership. In trying to 'please' everyone, it became worthless and pleased no-one - and we are paying ls.10d. for the privilege.

The abolition of Wine Press marks the beginning of an attempt to get the media at Sussex understood and organized; certainly, plenty of reorganization in other spheres of the Union is required. But one thing is certain - diseased institutions like Wine Press will have no place in the new scheme of things.

The first sacred cow has been slaughtered -- but has not the whole herd been a little contaminated?
One day this summer they moved a piece of Sussex history. This temporarily mobile terrapin, uprooted from opposite the Arts Centre, was once upon a time the Vice-Chancellor's office. Below Professor David Daiches recalls the ideas and ideals that launched the University, and examines how far that early vision matches the reality of Sussex in 1969.

I first heard of the University of Sussex almost a year before it came formally into existence. It was, oddly enough, in the bar of the Ritz Hotel, Hyderabad, India, and my informant was Asa Briggs, then Professor of History at the University of Leeds. I had come to India from Cambridge (where I was then teaching), to give refresher courses on English Literature to Indian university teachers, and Asa Briggs was giving courses in History with the same function. He had been in Australia, and came to India from there. We had never met before, though we knew each other by reputation.

We first met in a state of great fatigue after a hot day of lecturing, talking informally with innumerable university lecturers and students, facing persuasive Indians with theses in their pockets which they wanted us to read and to help get published, or with brothers or cousins whom they wanted us to help to get into Oxford or Cambridge.

We gravitated towards the air-conditioned bar of the hotel in which we were both staying, and there we introduced ourselves to each other and started some quiet drinking and talking. As the evening progressed, Professor Briggs became more and more eloquent about the prospects for the new University of Sussex, to which he had already promised to go as Dean of the School of Social Studies when it opened the following October. I had heard vaguely that there was to be a new university in or near Brighton, but had no knowledge of its plans for re-organising the curriculum.

In Professor Briggs's persuasive picture of the great opportunity of "re-drawing the map of learning", I saw a most exciting vision of a really fruitful academic reform that corresponded closely to some of my own hopes and ideas. I realised what a tremendous opportunity it would be to be in at the founding of a new university, confined by no traditions or vested interests, free to plan the structure of the courses in the way that seemed most appropriate and most educationally profitable at this moment of history. It did not occur to me that I myself might be involved in this process - I considered myself pretty well settled in Cambridge, after a long spell in the United States - so it was out of purely disinterested curiosity that I asked Professor Briggs about plans for English studies and engaged in a conversation on this aspect of the curriculum in which he elicited my own views.

On my return to Cambridge, John Fulton, Vice-Chancellor elect of the new university, who had heard from Professor Briggs of our Hyderabad conversation, wrote to me to ask if I would be interested in joining the pioneering Sussex team as Professor of English and Dean of the School of English (not yet English and American) Studies. I thought about it for a long time, but I eventually said yes, and I have never regretted my decision.

Exciting

There followed exciting days. We would meet at weekends in John Fulton's house in Hove - Asa Briggs, Martin Wight, Patrick Corbett and myself - to work out the main principles of the University's academic structure. We were still working at our previous jobs, but we devoted all our leisure time to planning for the positions we were to take up in October. We wrote memoranda and circulated them to each other. We drew on our combined experience of many different universities to try and profit from every relevant academic experience. And I should mention that between us we covered a lot of ground. I myself had started at Edinburgh (where I was also assistant lecturer for one year) then went on to Oxford, where I had had a research fellowship, then taught for five years at the University of Chicago and for another five at Cornell University, before returning to Britain to a teaching position and a fellowship at Cambridge. From each of these universities I had learned something, both positively and negatively. There were things I wanted to avoid and things I wanted to adopt or adapt. I would stress this, because it is important to realise that the Sussex scheme was not the product of airy theorising,
but was deeply grounded in the richly varied experience of the Founding Fathers as well as in their pressing sense of the needs of the times. Apart from my experience in Scotland, England and America, I have lectured and talked to professors and students in Paris, Rome, Berlin, Bonn, Frankfurt, Budapest, Belgrade, Oslo, Helsinki, Zürich, Moscow, Leningrad and Manila, to pick out only a few. I have talked with protesting students in Bologna and discussed their grievances with Hong Kong undergraduates. And I still think that in the shape of its curriculum, the nature of its faculty-student relationship, and the qualities of mind that it seeks to develop and encourage, the University of Sussex ranks right at the very top.

Of course, it has faults; of course, many of our dreams have not been realised in quite the way we expected; of course, there have been frustrations and disappointments. But I do want to stress, speaking as someone who knows the international university scene better than most, that in spite of this, there is no other university where I would rather be and none which comes closer to my ideal of what a university should be.

Affirmation

I make this affirmation, and I deliberately link it to what may seem vainglorious remarks about my own experience, because I am anxious to emphasise that most of the conditions which precipitated student revolts in other countries were deliberately avoided by the planners of Sussex. Whatever demands students may have made in later stages of protest, led by the inner dynamic of the protest movement they had started, the fact remains that we do not suffer from the faults that originally provoked these protests; we do not have the enormous undergraduate classes with impersonal lecturers that they have at Berkeley; we do not have several thousand students of English and only eight members of the faculty to teach them as they have at Bonn; we have none of the extraordinary abuses that so properly anger both students and young faculty members in Italian universities; we have none of the problems of the Sorbonne, with its huge student population and distant and impersonal teaching methods; we are less rank-conscious than any university I know; and we have a coherent philosophy of knowledge behind our curriculum which, however imperfectly it may be embodied in our actual teaching and learning, is related to an awareness of the place of knowledge in society and a sense of the "relevance" (to use that modish word) of academic studies to the realities of the human situation.

We have grown very fast, and this rapid growth brought problems that some of us had not anticipated. It is an easy matter to organise a tutorial system on a college basis, as they do in Oxford and Cambridge, where the Director of Studies in a given subject in a particular college only has a handful of students to deal with. But when one deliberately refuses to adopt the college system and at the same time takes over the Oxbridge tutorial system, the problem arises of organising tutorials on an enormous scale. It had never occurred to us that one reason why the Oxbridge tutorial system was so easy to administer was that it was operated by individual colleges. And then the carefully worked-out pattern of our curriculum. It looked splendid on paper, with all sorts of fruitful combinations and permutations made available to the student. But the proliferation of courses that this gave rise to and the almost insurmountable problem of examining in them all (whatever examination method you choose), were not properly anticipated by us. These are technical problems, problems of management and organisa-

tion, and I do not think that we have solved them all yet. And they affect the academic side too, because there is always a danger of fragmentation when different courses, planned originally to complement each other in the closest way, become by administrative necessity, wholly independent. Then again, the Sussex "core and context" idea involves surrounding real specialised work in a major subject with the study of other subjects which illuminate, and in turn are illuminated by the major subject. We originally said that the Sussex degree was an "honours degree plus", not a "honours degree minus" - meaning that our students did in their major work all that they would do in a conventional single-subject honours course, and in addition they would have their contextual subjects. But this, in fact, is not possible in three years.

Higher education, certainly in literary and philosophical subjects, needs leisure if it is to take proper root; time is needed for reflection, discussion, reading around a subject. One solution might be to let students do all their serious reading in vacations and devote their terms to discussing and elaborating on what they have read. But I know that many students have to take jobs in vacations, so this is not always practicable. I am not complaining that our students are overworked - they work less than good American students and most continental students - but that they are under continuous pressure, which is not quite the same thing.

In literary studies, I'd like them to read much more than they do, some of it very rapidly. I do not think that a book should be read only because an essay has to be written on it or because it will help in the writing of an essay on another book or topic. I would like to see the whole pace a bit slower - but so that students could do more, not less work, and that teachers could be relieved of the constant pressure to take their pupils at a smart trot through the significant ideas involved in a given work or subject. The tutorial system works inefficiently under pressure. So ideally, I should like a four-year course, with more time en route for reading, reflecting and talking. But I know that under present economic conditions this is quite impossible.

Faults

So we have our faults and our problems. But they are pretty minor compared with those of most universities in the world. I sometimes think that students who come up to Sussex, with its curiously illogical combination of establishment image and reputation for being new and rebellious, fail to realise what a different and what an interesting place it is. After all, it is the only university they know, and if the fashion is to protest it is not difficult to find something in Sussex to protest about. When I described the Sussex system to a student at Budapest, she said she couldn't believe it: "It's like a fairy-tale; in real life no university could do that," she said. It is no accident that some of our most enthusiastic students have been foreign students, from Germany, France and Yugoslavia. And this is my final point, in looking back over eight years of the University of Sussex. The present student generation is anti-historical and seems little interested in knowing how things came to be the way they are. Sussex is now old enough to be regarded by its undergraduates as a well- dug-in establishment institution, like any other establishment institution. But it is only eight years since its founding made academic history and less than that since its curriculum was the subject of excited discussion all over the world. I wish we could keep that excitement, and keep it geared to a knowledge and appreciation of the Sussex way of doing things, and a determination to keep making it better.
COUNCIL
The University's governing body responsible for management and administration of finances and property. Chairman of Council is Dr. S.M. Caffyn, who is Chairman of Caffyn's Motors. Twenty-six out of the Council's thirty-five members are lay members, some of whom are appointed by Local Authorities. The other nine are members of Senate appointed by Senate. Functioning essentially as a check and balance to other committees, Council meetings, which take place not more than twice a term, tend to be brisk and cheerful. Deans and other section heads such as the Librarian, often give talks to Council about their work and developments in their areas.

planning committee
Finding out where the real power lies is a favourite Sussex exercise. It's like trying to find out which is the key link in a chain. However, some pundits plump for Planning. Its twenty-six members under the Chairmanship of the Vice-Chancellor co-ordinate both academic and financial management and development of the University. Planning Committee examines the needs of Schools and units, ensures a degree of conformity, approves changes in organisation and structure, approves annual budgetary allocations and receives proposals from the major "area" committees - Arts and Social Studies, Science and Social Policy. In overseeing University strategy as a whole, Planning Committee has the onerous task of balancing desire for growth against available resources. Membership includes the Deans of the Schools, five lay members and six members elected by Senate.

discipline committee
for details see p. 18

arts & social studies com./ science committee
Under the organisation of the University the two main academic areas, Arts and Social Studies, and Science exercise control over their academic, administrative and financial affairs within the framework of Planning Committee and Senate. Under the Chairmanship of the Chairmen of Arts and Science respectively, these two committees are responsible for the day-to-day running of their areas, for the drawing-up of strategic plans, considering recommendations from the Schools on matters such as curricula, course structure and proposals for new Majors. All Deans and some subject chairmen are members of these committees, which also hear reports from most of the University's research centres and units. Students may be invited to attend for certain items, and agendas of both committees are posted on School Bulletin Boards.

social policy committee
The Social Policy Committee advises the Senate and Council on all social and cultural matters. A typical Social Policy agenda might include such disparate topics as car-parking, discipline, utilisation of Park Houses and a report by the Director of the Health Service. Last year, the Chairman of Social Policy was the Senior Tutor. This year the Senior Tutor, who has been to cut across all areas, and thus a separate Chairman of Social Policy has been appointed. He is responsible for the co-ordination of all activities within the social area. The thirty-seven members of the Social Policy Committee include the heads of the University's social services such as Health, Appointments, Sport, the Arts Centre, etc. Historically an area in which there has been a strong student representation since the University's foundation, the Social Policy Committee has a higher proportion of student members than any committee other than Discipline.

The above committees have across the board responsibilities. For a view of the University's organisation at school level see page 12.
who's who and what

Prof. A. BRIGGS
As Vice-Chancellor, Professor Asa Briggs is the one person in the University who cannot pass the buck. Said to have a photographic memory and can recite from documents days after reading them. Simultaneously took First-Class Honours in History and Economics at Cambridge and London respectively. Educated at Keighly Grammar School. Has taught at Oxford and Leeds. Professor of History at Sussex since 1961. Dean of School of Social Studies 1961-65. Succeeded Lord Fulton as Vice-Chancellor 1967.

Prof. B. SUPPLE
An Chairman of Arts and Social Studies. Professor Barry Supple controls overall expenditure in that area, and co-ordinates on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor and the Planning Committee the planning of its teaching and research activities. Came to Sussex in 1962 as lecturer in history; promoted to Reader the following year and to the Chair of Economic and Social History in 1965. L.S.E. graduate, was teaching at Harvard and McGill before coming to Sussex. Published History of American Railways in 19th Century. Now working on a History of Insurance.

Prof. C. EABORN
Professor Colia Eaborn was one of the first four Professors of science to be appointed to Sussex in 1962. Dean of the School of Molecular Sciences for the first three years of its existence he became Chairman of Science in April 1968, and his responsibilities in that area are similar to those of Professor Supple in Arts and Social Studies. A member of the Chemistry Committee of the Science Research Council and Hon. Sec. of The Chemical Society. Has published book on organosilicon compounds.

Mr. J. MANGOLD
The Bursar, Mr. John Mangold, advises the Vice-Chancellor and the Buildings Committee on the physical development of the University. He is responsible for the maintenance of buildings and grounds and for bursarial services such as mail and telephones. Came to Sussex in 1963 from the University of Nigeria, where he was Bursar. Before that he was with the B.B.C. for thirteen years, working in a variety of fields including lecturer in acoustics, management consultancy, engineering, establishment office and organisation and methods.

Mr. C. de N. HILL
Mr. C. de N. Hill, as Deputy Bursar and Business Manager, is responsible to the Bursar for the University's business enterprises such as catering conferences, the Bookshop, residential accommodation and printing supplies. He also has responsibility for planning and implementing the building programme. Appointed in 1964 after a long career as an Overseas Civil Servant, during which he served as a District Officer in Nigeria and Permanent Secretary to the Treasury in Tanganyika.

Prof. P. RIVETT
Chairman for Social Policy, and as such Chairman of the Social Policy Committee, Professor Pat Rivett is responsible, on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor and Planning Committee and with the Senior Tutor, for coordinating links, planning and development throughout the Social Policy area. Professor of Operational Research. Came from Lancaster in 1967. Research interests incorporate planning and finance. Also holds Chair of Operational Research at University of Pennsylvania.
Mr. A. E. SHIELDS
Mr. A. E. Shields has been the Registrar of the University since its foundation. After Lord Fulton, he was the first member of staff to be appointed, and in 1960 he was already working on the Charter and the initial building plans. As Registrar, he is Secretary to the Court, Council, Senate and Planning Committee, and is responsible for the general administration of the University. Previously Registrar of Rhodes University, South Africa, and before that, in the Indian Civil Service.

Mr. G. LOCKWOOD
As Planning Officer, Mr. Geoffrey Lockwood co-ordinates and reports on the logistic and strategic implications of plans proposed by Subjects, Schools and Units. Advises the V.C. on all planning and organisational matters. A Yorkshireman, educated at Bailey Grammar School and the London School of Economics, he came to Sussex in 1961 from Manchester University and was appointed Planning Officer in 1965. Consultant to OECD and UNESCO. Has written papers and articles for OECD, IIEP, Universities Quarterly, etc.

Mr. R. HOWARD
Mr. Raymond Howard is a man with a £3 million-a-year headache. As Finance Officer, he is responsible for keeping the University's books straight, advises Senate and Council on financial matters, and, under the direction of Planning Committee, prepares budgets for the various University areas, and sees that they are adhered to. After Local Authority service at Eastbourne, Rochester and Orpington, he was appointed Accountant to the University in 1961, a post redesignated Finance Officer two years later.

Mr. E. COX
Mr. Edwin Cox, Admissions Officer is responsible to the Registrar and Admissions Committee for undergraduate admissions and registration. Also, as Assistant to the Senior Tutor, has responsibilities to him for administrative work involved in that post. Formerly General Secretary of United Nations Student Association, Mr. Cox was educated at Manchester Grammar School and Sheffield University. Joined Sussex in 1965, appointed Admissions Officer in 1967.

Mr. M. GRIFFITH
Mr. Mel Griffith, Secretary of Arts and Social Studies, heads the Arts and Social Studies office. Seconded from the Registrar's staff, he has operating responsibility to the Chairman of Arts and Social Studies and is secretary of the Arts and Social Studies Committee and Arts Deans' Committee. First came to Sussex in 1964 from Bristol University. Seconded in December 1965 to work in Nairobi where he was Chief Academic Administrator until returning to Sussex in June this year.

Mr. R. NIND
The duties of Mr. Robert Nind, Secretary of Science, are equivalent to those of the Secretary of Arts (see left), servicing the corresponding committees on the science side. Mr. Nind joined Sussex in 1965 as administrative assistant to the now defunct School of Physical Sciences. Appointed Assistant Registrar in 1967, he became Secretary of Science the following year. Before coming to Sussex taught Physics at Sir Thomas Rich's School, Gloucestershire, where he was educated, and to which he returned after taking a Physics degree at King's College, London.
Dr. B. ENRIGHT
Dr. Brain Enright came to Sussex as Librarian in February this year, after four years as Librarian of the City University. A firm believer that libraries should utilise modern technological aids such as videotape, micro-film. Worked for eight years at the Bodleian, Oxford, then moved to House of Commons Library where he became Senior Library Clerk. In 1962 moved to the B.B.C. to take charge of the Television Film Library, where he had to catalogue two million feet of film a month. Left the B.B.C. for the City University in 1965.

Mr. I. KERR
Mr. Ian Kerr came to Sussex as Assistant Appointments Officer in 1966. After serving as Acting Appointments Officer from April 1968, was confirmed as Appointments Officer in April this year. Previously Senior Course Tutor at the National Institute of Industrial Psychology, where he also undertook vocational guidance work. Has been a teacher and worked in import-export business in the Far East. Regards his first duty as providing a counselling service to help students with career development problems.

Dr. A. RYLE
Dr. Anthony Ryle was appointed Director of the University Health Service in 1964, after working as a G.P. in a London Group Practice and as a Clinical Assistant in Psychiatry. His publications include 'Neuroses in the Ordinary Family' and he has just published 'Student Casualties' - the product of one of his main research interests - the relationship of academic and psychiatric problems. Responsible for the administration and development of a medical and health service for students.

Miss N. WILSON
When Miss Norma Wilson was appointed Accommodation Officer in 1962, there was a queue of students waiting to greet her - with complaints! In those days she had to cope single-handed. Now has a staff of four to help her inspect, register and allocate student accommodation, But coming to Sussex was based in Cyprus as W.V.S. administrator responsible for finding living and working accommodation for W.V.S. members throughout Middle East. Went to run a hostel for five hundred nurses in Vancouver. Then W.V.S. cabled an S.O.S. asking her to return to Cyprus at the time of the crisis.

Dr. M. FORD-SMITH
Dr. Michael Ford-Smith has just taken over as Senior Proctor. Came to Sussex in 1963 from the National Chemical Laboratory at Teddington, Middlesex. During his term of office one year, renewable for a further year - he will be carrying on with his normal academic duties. His particular research interest lies in Inorganic Reaction Mechanisms and in collaboration with a Visiting Professor, is writing a book on Inorganic Chemistry. Dr. Ford-Smith has been married for two-and-a-half years and his wife, whom he met at the University, is a Sussex graduate.

Mr. D. OLDFIELD
Derek Oldfield begins his term of office as Senior Tutor at a time when the social fabric of the University is being spread wider and tighter. With comprehensive new responsibilities, he heads a team that will co-ordinate academic and social activity, recognising that the two fields are not simply related, but indivisible. The function of the Senior Tutor will be to knit together a support system of Sub-Deans, Personal Tutors, School Speakers, the Health, Appointments, Admissions and Accommodation Services into a linked, University-wide Counselling Service, offering advice to both students and faculty.
In a tutorial University like Sussex, there are a variety of ways in which the individual may become involved in its running. Sitting on a committee happens to be one method, but clearly student representation and participation is not to be measured solely in quantitative terms. Therefore the chart below needs to be seen in the context of other and less formal involvements of both faculty and students in University business. Students have sat on committees since the University's foundation in 1961. Over the last eight years this involvement has developed pragmatically by regular marginal changes, and in the light of experience. Again last year, following the annual review of the University's business, changes have been made. Below is the picture as it stands for 1969/70.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE</th>
<th>total members</th>
<th>student members</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SENATE</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Increased from October 1969 to include the nine School Speakers and two post-graduates as well as the Union President and Vice-President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNCIL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Union President and Vice-President attend by invitation and may be asked to withdraw for specific items such as faculty salaries etc., though this has never happened yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Union President, Vice-President and one other student. Students now full members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL POLICY</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS &amp; SOC. STUDIES</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Senate last term discussed representation on these committees. In the light of difficulties in size of these committees, it decided against formal representation, but suggested that both committees invite students for specific items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDINGS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCIPLINE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL MEETING</td>
<td>all faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>All student members of the Joint Committee are members of the School Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL JOINT COM.</td>
<td>not more than 12</td>
<td>not more than 6</td>
<td>For precise School memberships and variations in structure see section on Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT GROUP</td>
<td>all faculty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Subject groups are encouraged to invite students to informal meetings and, in appropriate cases, to formal meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One result of the McKinsey reorganisation, with its streamlining of the University committee structure, was the disappearance of a number of committees vested with responsibilities for specific services such as Accommodation, Health Service, Catering and the Library. Areas like these now have formal links with the Planning Committee. However, it was felt that there should exist, in addition to these formal ties, a system of informal consultation through which all members of the University could bring their views to the notice of Directors and heads of services. The Senate therefore asked each individual responsible for major services or activities to set up what might be called his own Consumer Association, through which he could keep in touch with student and faculty opinion, and which he could call on for advice.

Contact
The existence of these Consultative Groups does not, of course, preclude any individual from contacting direct heads of services, nor from making use of any other existing means of communication and participation for putting forward proposals, asking for information and lodging complaints.

We give below the memberships of the various Consultative Groups so that, if the occasion arises, any member of the University may approach a representative on a Group.

At a meeting last June of Group Chairmen, the Chairman of the Union Council, pointing out the difficulties of finding students to represent the Union on some Groups suggested the possibility of basing membership on School Joint Committees. The proposal that Chairmen might co-opt, for an experimental period of one year, a representative from each School Joint Committee, is now to be discussed within the Groups.
**Group membership**

Miss Barbara Burton (Library Faculty); AFRAS: Mr. G.F. Rehin; EAM: Dr. E.P. Hemnock; EURP: Dr. M. McCowan; Dr. B. Harris; BIO.SCI: Dr. J.L. Hall; MAPS: Mr. G.B. Trustram; Tessor T. Elkins; Dr. M.S. Halliday; Mr. B. Chibnall; Mr. N. Mackenzie; R. Fry; Mr. P. Gimmings; Miss M. Henry; Mr. B. Jackson; Miss S. Trueplock.

Mr. J. Venables; Mr. A. Goldman (Deputy Senior Tutors); Mr. B. Leahy (Registrar); Mr. C. Hill (Deputy Bursar); Mr. R. Howard (Finance Officer); Dr. J. Rosselli; CCS: Mr. J. Simmonds; EAM: Mrs. M. Winkler; R.T. Wood; APP.SCI: Dr. R.D. Doherty; BIO.SCI: Dr. K.A. Wise; MOL.SCI: Dr. R.D. Guthrie. Students: Six students appointed by the Union.

Mrs. D.P.J. Wood; CCS: Mrs. M. Winkler; EAM: Dr. T.J. Diffey; Dr. T.W. Leggett; APP.SCI: Dr. A.W. Simpson; BIO.SCI: Professor Turner; MOL.SCI: Mr. R.W. Dott. Students: The Union to appoint four L.H.S. staff.

Mr. B. Smith and Mr. P. Bishop (members of the Sports Federation Committee); Dr. B. Jayawant, Dr. P.J. Dauber and Dr. M.A. Tribe (Staff Association); Mr. G. Hammel (Technical Staff) Manager.)

Vice-geress): Mrs. D. Martin (Assistant Catering Manageress); Miss V. (Social Policy members); Mr. L. Ricketts and Dr. R. Taylor (S.C.R. (Staff Association); Mr. K. Pike (Technical Staff); Mr. J. Mangold (Student members to be appointed by the Union for 1969/70.)

Vice-gerger): Alderman W.P. Lebbon (Councillor); Dr. J.F. Pickering (Senate); W. Schullkind (Arts and Social Studies Committee); Professor R.W. Cahn (Committee); Mr. W.H. Chaine (Assistant Bookshop Manager); Mr. J. J. J. Murray (Union Secretary); one other member to be elected.

Vice-gerger): Mr. L. Healy (Musical Director); Mr. G.H. Moore and Dr. A. Committee): Professors R.W. Cahn and J.H. Sang; Mr. M.S. Jamieson (Mangold (Bursar); Mr. J. Thomas (University Surveyor and Engineer). Mr. R. Fry (Vice-President) and four other for 1969/70.

Vice-gerger): Miss N. Tidmarsh (Librarian); Mr. G. Lockwood (Vice-Presidents selected by the Director to cover as wide a range of subjects and Black); Dr. K. Bliss; Mr. M.G. Brown; Dr. J.W. Chapman; Mr. S.B. Pryce; Mr. T.R. Sexton; Dr. M.A. Tribe; Dr. A.J. Weir; Mrs. M.

**Remarks**

Group to meet once a term. A member of the Library faculty will attend School and Subject meetings to discuss issues related to these Groups.

Group to meet once a year, but termly meetings to be arranged with President of the Union, Disciplinary Officers and student Guest House representatives.

Liaison Tutors have been chosen by the Schools. They meet termly to discuss principles and details of U.H.S. role in relation to the Schools.

To meet preferably twice a term. Members of Registrar's, Bursar's and Finance Officer's staffs and Permanent Secretary of Sports Federation to attend.

To meet at least once a term. The Group is additional to Bookshop Manager's working relationships with Schools. It is hoped that School and Subject Groups will nominate faculty to liaise.

To meet at least once a term. An Arts Centre Board has now been established.

To meet once a term. The Group to act as link with faculty who have proposals of projects to put to Centre for inclusion in programme.

Main Group to meet at least once a year. Consultative Group to meet once a term.

To meet once a year to discuss that year's ceremonies.
HOW THE SCHOOLS WORK

Within certain provisos, Schools of Studies may alter their internal forms of government and some have indeed done so. However, any such change must be approved by the School Meeting. In addition, any changes that alter the responsibilities and memberships of Schools, School Meetings or School Joint Committees as outlined below, require the approval of the Planning Committee and the Senate.

**arts & social studies and science committee**

**school speaker**
The School Speaker is the student who receives the most votes in elections for the School Joint Committee. He is the senior spokesman for all students in the School and sits on the Senate.

**students**

**tutor**

**ad-hoc working parties**
Schools may establish ad-hoc working parties to enquire into and report on any matters relevant to the School. Recommendations are made to the School Meeting.

**school meeting**
All members of faculty and all student members of the School Joint Committee are members of the School Meeting. Formal meetings take place at least once, and in the Spring term, twice a term. School Meetings discuss relevant academic and non-academic matters, making recommendations to the Arts and Social Studies or Science Committee, or to the appropriate committee or officer. On matters entirely internal, School Meetings make recommendations to the Dean, who is ex-officio chairman of the School Meeting and who has sole executive authority within a School.

**subject meeting**
There are 31 formally recognised Subject Groups, and faculty teaching those subjects - see list - are eligible to attend meetings at which all aspects of that subject's academic work are discussed. Subject Meetings nominate spokesmen to represent Subject views and explain Subject policies to School Meetings as and when the occasion arises. Formal Subject Meetings, under the chairmanship of the Subject Chairman, are held at least once, and in the Autumn term, twice a term. Informal meetings may be held any time at which Subjects are encouraged to have student opinion represented. Students may also be invited to attend formal meetings for specific items. Subject Chairmen are appointed by the Arts and Social Studies or Science Committees after having been chosen by Professors and Readers in their Subject.

**subject groups**
- Arts and Social Studies: American Studies; Development Psychology; Economics; English; French; Geography; German; History; History and Theory of Art; International Relations; Italian; Law; Mathematics; Philosophy; Politics; Religious Studies; Russian and Russian Studies; Social Anthropology; Social Psychology; Sociology. Science: Biochemistry; Biology; Chemistry; Electrical, Electronic and Control Engineering; Experimental Psychology; Materials Science; Mathematics; Mechanical Engineering; Logic; History and Policy of Science; Operational Research; Physics.

Graduate Studies: in the Science Schools some studies and subjects are responsible for Graduate Studies. In Arts the Graduate Division is responsible to the Arts and Social Studies Graduate Committee.
Brief-in/School by School

African & Asian Studies

Prof. D. A. Low
In the five years since its foundation the School of African and Asian Studies has become, together with the University's Institute of Development Studies with which it has close links, one of the largest concentrations concerned with the study of Africa and India in this country. Being an integral school within the University, it suffers from none of the disadvantages of similar specialist institutions at other universities which tend to feel disassociated from the parent body.
As a result, the Dean, Professor Anthony Low, confidently expects to continue to attract the best students and faculty, and academically the School has, in each year of its existence, returned a higher proportion of Firsts and Upper Second degrees than Lower Seconds or Thirds.

Prof. Low spent several weeks during the past vacation in India, working in the National Archives of India in New Delhi. Between 1952 and 1958 he taught history at Makerere University College, Uganda, and several of his former pupils have been and are Cabinet Ministers in East Africa. Professor Low has just published "Government Archives in South Asia: A Guide to National and State Archives in Ceylon, India and Pakistan" and has now sent to press a volume of essays on the modern history of Buganda.

Applied Sciences

Prof. J. West
Professor John West has been Dean of the School of Applied Sciences since it was founded in 1965. He is also the University’s Pro-Vice-Chancellor, acting as the Vice-Chancellor’s deputy when he is absent.

Prof. West has written several books on industrial automation, which is his research interest, and has worked in consultation with A. E. I./G. E. C. on control of electrical machinery. He has also worked with British Nylon Spinners on the automation of the production of yarn and is a Director of the Inter-University Institute of Engineering Control. The School, which has 380 undergraduates and 40 post-graduates, has acquired since its foundation in 1965, a national reputation for its teaching and research work in engineering.

A third of the country’s aspiring engineers apply to Sussex, says John West, and he could fill the School twice over without difficulty. Apart from its academic reputation, the School has pioneered its own structure regarding faculty/student relationships, having formed a School Joint Committee long before such a structure was written into the organisation of business.

School government follows the laid-down pattern, with a School Meeting and S.C.J., and there have been no changes in structure. The sense of professional identification within the School is a strong one. All students take a common engineering course over the first two years, which is welcomed by industry, and graduates find little difficulty in obtaining employment.

Biological Sciences

Prof. Maynard-Smith
In the saddle since 1965, when the School of Biological Sciences accepted its first forty pupils, Professor John Maynard Smith had to wait until last June for the official opening ceremony. By then the School covered 70,000 square feet and 35 faculty were teaching 339 undergraduates.
Indeed, the School has multiplied almost with the speed of Professor Maynard Smith’s fruit flies, which he uses in his research connected with the causes of ageing. His other main research interest is in the theory of evolution, and he has published a Penguin on that subject. He is a frequent television and radio broadcaster. A scientist with a social conscience, he encourages students to become concerned with the history of their subject, but does not believe that everything needs to be put in a syllabus before it can be discussed.

This year’s School business will be conducted according to the book—School Meetings, School Joint Committee, etc. He hopes to see the informal talks that have been held between faculty and students at the end of a Course increased and will once again be making facilities available for the School Speaker to address students for ten minutes or so before a lecture "so he can have a captive audience".

Following the B.Sc. Preliminary Working Party Report, Prelim exams will be held at the end of the Spring term. An increased amount of Biology will be taught, which will integrate with the later course, and Biochemistry will be taught from the beginning of Prelims. A short-answer paper has been introduced so that candidates will know whether they have passed or failed before going down. Grading will be based on the essay papers.
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FOCUS ON THE SCHOOLS...

CULTURAL & COMMUNITY STUDIES

Prof. R. B. FORD

Founded in 1964, and the youngest of the nine Sussex Schools, the School of Educational Studies is also one of the first to change its name. It is to be known as the School of Cultural and Community Studies. As a small School of around 170 undergraduates, it has an intimacy and sense of unity that larger Schools find more difficult to create. The Common room really is a social centre, with its catering services run by students, and the same enthusiasm resulted in an appeal for "sponsors" for freshmen being heavily oversubscribed. In addition, a "Brief-in" has been organised to put freshmen in the Sussex "political" picture.

Professor Boris Ford, Dean of the School since its creation, is the author of numerous publications, including "Teacher's Handbook to Human Rights", "Liberal Education in a Technical Age" and editor of the Pelican Guide to English Literature.

During the last year, a School Working Party recommended that the School Prelim paper should be either three-hour unseen or 24-hour. The School Meeting accepted the suggestion. Now, for this year, assessment will be by essay. Student representation on the School Meeting was increased from three to six, thus allowing all student members of the School Joint Committee to sit on the School Meeting. A Music major has been introduced for this year, and once again discussion sessions for first, second and third years are planned for the Isle of Thorns.

ENGLISH & AMERICAN STUDIES

R. P. C. MUTTER

R. P. C. Mutter has been Dean of the School of English and American Studies since August 1968, having previously spent a year as Acting Dean. He came to Sussex in 1962 after eight years teaching at King's College, University of London, and has been a visiting Professor at the universities of California, Pittsburgh and Victoria. His main academic interests are in eighteenth-century English literature, and in American literature, but he has taught fourteen different courses in the School. His publications include editions of works by Spenser, Pope and Fielding, as well as numerous articles and reviews.

The School of English and American Studies has changed a good deal over the last seven years. In 1962, over 75% of the School's hundred-odd undergraduates were majoring in English, but the range of the School has broadened with its growth; in 1968 it was one of the largest of the Arts Schools, with over 340 undergraduates in eight majors. English no longer dominates to anything like the same extent.

The School Joint Committee was active throughout last year, and organised an all day teach-in, called "School under Scrutiny", at which papers were presented for discussion by students and faculty. School working parties on Prelims and on the Arts-Science Scheme have been sitting throughout the year, and have recently reported. The former recommended changes in the assessment of Prelims will replace the School three-hour examination paper, while the latter have made proposals for the Arts-Science studies more closely integrated with the undergraduates' other work.

EUROPEAN STUDIES

Prof. T. ELKINS

Professor Tom Elkins has just taken over from Professor Martin Wight as Dean of the School of European Studies, a position he has held since the foundation of the School and, for that matter, the University, in 1961.

Professor Elkins, a graduate of L. S. E., has specialised in the study of city growth in Western Europe and its effects on rural areas.

Publications include a book called "Germany". Professor Elkins came from Kings College, London, to take the Chair in Geography at Sussex in 1963.

The School of European Studies, with more than 300 undergraduates, offers eighteen majors, more than any other School, and a new major in Intellectual History is to be introduced this year.

This coming term, proposals for change in School organisation will be presented for approval to the Planning Committee. Proposals include a reconstituted Joint Committee made up of four School Officers, including the Dean and Sub-Dean, four elected faculty and four students. It is proposed that this committee meets regularly and informally both to advise and to inform the Dean on currents of School opinion. All student members of the School Joint Committee have been co-opted onto the School Meeting. A Working Party proposed one-third student representation of students on the School Meeting. After discussion it was agreed that there should be a maximum of eighteen, five students from each year and three post-graduates.

Once again, this recommendation is to be submitted to the Planning Committee for approval.
...AND THEIR DEANS

MATHEMATICAL & PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Prof. K. F. SMITH
Professor Ken Smith took over the Deanship of the School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences following the resignation of his predecessor in January of this year. He came to take the Chair of Experimental Physics at Sussex from Cambridge in 1962, and his particular research interest lies in the interaction of radiation with atoms. Since coming to Sussex he has been closely concerned with the University’s disciplinary structure. He was the first Chairman of the Disciplinary Committee and 1 Chairman of the Working Party that drew up the revised 1969-70 disciplinary scheme. Within the School, a School Assembly which all members of the School including technicians and typists are entitled to attend has been set up and three meetings held to date. The Assembly Executive is an enlarged School Joint Committee now composed of 10 elected Student Members and 11 faculty including Professor Smith, 6 of whom are elected. The Chairman of the Joint Committee is a student, School Speaker Stephen Benda. The S.J.C. is expected to meet fortnightly and has already proved active. It has set up a working party to examine the effectiveness of tutorials, and has put forward a suggestion that a School guide book should be produced and has given its backing to the publication of a regular School Bulletin. The School Meeting remains the ultimate decision-making authority.

MOLECULAR SCIENCES

Prof. J. MURRELL
When Professor John Murrell, Dean of the School of Molecular Sciences, welcomes the eighty freshers, sixty of them will be chemists. However, the School is in a period of transition and Chemistry will play a less dominant role when the new majors in Biochemistry and Polymer Science are introduced in 1970. Competition amongst universities for well-qualified chemistry sixth-formers is fierce. Last year, the School started to interview candidates from the north of England in Manchester, and this experiment is to be repeated.

The School has space problems for its research, which will be eased once the Stage III Building and Agricultural Research Unit Building - total cost £350,000. - are added to the complex, but construction will not start until April 1971. The School Joint Committee has been very active over the last year, amongst other things, organising a weekend discussion on careers for Final year students. It has also instituted informal discussions between students and faculty on social and scientific matters which will take place in the School Common Room once a month during the coming year.

As a result of growing demand among employers and students for the inclusion in chemistry degree courses of some aspects of economics, undergraduates will now be able as part of one of the Chemistry major courses to take the Arts Prelim course in Economics and Social Framework during their second year. There is also a course on Industrial Economics which most chemists attend. Finals results for 1968/69 found the School with more than its share of Firsts - 15 out of a total of 39 for the whole University.

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Prof. D. N. WINCH
Professor Donald Winch - his appointment to the Chair of Economics was announced last term - took over as Dean of the School of Social Sciences in October 1968. His primary academic interest lies in economic thought and economic policy, and he has published a work on classical economic thought on colonies. Another study on economic thought and policy in the 20th Century is about to be published.

As in other Schools there has been during the course of the year, debate and proposals for change in the structure of the School's government. These discussions, arising in part from the annual review of the University's organisation of business, were accompanied by equal vitality in the academic field. There was not a single failure among the School's 103 Finals candidates, with four firsts and 36 Upper Seconds.

The concern within the School for combining efficiency with effective participation led to a variety of proposals being made. One, that the School Meeting should be replaced by a General Assembly was defeated after a referendum. However, that the majority of the School was in favour of some change became evident after a questionnaire by Donald Winch to all faculty indicated a substantial majority would support an Executive Committee composed of 20-30 members, including a higher proportion of students, to replace the School Meeting.

Any such change would require Senate approval. Senate briefly discussed the proposal last term and some concern was expressed about the possible disenfranchisement of faculty members and the School's proposals will be now coming before Planning Committee early this term.
A total of 806 candidates sat for the 1969 B.A. and B.Sc Final Examinations. Of these only 15 failed to obtain a degree. 59 firsts were awarded, 20 in Arts, and 39 in Science. Among the students to obtain firsts were Merlin and Carolyn Stone, who were married in their second year at the University. Merlin Stone, aged 20, obtained his first in Economics and his wife Carolyn was awarded her first in Philosophy and French. The Stones are continuing at Sussex with post graduate studies in their respective subjects.

Another candidate, Martin Grundy, was allowed to take extra time over his examinations. Mr. Grundy lost the use of his right hand and arm and partial use of his right leg following a cerebral thrombosis eight years ago. He has since taught himself to write with his left hand but this is still a slow and difficult process. Special arrangements were made for him to take his final examinations at the University Health Centre and, with the examiners' approval, he was given 25% more time to complete the examinations. He was awarded a 2.2 Class Honours in Electronics. Mr. Grundy's second class degree deprived him of the chance of a State grant. However following the publicity given to his story in the Evening Argus I.T.T. Creed, a firm manufacturing communications systems and machinery for use in computers, offered Mr. Grundy a grant to enable him to continue his studies at Sussex.

The following honorary degrees were also conferred: Doctor of Laws - Baroness Sharp, Doctor of Letters - Clifford Musgrave, and Doctor of Science - Sir Ewart Jones and Henri Cartan.

**Results in full**

### Arts & Social Studies (B.A.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Class of Degree</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
<th>Honours</th>
<th>Aggregat</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afras</td>
<td>I II II2 III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ.</td>
<td>3 19 35 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. &amp; Amer.</td>
<td>6 45 40 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europ.</td>
<td>6 32 42 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>4 36 50 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20 159 186 24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Science (B.Sc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject*</th>
<th>Class of Degree</th>
<th>Aggregat</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automatic Control</td>
<td>2 11 8 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochem.</td>
<td>1 3 18 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1 9 22 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem. Physics</td>
<td>2 3 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>7 9 16 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>2 5 7 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. with Soc. Stud.</td>
<td>- 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Psychology</td>
<td>2 7 8 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>- 1 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science</td>
<td>3 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math. Physics</td>
<td>3 4 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>6 14 26 21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech. Eng. Sci.</td>
<td>- 1 6 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Theory of Sci.</td>
<td>- 2 4 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>7 14 19 13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Chemistry</td>
<td>3 - 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>39 85 150 73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Science Results are not available by School.
What will be the shape of Sussex in the 1970's? How many more students will it have? How many new Schools will be created? Will there be more or fewer graduates? In two years' time, this University, in common with all other universities, has to put in a bid for expansion for the next quinquennium - the period 1972/77. Already our planning for that submission has begun. It will continue during the course of this year and into 1971. However, our own plans for the 70's - if they are to be realistic - necessarily must be formulated within the context of national trends, available resources and higher educational policy as a whole. If we want to expand - which we certainly do - we shall be in severe competition with other universities. So before touching on our own tentative guidelines for expansion drawn up in July at a special meeting of the Planning Committee, it is as well to sketch in briefly the national picture which must be the background to our internal planning.

**Student numbers**

Undoubtedly student numbers will be the main criterion of national planning for the 1970's. Existing plans allow for 235,000 students by 1971/72, and my guess is that the total set for universities for 1976/77 is unlikely to be below 270,000 or above 285,000. Against this estimate the expansion bids made by universities will probably total over 300,000 - which is where the competition comes in. In those circumstances, comparative unit costs (costs per student) are bound to be the critical element in the decisions on the allocation of expansion. If this University wishes to submit plans for an expansion, then the costing of those plans must be very realistic; in real terms, the unit costs should be lower than those we are presently operating on. If the next two years' thinking of each unit is not based on that premise, there will be much wasted effort. And it is no use each unit thinking that it is a high-quality centre of excellence which can be exempted from that premise. Turning from total student numbers, it is even more dangerous to predict the distributions between undergraduate and post-graduate, between Arts, Social Studies, Physical Sciences and Applied Sciences, etc. However, until more definite information is available, my assumptions are that little post-graduate expansion will be allowed for nationally by the U.G.C. (emphasis will be placed upon vocational and post-experience courses and Social Studies will be the only area in which much "pure" expansion will be catered for), and that Arts and Science undergraduate places will be assumed to rise by approximately equal percentages from the 1971/72 baseline; again, Social Studies may be given a slightly higher proportion, but basically planning will proceed in the hope that there will be a swing back to Science. There should be special scope for genuinely innovatory proposals straddling the Arts/Science borderlines. One reason why the drafting of the quinquennium submission will take most of 1969/70 is that we need more information on the national data and trends. Also, several major national policy decisions may be taken during the year, any of which would seriously affect our internal planning (e.g. a clearer division in the financing of teaching and research, a less complete division of capital and recurrent funds, compulsory teacher-training for graduates, co-ordination of universities and polytechnics, regionalisation of universities. In a climate where the most searching scrutiny will be given to universities' plans for the future, and where one submission will be carefully assessed against another, we need to utilise to the full our new mechanisms and processes for planning in drawing up the Sussex quinquennial submission. The last academic year saw the initial testing of these procedures, which had five main aims:

A. To enable as many members as possible to participate in the forward planning of the University. Planning at Sussex is an attempt to obtain a concerted and collective exercise of foresight.

B. To get each of the eighty-plus units and each of the four main areas of the University to produce unit and area plans; the plans themselves being less important than the acts of discussing the aims and of self-evaluating the present state against those aims.

C. To agree upon a University plan for the last three years of the current quinquennium.

D. To produce ideas for change in the next quinquennium.

E. To see whether the new processes could function and how they could be improved.

All five aims were successfully fulfilled. Not everyone who was involved in the work would agree with that conclusion, even though the creation of an agreed University Plan for three years ahead is an achievement of some stature. On a future occasion in Focus, I may attempt to justify that conclusion as part of a more general article on planning universities for change. In the meantime, I will comment briefly on one set of the criticisms I have heard of last year's process, which is that there is too much organisation and planning; it causes too much change too frequently, and it results in stress and conflict. On the contrary, universities are changing less rapidly than their parent environments, and their rate of change has to increase if they are to remain relevant institutions. It is often noted that change results in stress, but it is less often recognised that stress is a pre-condition for change. Equally, universities are not independent communities of altruistic scholars, they are national institutions whose actions are limited by external pressures and constraints, and whose policies are determined by internal balances of powerful forces. The creation and control of change, the maintenance of stress at a tolerable level, and the balancing of external and internal forces, require more organisation and more planning, not less.

**Open-ended**

The meeting in July of the Planning Committee was its first discussion of the major planning issues and opportunities facing the University in the 1970's. What was the outcome? The meeting was a preliminary one, open-ended and not designed to reach firm conclusions. The discussions were wide-ranging; they covered proposals in all fields of activity, they dealt with possible bottlenecks and limitations, and they challenged some of the long-standing precepts of University planning. No secret decisions have been reached. The main
tentative guidelines set for the quinquennial submission were as follows:-

(1) The University should aim to expand by 1976/77 to between 5,000 and 6,000 students compared to the expected 3,700 in 1971/72.

(2) The balance between Arts and Science should be kept approximately even, with all existing Schools having some expansion.

(3) The proportion of graduate students should not increase, and a higher percentage of graduate students should be undertaking advanced "vocational" courses.

(4) A third academic area, in addition to Arts and Science, should be proposed; it should consist of Schools of Studies as well as graduate programmes. Such proposals are under consideration by the Planning Committee's Working Party on Liberal Studies in Science.

It is difficult to go beyond the above brief statement at this stage.

The Planning Committee agreed, subject to Senate approval, upon the following next steps:-

(1) The Planning Officer will prepare a draft quinquennial submission, taking into account the views expressed in the unit plans and the discussions of the Planning Committee. That work will take several months; it will be directed by the Vice-Chancellor, who will discuss it regularly with the Chairmen of Arts, Science, and Social Policy. The aim is to produce an integrated submission which avoids the usual practice of simply stringing together sectional pleas, and which is both innovative and realistic in its approach.

(2) The 1969/70 Planning Process will not be concerned with quinquennial planning, though particular units and areas may choose to use it for the purpose of further developing their strategic planning aims. 1969/70 should thus be the quiet year of the quinquennium as far as logistical planning is concerned, since it will deal only with the minor revisions to the plans for this quinquennium required by external change. Planning in 1969/70 will be concerned with other problems, e.g. some of the teaching and learning issues which were raised in Focus and at the Haywards Heath conference last year.

(3) The draft quinquennial submission will then become the University Planning Assumptions for 1970/71. During that year, every unit, area and the Students' Union will be able to discuss and comment upon the proposals in the submission in the light of their own aims. Thus, the relatively quiet and closed planning year of 1969/70 has to be seen in the context of being preceded by the major open planning activities of 1968/69, and of being followed by another busy and participative year in 1970/71.

(4) At the end of the 1970/71 cycle of discussions there should be an agreed quinquennial submission, which can be sent to the University Grants Committee as required in the Autumn of 1971. Thereafter, little planning can take place until the U.G.C. informs the University in 1972 of its quinquennal grant (or, as may be more likely, of the grant for only the first year of the quinquennium.)

I have attempted to sketch out the University's planning perspective, and how the next phases will be timetabled. The second major expansion of the University now has to be planned. It ought to be an exciting enterprise; as exciting as the creation of a new institution since no vested interest or long-standing concept should be left unchallenged.

Finally, the present aim is that the draft quinquennium submission will not be a fixed set of rigid proposals; it will attempt to present ranges of choices to the University for critical discussion during 1970/71.

DISCIPLINE: the revised scheme

The Disciplinary Scheme for 1969-70 was approved by the Senate at the end of last term. Drawn up after a series of discussions and debates, and drafted by a Working Party under the chairmanship of Professor Ken Smith and including the President of the Union, the scheme incorporates two major principles around which discussion centred. The Basic Regulation, felt to be too vague, has been abolished and replaced by more specific regulations governing conduct in University buildings and in buildings being used by the University on and off the campus. Concern over 'double-jeopardy'-the view that a student should not be punished for the same act by the Courts and the University - has been met by a regulation stating that if an alleged offence is referred by the Senior Proctor to the police, the University will take no further action, irrespective of whether the police proceed with a prosecution or not. There is also now a formal appeals procedure against any disciplinary decision. Discipline is traditionally an area which, at Sussex, has been marked by faculty-student co-operation, both in formulating regulations and in seeing to their enforcement. Regulations are kept under review by the Senate Discipline Committee.

The Senior Proctor, Dr. Michael Ford-Smith, and three other Proctors, Dr. D.S. Betts, Dr. M.S. Halliday and Mr. T.R. Sexton, together with nine Student Disciplinary Officers, are responsible for enforcing the regulations. Student Disciplinary Officers are appointed by the Senate upon recommendation of the Union. The overwhelming majority of infringements are of a minor nature resulting in cautions or small fines. Any of the disciplinary officers will be glad to help students with any problems or difficulties, and in fact much of their work is of an advisory nature.

Full details of the working of the disciplinary scheme and the regulations are contained in the document issued to all students on Registration.
THE STATE OF THE UNION

Brian Leahy, Union President, introduces himself and some of the problems that will be the subject of debate and controversy during the coming year.

In its eight years of existence, this University has been described as "the greatest innovator in the history of British higher education." It has, of course, also been described as "the only brothel in Britain with a Royal Charter." The most common designation, and possibly the most damaging, has been "the trendy University."

The image of a group of students dashing around Sussex in high-powered sports cars, leaving a trail of pregnant natives and empty drug syringes, is as patently ridiculous as the image of the University as a red base, plotting to overthrow the rule of law and cutting a swathe of "revolutionary" destruction along the South Coast. Nevertheless it is an image that has gained some currency locally, and it militates against us becoming a normal part of the social and cultural structure of the area.

I have been at Sussex for a year, and I come from a background that is atypical for a student here. Because of this I believe that I am in a sufficiently informed position to put some of the myths of the local community into their correct perspective.

First, though, it will be necessary to give some details of myself so that you may decide if I am likely to be prejudiced to the extent of becoming a student apostate.

I am thirty-one, twelve years older than the average student, and left school at fifteen to become a vanboy. I was in the Army as a regular soldier and spent thirty months in Germany. I worked in the London sewers for a year, was a full-time trade union official for a year, and spent nine months working with a travelling fairground. For the rest of the time I was a long-distance lorry driver, earning considerably more than I now receive as a grant. In a University such as Sussex, committed to the education of the upper middle class (over 50% from fee-paying schools), this does not make me so much unusual as exotic.

During my first year I was fairly active in the politics of the Union, and in my third term I was elected President of the Union, which proves nothing except the fallibility of democracy.

Democracy

Democracy, and the rights of the individual in society, are the first major points of contention I wish to discuss. The Union has two policy resolutions which, at first sight, appear contradictory. One bans Enoch Powell, or any racist, from addressing a Union meeting while the other describes absolute freedom of speech as an ideal to be striven for.

The first motion is, I admit, a denial of the ideal expressed in the second, but it was overwhelmingly passed by a general meeting of students who were concerned to express their repugnance at the wave of racialism being stirred up by malicious or myopic politicians, and who wished to demonstrate their belief in the brotherhood of man. It was in this atmosphere that the major cause celebre of last term occurred.

When Sir Archibald James was escorted from the campus last term, I agreed with the motivations of those who denied him a hearing. The subject of his talk was to have been the recognition of Rhodesian independence. This at a time when the rebel government were preparing to disenfranchise over
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75% of the population, while simultaneously compounding their earlier acts of treason. The view of the Union is that there are numerous other organisations where views such as these may be expounded, and that we would prefer not to give a platform to them. Sir Archibald, incidentally, was no more invited by the Union than the Rents Project demonstrators were invited by the Council, and received far more gentle treatment.

The only other major political action in which students were involved last year was the participation of some individuals in the actions of the Brighton Rents Project, culminating in the arrests at the Town Hall. Each of the people involved were acting as individuals and expressing their concern at the plight of the homeless. They broke the law, and were punished for it. To insist on further punishment for these people is to throw the courts into disrepute. What often appears to be forgotten is that the generic term "students" is used, is that students are also people, a little more impetuous than some, also possibly a little more idealistic.

The University disciplinary scheme has recognised this by the elimination of double jeopardy, and yet people still expect disciplinary action to be taken against "political" students. The majority of students are not political, but should one militate against those that take an interest in the world outside the narrow confines of their courses? Last year one of the professors here was a (Conservative) councillor, I cannot remember anyone saying that he should confine his interests to the University.

We have other problems at Sussex, too. A lack of social facilities and, possibly connected with this, a small drug problem, but the main problem here, as elsewhere, is apathy. To those first-years who are reading this, I can only say that undergraduate life is not simply tutorials and exams, but also an opportunity to expand ones social and philosophical framework. Use it.

For a Tory view of Free Speech, see over.
At the end of last term a mob of students led by Maoists forced off the campus a 76 year old man, who had been invited to address the Debating Union on Rhodesia. Their slogan - no well-dressed Maoist would be seen dead without his slogan - was: "No Free Speech for Fascists!"

I believe, Conservatives in this University believe, and anyone who has the interests of a liberal university at heart has to believe, that freedom of speech is an absolute and indivisible right. I don't mean that the student body has to commit itself to any particular position - such gestures are meaningless anyway. I mean that, at least up to the limits set by the law of the land - which can only be enforced by the requisite authorities - any point of view must be allowed to be expressed on campus, and anyone should be able to listen to it. Any alternative, any limitation of free expression, must inevitably degenerate into the subjective opinions of a clique.

No one likes freedom of speech. Everyone hates hearing the other side. No Conservative believes Marxists are democrats. Liberals are unhappy about what they call extremists. (The counterpart of the communist groups - the National Front - is not yet represented on campus.) And the mutual hatred of the various Marxist cults is beyond words. Moreover, some groups incompatibility is international - Arabs and Zionists, Africans and Africanans, know that their relatives might have killed each other. No 'consensus' can evolve here. Only solutions are possible. Either all groups agree to tolerate one another. Or every deviant group must be excluded. And once the principle of free speech had gone, even the most left-wing elitist University could not prevent the mores of the outside community being enforced - it could hardly plead "Academic Freedom", since it would have already denied this to its own dissenters. If you've ever talked to many wage-earners in the country, you must know what they think of students, and for that matter of the doctrines of the progressive intelligentsia in general.

Untenable

It is sometimes said that a Union General Meeting once voted to exclude "Enoch Powell and other racialists" from the campus, and that - for example - this justified the mob's suppression of last term's Rhodesia debate. This whole argument is completely untenable. A University cannot be governed by Mass Meetings: only a minority can attend, and anyway they're not democracy but mouthocracy. Besides, that particular meeting had earlier reaffirmed the unlimited free speech motion carried at the time of the paint-throwing incident. And the later motion was instantly reduced to a dead letter by a Black Power speaker the Maoists smuggled in. Moreover, the Union President made no effort to ban the Debating Union's guest: the mob acted as unauthorised vigilantes. If this is countenanced, there is no reason why any group of students shouldn't accuse anyone they dislike of being a "racialist" - no definition was agreed and force him off the campus. In fact, the U.G.M. motion is a (literal) red herring: we were told that, even without it, some of the mob would have disrupted the meeting, and the Maoists would still have prevented the Speaker from entering the University.

And, irrespective of all this, even if the overwhelming majority of students were against a given group, like Germans disliking Jews, that group would nevertheless have a right to exist, and all liberal democrats are bound to support that right on principle. Shaw said 'All great truths begin as blasphemies' - which is of course precisely what our self-appointed inquisition is afraid of.

Disasterous

Some liberals say that, on the one issue of race, censorship is in order. This is a disastrous error. The Race Relations Act doesn't need private lynching parties to enforce it. But, more importantly, they are building a gallows for themselves. Stalin invented a whole series of plots for this purpose. Social Democrats found they were 'Social Fascists'. Subjectively, you may throw up at the sight of Cape Grape, but how do you know the People's self-elected representatives aren't going to decide that, if you don't support the latest Party line, and thus hinder the struggle, objectively you're a racist? Political leprosy is catching. The only inoculation is free speech, and no vague anathemas. After all, what is a fascist? If you're argued with anyone on the Left, you're certain to have been called one. The only historically precise definition is: "a devout form of Italian socialism!". They went in for symbols, rhythmic chants, violence and, according to Slone's School for Dictators, they stopped debates by saying "We don't argue with traitors". Red Flags - "Ho, Ho..., "Grosvenor Square - "...racists/fascists" - the similarity is too obvious to labour.

Tolerant

In conclusion, if you have an open mind, if you've come here to learn, if you don't believe truth is the exclusive property of one sect, then you've got to have an open and tolerant University. As the man said, "Let a hundred flowers bloom." Even if you think you've got The Word in one form or another, it's in your interest, if you're sensible, to support an open University, since otherwise, if you take it over, you may become the target of a crusade.

But whoever heard of a reasonable fanatic? Other meetings are going to be suppressed. And no student group can rely on another coming to its rescue - any more than if they were sovereign states. So three things can happen. Either controversial meeting will be abandoned. Or the University authorities and the Union will have to take a stand - which will require courage and student support. Or the students whose meetings are being suppressed will become equally fanatical and start to cause trouble, like the proverbial caged animal, by defending itself when attacked. They would win in the end, if only because the outside world would redress the balance of the campus. But the University would lose.

The University's motto is "I'd Still And Know". This is a good idea. After all, to return to Shaw, the extreme form of censorship is assassination. And we don't want that, do we?