COMMENT

Expansion and accommodation

There are encouraging signs that the University Grants Committee is coming round to the view that university expansion cannot be purchased in isolation from the problems of student accommodation. It is now conducting a national survey among universities in order to establish clearly what are the needs of universities over the next quinquennium as regards residential buildings, what financial resources they have for this purpose and what plans, if any, exist for raising money.

Hopefully the results of this survey will further impress upon the government that it must make changes in its policies in order to make it easier for universities to borrow money at rates of interest that will enable the universities to build residences and charge the kind of rents that students can afford to pay.

Many universities, and particularly new universities like Sussex, own neither land nor property, nor are they in receipt of large endowments. They therefore have neither resources of private capital, nor collateral that can be offered against loans.

Over the past few months this University has approached banks, building societies, insurance companies, the Local Authority, finance houses and even the London money market. In every case, for one reason and another, it has not proved possible to raise finance. Should universities therefore press the issue by saying: no expansion without accommodation? It is not an argument that has ever been advanced at Sussex. Indeed the University never could have expanded as rapidly as it has done if there had been an insistence on 100% or even 50% on-campus accommodation.

It was certainly not an argument put forward at last month's special meeting of the Planning Committee, which met to discuss the future of Essex House.

Indeed at that meeting there emerged a clear commitment for further expansion along the lines already proposed in the quinquennial assumptions.

The aims of the University, many would say its social responsibility, too, is to educate as many students as possible over the next five years. This may mean that there will have to be compromises and that not all students will be able to live in ideal accommodation, or in flats, or on the campus; by the same token not all faculty may be able to teach in ideal surroundings; and not all researchers will have ideal facilities for their experimental work. University expansion at a time of economic restriction, has its price.

We believe that more money should be made available for residential building; we believe that students at Sussex should receive the same additional £40 allowances in relation to rent levels as students in London.

But we also believe that if a university education is to be made available to significantly increased numbers, it will call for some sacrifice, not in academic standards, but in terms of what we would ideally like, as opposed to what we are likely to get.
Dear Sir,

Randomly selected, I have just received a questionnaire on lecture assessment from the "Vice-Chancellor's group on undergraduate teaching." It aims to assess the relevance and effectiveness of lectures to course work, an extremely constructive and possibly beneficial aim. Does the questionnaire, relying solely on quantification for what are essentially qualitative factors, do justice to this laudable aim?

"Q.1. How many lecture courses have you attended at this University?" For a start, if one is randomly selected, they might get a first, second or third year student, who have all been to a very different number of lectures! Secondly, "scientists" generally go to far more lectures than "artists". Thirdly, how can one remember accurately all the lectures (course, society or open) one has been to? One may have been to the odd lecture in a series, or the lot, or many lectures completely unrelated to coursework - which count?

"Q.2." - this requires a scaled 1-5 assessment of eleven factors making up what you consider lectures are at the moment and what they ought to be. For example, one is asked to scale "(f) to awaken questioning attitudes" as 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5. What on earth have numbers got to do with the question?

If "1 = not at all important" and "5 = very important", I suppose 2 = not very important, 3 = important and 4 = quite important." Its a nice statistical game, but has little to do with the question "to awaken questioning attitudes". In any case, the aims of lectures are very particular. Each of the eleven listed factors will take on unique configurations in relation to lectures as different as ecology, linguistic philosophy, economics, flying saucers, R.H. Tawney, the micro-politics of gossip, E.S.P. etc. How can such generalised figures honestly assess the quality of a particular lecture course, given by an individual lecturer to a specific audience of students on a given subject? Plainly, they cannot.

"Q.3.(a). Please give your impression of the relative time you spend in the various formal contact situations used at present, Please express this as an approximate percentage (say to the nearest 5%)." What has this question got to do with the qualitative difference between lectures, seminars, tutorials, lab, work etc? These each have very different functions, so what is the point of assessing them in numbers? In any case, the informal discussions, conversations etc., with friends or teachers may be just as educational. How on earth can one assess "the approximate total number of contact hours per week"? It varies so much, both in quality and quantity.

"Q.3.(b). What would your ideal mixture of time be to spend in the various teaching situations?" One must clearly take a slide rule to work it all out! Its an impossible question to answer. The rest of the questions are quite relevant in finding out about the need for problem sheets, summaries, student-lecturer communications, relevance of lectures to courses, well run lecture halls etc. Again, they are rather general.

As an "arts" student, these remarks probably are more related to that 'side' of the University's lecture courses. I think it has been shown that the questionnaire falls short of its excellent aim. Perhaps an essay competition with prizes would do this in a more effective way. Anything is better that the servile social scientific reduction of qualitative criteria to quantification, which proves of very little value. This blind obsession with statistics will not tell us what kind of lectures are needed. It is clear that different means must be adopted to assess lectures more effectively.

Yours sincerely,

Martin Large,
Park Village.

Dr. Peter Simpson (Chairman of the Lecture Project Group) replies:

I am very glad indeed that Mr. Large has raised some of the important problems which confront our project group in fulfilling its terms of reference, and I readily accept his invitation (implied) to present our views on these problems and to indicate, briefly, what our approach is.

We are, in fact, operating on four main fronts:
(a) Informal discussions between project group members and other members of the University.
(b) A questionnaire to faculty concerning the present use of lectures, faculty opinions on the use and the changes which faculty would like to see.
(c) A similar questionnaire to students.
(d) Discussion, by subject groups, of certain key issues raised by us in the light of our questionnaires and discussions.

I hope, therefore, that it will be clear that we are not placing our faith in the questionnaire as the sole means of tackling our objectives.

Nevertheless, whilst questionnaires have many shortcomings, informal discussions, essay competitions etc., also have many, not least of which is that they cannot lead to any assessment of a consensus of opinion. Only those appropriately gifted and motivated will respond to these methods. We believe that we have a duty to the whole University, and not just to the few who are prepared to talk and write at length.

Mr. Large sees no relevance in attempting to quantify data on lecture aims etc., and points to some dangers in such attempts. Whilst we agree with him that such 'quantification' is not easy, and that it is subject to a number of dangers, we still feel that it is relevant to try. The important thing is that we should be aware of the dangers and should guard against them. Failure to achieve some quantitative measure of opinion makes it impossible to assess whether one factor is more (or less) important than another.

Perhaps I might briefly answer some of Mr. Large's

cont on page 9
'I am impressed with the place but I'd rather live in a Victorian novel than a 2001 cell. It's the Brave New Worldishness of it all which is so disturbing.'

First impressions of Sussex though not always important are hard to erase and are not always qualified by what one has previously seen, read, or heard about the University's social or academic life. This Huxleyan view of life in a Park House is that of Louise Campbell, twenty year-old first year in the University's tenth intake since it opened in 1961. First years look now much the same as they did then, and after the first few days of endless corridors, red brick and unfamiliar faces, experiences typical of the indifferent atmosphere of any large institution, they begin to form personal impressions of their new environment.

The myth which has surrounded Sussex since it opened in 1961 rests on its reputation as a swinging social scene. Press reports in the mid-sixties, which to a great extent created the myth, gave names-dropping accounts of Summer Balls and picnics in the Park designed to make all aspiring sixth-formers green with envy and rush to put the University at the top of their list. Since those days, publicity of the social side of Sussex has slowly declined. If the University has ever been the trendy social centre for the upper middle class classes which the press made it out to be, this year's first years only seem to have heard vague rumours. Of the University's academic reputation they have more definite notions. But is there in fact something of a 'deb's delight' about Sussex which is still as noticeable now to first years as it was to the press?

'I am amazed at the number of publically educated sweet little debby types. They are such dilettantes, real duffers. This place really seems to draw some high speed pseuds.'

Louise Campbell spent two years at Art College in Bristol before coming up to the University this year. She is a History of Art major in the School of European Studies and articulately describes the impressions she has received in her first few weeks on the campus. She qualifies her enthusiasm for Sussex with constructive comments on what she thinks are its defects.

'I applied to Sussex as a mental dare. I wanted to do History of Art and one of my tutors at the Art College in Bristol recommended Sussex as having a good department for my subject and advised me to apply. I made it my first choice as I thought other well established universities wouldn't mind being put further down the list whereas Sussex might. I chose European
Studies because I wanted to do a language and am doing Italian. I had heard of the University's academic reputation but I knew very little about it socially and when I came for my interview was very anxious to see what kind of a place it was. My interview was a good one and the whole place looked very sunny so I had a favourable impression.

Sussex is a show place. The ideal student life is here and that is its trouble. I get the impressions that the authorities here have done away with as many rules and regulations as possible and now there is nothing to rebel against. The first few days were frightful. I hadn't realised that I could feel so alien in such a modern environment. I'm used to living in Victorian flats and obviously hadn't realised just how important that kind of environment is to me. I'm in Lancaster House and I've done my best to turn my room there into a Victorian junk shop. I actually put down a guest house as my first choice but they sent me the Hove address and I was so horrified at the thought of living in Hove I wrote back and said I'd changed my mind. I think of myself as a non-academic kind of person and I was also frightened about not doing any work if I lived in Brighton. The Park House is quiet until after six when all hell is let loose. The rooms are adequate, although they're not at all sound-proofed and its impossible to feel on one's own. The kitchens ought to be larger with more cookers

and it could all look a bit less surgical and uniform. It's the artificiality of the whole campus that I find disturbing. There is everything on the campus apart from a chemist. One could live here and never go into Brighton, and it terrifies me to think that some people just might never go off the campus. It really is a complete mini-culture here. I feel the need every now and then to go into Brighton, sit and drink cups and cups of tea and watch the people go by. There are no policemen here, no traffic. It's a relief just to go to Falmer Station and see real flowers and trains. A friend thinks the campus is rather like a film set and I suppose it is. I am very impressed by it. I admire the buildings but they are difficult to live in. One feels so built into them. The whole place is very modular but I think they could have been even more imaginative with sculpture in the quadrangles and more fountains.

So far I'm interested in the work and impressed by the teaching. I did read the handbook before coming but perhaps it just didn't click. Now I realise that although the contextual courses are all theoretically related to the main ones if one is silly at first one can find oneself with some totally unrelated courses which can be very distracting. Of course I just didn't think; in terms of hours per week, how long I'd actually be spending on my major. I'll have a broadly based degree I suppose but I'm angry in a way that I shall be only half an Art Historian whereas someone from London or Edinburgh say, will have a full History of Art degree.

As far as organised activities are concerned I have
joined the Theatre Club and am helping on the production side of things. I'm impressed by the Arts Centre and think the idea of having artists in residence is a marvellous one. If I get time I'd like to talk to them. Socially I have been amazed at some of the people here. There certainly seem to be some high speed pseudos. The social atmosphere can be shattering. Everyone looks so confident. You feel you have to look suave and self-assured even to walk into the snack bar.

Louise herself looks confident and assured, is older than the average first year, would suit the press idea of the Sussex image and is on the whole enthusiastic about the University. First impressions are usually mixed but one has the feeling that the Sussex myth - the Oxbridge-by-the-sea, Basil Spence Wonder, jetsetters paradise image is fading fast. This year's first years have scarcely heard about it. They may still be wearing fashionable clothes and talking of revolution but choosing Sussex seems to have been more on advice about its academic reputation than a yearning to be among the trendy lefties.

A number of people have commented on my 'Unionews' article on University 'double-think' - the use of euphemisms for facts of life, like capitalism, which are seldom spoken of 'in cold blood' by university teaching staff.

A small number of doggedly courageous marxists, near-marxists, and uncommitted, but tell-it-as-it-is people stand out as exceptions to a rule which is at once comical and - downright sinister.

A slightly larger number speak of capitalism, now and then, using the dread word in a clinical, specialist sense. Hastening, by means of all manner of sidelong glances, gesticulating alibis, and karate-like flamencos to assure us that (a) they didn't mean it; (b) they're being bloody daring, or (c) it's really a technical term, like heterodyne, or vagina.

Most of the rest are 'not at the Races'. For them, we really do live in a Free World of Liberal Institutions, full of Modern European Minds, Free Entrepreneurs, and Japanese Protagonists of The Western Way of Life. And that's the good news.

The bad news comes in two sizes. First, a tiny number of people defy all attempts to exonerate them from the moral charge: 'you are well aware of what you are doing.'

Unlike those on the Left, who announce their ideological
'Interest', their ideological subleties amount to brainwashing. This makes these people a positive part of a capitalist university.

" Conditioning in Britain is the world's top conditioning...."

Second, a large number have themselves been so conditioned by capitalist society that they are unable - in practice - to conceive of any future which is not merely an extension of the present. The same streets, bus, T.V. Timeless. Changeless. The future is the future only in theory. No more. Because of this, there is no Capitalism. No Socialism. Only Now. (To speak of capitalism is to refuse to say 'passed away.')

This makes them kind, friendly, genuinely helpful people and only negatively of "a bloody capitalist university." (I owe this phrase to a sincere, Maoist ultra rrrrevolutionary whom University has rendered 'safe for the System' by convincing him that he is 'a member of the middle class'. A member. Except for one word. He said 'Imperialist' - because he could not bring himself to say 'Capitalist'. A much more fundamentally cruel word. And one for which no-one is forgiven.)

Neither of the two sorts will admit - in practice - that 'heterodoxy could be someone else's doxy'. The second lot will not admit that an outside-of-Bourgeois Ideology standpoint could be 'right' - because it involves the future. The first, because they know that it is right. (Whether it is 'right' or not, isn't the point, here.)

The first, cannot believe that they are conditioned, partisan, 'bashed'.

To those of us who are 'biassed' - and know-it, for whom objectively 'telling-it-as-it-is' is a permanent, agonising struggle against the strait-jacket of what has so often been our own dogmatism, this partisanship of theirs is blindly clear. From where we stand. It also forces us to 'schematicize'. Be 'more royal than the king'. To utter outrageous provocations just to force consideration of a point of view. Because these attacks against us - by these particular people - so honest, so unaware of their own "bias" are very much harder to counter than the subtlest gambits of the first, small consciously "anti" group.

An example: 'Do you read the Morning Star?' 'Yes, and The Times', 'Why?' 'Because what's not in one is in the other, and because "he who reads only one side is blind in one eye".' 'Oh!?' And another: Ex-sabbatical year: 'You're reading Tribune'. I thought you read the Star.' Turgenev said: 'He who would understand his enemy must go into his enemy's country'.

That is what a university is all about. Or isn't it? And so, I wrote a "funny" in 'Unionews'. It had to (try to) be funny. The cold truth would have been out of place.

It was meant to make people see that conditioning in Britain is the world's top conditioning. The Russian sees "C.P.S.U. (B)" on 'Pravda'. The American knows he's getting "The American Way of Life".

They can - and do - switch on their short wave radio. They may have to be circumspect. In Russia they may otherwise be put into a nut-house for a couple of years. (these days). In the U.S.A., go the way of Yablonski, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King.

But they know. In Britain, we hear; "It's in the papers", "It was on T.V." - And at University - "It was in a book the tutor recommended."

(All 6th forms get 'Lord of the Flies', '1984', 'Animal Farm', 'Darkness at Noon' - they're just not on an open, Party list.)

Brainwash is brainwash. (There is a world class struggle. Sometimes bloody, sometimes subtle. Until it's over - horrible.)

But it is worse for those who don't face the needle. It is better for the minority. They at least have to hear the din of opposite views.

"The majority..... don't notice how they've been conditioned....."

It is worse for the majority. They don't notice how they've been conditioned not to even want to read what - otherwise - attempts would have to been made to suppress.

What is this article? I believe that it is an attempt to cause people to know that - we are all conditioned! We are all 'partisan'. And we must KNOW IT. It won't stop us being dogmatic, but it may enable us to 'ermite when we draw' - thus, admitting it.

For me, it is 'a revolutionary act'. Because it seeks to change the balance between 'them' and 'us'. It is more revolutionary than a pot of paint, begged for by its targets - the better to isolate.

My wife once said - more or less - 'Are you going down there to take the system on. As you did in all those factories and offices. Remember what happened?'

'When will they ever learn?"
politics or paternalism?

a reply to Professor Lerner

by Tony Agathangelou and Andrew Chester

Tony Agathangelou is a Research Fellow in Social Psychology. Andrew Chester is an Experimental Officer in Social Psychology, (he is also Secretary of the A.S.T.M.S. but would like to stress that he is writing here only in his personal capacity.)

We are indebted to Professor Lerner for opening a discussion on 'Politics, Participation and University Government' (Focus 13, November 1970), a topic which from experience, has proved highly contentious. It is difficult though to understand why this has proved the case when if, as Professor Lerner suggests, students merely wish to be 'consulted, argued with, convinced, because it is, done with, their education which is at stake'. Surely, it is precisely because this is not the issue (nor is this paternalism welcomed); for other, more important, reasons this area will continue to prove a central and highly contentious one within and without the universities.

Professor Lerner poses the question of control (not his term) as if:

(i) this were an issue between 'faculty' and 'students' alone; these two groups were contending for power and faculty have power at the moment; no other meaningful groups either exist, or if they do, are not important enough to reconsider in this context.

(ii) the University is an independent institution which has power vested within itself to decide who runs it and what its policies should be.

(iii) 'politics' are irrelevant and institutions such as the universities should be above such considerations; ideological questions are not relevant to such areas as 'exams', 'syllabus', and 'teaching and research.'

We should like to suggest that these omissions prevent any adequate assessment of the current situation and consequently preclude any insight into future developments. We merely hope to be able to propose an alternative set of considerations which will afford a more realistic framework for continued discussion. Nor should it prove surprising to the reader to discover that this alternative framework springs from precisely those considerations the Professor most glaringly neglects.

'The student' constitutes a 'class' in only the narrowest descriptive sense of that term. This does not imply that he cannot be discriminated against as if he were a subordinate class, as was 'the woman' prior to (and to only marginally lesser degree since) universal female suffrage. What is implied here is that there will be greater variability of perceived discrimination within this group than between this group and 'the faculty', where the above argument applies but to a lesser degree because of greater similarity of class background and higher likelihood of common values (liberal bourgeois) and aspirations. This latter group is also more likely to become consolidated around accepted group norms. It is smaller, and thereby affords greater possibility of a relatively wider personal acquaintance among its members.

It is less mobile - having a current turnover of approximately 7% per annum, projects an average stay of 14-15 years (this figure needs to be qualified by the fact that the University has only been functional for eight or so years and is still rapidly expanding.) These factors, along with a higher average age, suggest the probability of an inbuilt 'conservatism', especially within the caucus. It is then naive to equate the 'interests' of these two groups as groups concerning the matter Professor Lerner discusses. Rather it could be predicted, on the basis of this analysis, that deeper divisions will be found among students and to a lesser degree among faculty which might prove the basis for an alliance which cuts across both these groups, (this fact is already implicit in the faculty selection of those students 'best able' and 'qualified' to assume a place in their ranks).

The possibility of other, more important kinds of alliance of interest also exist and it is with these in mind that this article has been written.

Professor Lerner ignores the presence at this University of groups who would place themselves within neither of the two discussed, and yet play a crucial role in the functions of this institution. The two most prominent omissions are the 'administrative' and the 'technical'. Both are central in any adequate definition of a University but both are excluded as groups from University government.

The only provisions for them are the 'consultative committees.' There are several of these for various staff-areas, they are constitutionally toothless and the discussions in them reflect their narrow conception, although that is not to say that it was not originally a struggle to get them set up.

If the situation is to change a prerequisite is strong trade union organisation, which is at present hampered by several factors, including the existence of the Staff...
Defensive

Secondly, any discussion about staff being, say, on the Planning Committee runs into variations of the 'Manager's prerogative to manage' or 'that discussion would not have any relevance to you'ploy. This adds up to the same accusations made against students: 'You are precocious, you are overreaching yourselves.' The consequence of these arguments may be to cause non-academic staff to lower their sights to a purely defensive position 'we must defend our interests on higher committees' because this is less assailable. We will refer to this 'precocity' view again. It would be wise, before pursuing this analysis much further, to enquire of the nature and 'independence' of this institution which is supposedly currently being squalled over. Firstly, it is far from being 'independent' in any meaningful sense. The iminent diktats of Mrs. Thatcher are awaited with a mixture of apprehension, resignation and fear. The University Grants Committee, whose function it is to allocate, within narrow economic constraints, monies allocated to it under equally limited conditions, has never been, since its inception, anything but a government body despite the intentions of academics that it should retain a high degree of autonomy of government. Consequently the universities themselves have been directly involved in policy formulation which has had its terms of reference strictly defined elsewhere (as any faculty currently involved in drawing up Quinquennial Plans will know).

This has led to a blatant (and at times sordid, e.g. LSE, Warwick scandals) compromise of whatever independent integrity may have at one time existed within the University (we believe that this has always been the case, even from the universities' earliest medieval beginnings, but that would take us too far off track).

The question is not then 'who should run the University?' but rather, 'who does in fact run the University?'

This is not the old academic parlour game, 'Find the Planning Committee' but rather 'how much freedom of decision and choice is left at the University level?' as a necessary question for all those interested enough to want to understand the nature of a modern industrial state and its institutions. It is clear that the University is even unable to secure details of allowed expansion, if and when it comes. What has happened to the New Schools Debate, the question of a Third Area (in Social Sciences) and the most criminal of all the necessary planning to cope with the proper and reasonable accommodation of those here already, let alone those yet to come? In the light of this situation it is absurd for Professor Lerner to discount political considerations. We are directly immersed, in the most direct and obvious sense, in political relationships and controversy. The introduction, by those on the political Right, of the Black Papers and the proposed Private University are just two obvious political developments. The attacks by the Tories on the entire social sector may be ameliorated somewhat in the University sector to prevent the possible collective defection of the Intelligensia. These considerations are not external political attitudes being insinuated from without but stem directly from any critical analysis of the state of internal processes clearly manifest.

It remains for us to deal with two of Professor Lerner's most glaring naiiveties: the nature of the teacher-student relationship and the overlapping question of the nature of ideological components of the context and content of this relationship.

The former, i.e., the 'context' of the relationship is described by Professor Lerner in either a humanistic paternalism or defensive authoritarianism. To the extent that he describes 'the teacher' as the repository of 'knowledge' and the 'student' as an empty vessel waiting to be filled he totally misconceives the dependent reciprocal relationship both are in fact in, and which is the necessary precondition for the advancement of understanding. 'Knowledge' (if at all a relevant distinction) is merely one aspect of this understanding; the development of 'critical awareness' as a necessary state for 'discovery'; a healthy disregard for the 'source' which claims 'authority' as the basis for the 'rightness' of its stance, are the values of progressive educationalists. Against this necessary social discourse which is the basis of the advancement of understanding and a corrective to imbed 'specialisms' any withdrawal to faculty 'expertise' is little but a defensive and dogmatic retreat. We anticipate similar defensive arguments based on simplistic analysis concerning the role of staff-groups such as technicians. Are they a 'service' to 'academics' in the passive sense or are they as we see them, an active part of a reciprocal relationship? There are strong arguments from the experience of technical staff that suggest the latter, and they are the ones to be used to combat the accusations of 'precocity' mentioned earlier.

Precondition

A discussion of the nature of the ideological components of the 'content' of academic 'disciplines' is necessarily somewhat abstract where each might be relatively ignorant of the other's domain of interest. Nevertheless, certain come readily to mind within the Professor's own sphere of 'expertise', 'literary criticism'. It has been suggested elsewhere (Perry Anderson, NLR 50, 1968) that literary criticism has assumed the 'responsibility of moral judgement and metaphysical assertion'. To detail this would require a systematic critique of bourgeois English culture. Anderson has pointed out that the central idea of current literary criticism epistemology is the interrogative statement which 'demands one crucial precondition: a shared, stable system of beliefs and values'. (p. 52). It is naïve to expect these to go unquestioned in an institution as heterogeneous as the University and ingenious to assume this stability as the basis for any assessment of the current state of dissatisfaction. Professor Lerner's declared preferences are those of the literary critic, mystified by 'detachment' and timelessness. In an institution where political and ideological processes are so potently manifest we are happy to say his preferences cannot be shared by us.
specific questions about the student questionnaire.
(i) We are aware that different people will have attended numbers of courses. We do ask for information on the questionnaire, though, which will enable us to distinguish between, say, replies from first year, second year and third year students, and between replies from Arts and Science students.
(ii) He has interpreted our five point scale correctly.
(iii) Question 3 has nothing to do with the qualitative differences between lectures, tutorials, seminars etc.
The object of the question is to enable us to find out what changes in the pattern students would like to see. It may appear a rather complex way of finding out, but we believe it will be effective. If more lectures are thought to be needed, say, we would like to know whether the desired number is twice as large, or three times as large, as the present number. We would also like to know whether the extra teaching time involved should be at the expense of, say, tutorials, or whether the total amount of teaching 'contact' time should be increased.
In conclusion, may I say that we should welcome written comment or suggestions (which may be addressed to me) from any student, whether he was part of our random sample or not. Verbal contributions are also welcome. I do hope, though, that Mr. Large - and the other 399 members of our sample - will complete the questionnaire. Perhaps if five questions of our eight are relevant, as Mr. Large believes, then that will be reason enough to complete and return the whole questionnaire.

Christmas is coming...!

Dear Sir,

May I ask all secretaries in the University............. what they are going to give their bosses for Christmas? A snazzy tie, another ashtray for his desk - or half a bottle of his favourite tipple - generously laced with arsenic?!:

That dreadful decision has to be faced again, pondered over, worried about, and then when the article finally materialises, wrapped in carefully chosen paper, it is placed heavily in front of him, accompanied by pathetic whimpers of: 'Oh, don't be silly, it's nothing really', (while all the time you're thinking that it damn-well is something and if he doesn't appreciate it, its the last time he'll get one.)
The problem doesn't seem to bother some secretaries at all - its all according to the environment. One can't imagine a 'flower-power' tie or even a bloodied piggy bank for his coffee money going down too well in a solicitors' office. I imagine a packet of white linen hankies or one of those pen-in-a-holder sets that only the most infuriating of people would ever use, would be your lot there.
But here, on the campus, where first-names are usually the order of the day, and where the white-collared, french-pleated vision of a secretary never had a chance, we should be dashing off to Habitat or the nearest man's boutique to pick up that little something......
There's just one complication........ The Wife............... Now however much you think he'd appreciate a pair of the psychedelic underpants in Marks and Spencer, its just not worth the raised eyebrow and the touch-of-intimacy noted by his better half (and - contrary to popular belief - that's not you).
The same might apply to the 'safe-as-houses' purely impersonal gift 'for the office' such as a larger than jaw-size mug, a sheet of fluorescent lime-green perspex to cover up the sellotape marks on the wall, or one of those lethal plastic spring-back-book-holder-things. All this might be regarded as creating the office into a 'nice-little -nook', ideal for a spot of illicit dictation. Of course some wives wouldn't bat an eyelid at the psychedelic undies - but in that case, somehow I don't think he'd be the type to wear them!!!
Of course if your boss is a woman, then all these problems are non-existent. But still its not just as simple as counting your punities and trotting off for some frothy bubble-bath.

All women know (or should know) that every fellow-member of their sex is, to a lesser or greater extent, bitchy. (Do you remember how very UN-grateful you were when you realised that the scarf your sister gave you was bought in a sale?)

Be careful that, in trying to impress, you don't go too far the other way and, in giving her a couple of embroidered Swiss hankies, make her feel slighted, as she, like you, happily sniffs into her packet of Kleenex in the top drawer of her desk.

So, have you reached a decision yet? Of course there are still the Broad-Hint type of presents. The new wire basket for all that filing, an initialed brio, to stop him (her) pinching yours or even order from Central Stores a dictating machine, to enable your shorthand book to look less like a battle-field.

Well, with Christmas looming up menacingly near on the horizon that vital addition to your Christmas list must be purchased (or even made - how about a wooley hat with a pom pom?). But there are always the old stand-bys, cigarettes or cigars can't go wrong (do remember, however, if one of his new-year resolutions is giving up smoking) or you could always offer to pay for his Christmas Dinner at the Refectory......... We always seem to turn up with the ideal gift in the end (or could it be that they're prepared for the onslaught and brush up on tactful exclamations the night before). There is only one question still unsettled.....what are THEY going to give US???

Yours confidentially,
(name and address withheld.)
The triple jump, or as it used to be called, the hop, step and jump, is a peculiarly difficult athletic feat. It requires suppleness, strength and timing as the jumper, like a stone skimming over the surface of a pond, hurls himself into a series of movements that cover 16ft-13ft at a time.

"Like the hammer-throw and the pole vault, it's a technical event. It's one event that women don't do, because of the stress round the pelvic girdle," says Derek Boosey. "And when I come off a hop I come down with a pressure about 4½ times my body weight."

In Mexico, in 1968, at the last Olympics, Derek Boosey, Britain's number one exponent of the art, finished 16th. Now the sixteenth best triple-jumper in the world finds himself here at Sussex - a University that has a number of reputations but not one for being sporting. The emphasis is on exercise rather than excellence, and few of the thousands who blow and puff in the Sportcentre or cavort around the playing fields would bring anything more to the face of a dedicated coach than a look of sheer horror.

But if Sussex, compared say with Oxfbridge, has the kind of X-certificate for sport that no budding athlete under 16 should be permitted to witness, Derek Boosey remains unperturbed. Since he took up his appointment in September as Deputy Director of Sport he has plunged himself into the work of what is one of the busiest and fastest-growing of all the University Services. He has given advice to a lady who wanted to know if she could exercise her horse in the Sportcentre, organised the Soccer Sevens competition, taken over the editing of the Service's publication 'Sport' and has given help to any of the 42 Sports clubs within the University who have asked for it.

Thinking about this proliferation of activity which stretches from Chess to Athletics, from Angling to Gliding, he says that sport is "actually doing quite well really because there are some Universities where there's absolutely nothing happening."

He enjoys the administrative side of his work as much as the coaching, and always wanted a job "with a bit of everything." He doesn't think that being a 'professional' athlete in what is essentially a casual sporting environment makes his job any harder. "I like to think students have accepted me," he says. "After all I am not that far removed from them... Even though I'm 28 I have only just come out of College."

However, he has no intention of 'trying to be one of the boys'. "If you do that - and I've seen it happen to a College lecturer - you may feel that you suddenly have to show your authority. When you do that the guys don't know how to take you, and then they're inclined to discard you. Well, I'm not going to start that. I don't particularly exercise any authority. I'm on first-name terms, I don't issue any orders. I just suggest and advise. You don't want an authoritarian attitude in a
University, they’ve had enough of that at school. You want to be free and easy. Students have moved into an adult world. You respect them, they respect you. Everything’s built on respect, not authority, and if I lose their respect it’s my fault.”

Derek Boosey was born in India, and into the sporting life. His father was an international triple-jumper, among the top six in the world, and started his son 'jumping into sand' as Derek puts it - when he was 14. He came to England in 1961, and as a jumper he also had ambitions to fly. In 1962, the same year that he first made the England team, he joined the Royal Air Force.

But his eventual application to fly was turned down because his eyesight was not good enough. Meanwhile the 1964 Olympics passed him by. He was third string in the team and only the first two went. So, barred from flying - he says he can quite understand that they have to be careful about whom they let handle a £2½ million aircraft - Derek Boosey spent his time in administration. Then, in January 1967, he left the Air Force and went to Nevada University on a scholarship. After competing on all the athletic circuits in the U.S.A., he returned to England and Madeley College, where he took his Certificate of Education.

First job

It was from Madeley that he came to Sussex. This is his first job, and he brings to it the appetite for hard graft which is essential to most sportsmen who have their eyes on the summit, but particularly so to the athlete.

"Athletics requires sustained training over a long period," he says. "You can't come out in the Spring and say 'This summer, I'll get something done.' Now's the time to put the work in, between now and Easter, and then you reap the benefits in the summer." With more than 30 internationals behind him, Derek Boosey's next target is the 1972 Olympics in Munich. He reckons that in the past, he has reckoned in on his natural ability, but never trained hard enough. "That's what people tell me," he says. 'They see me training and say 'Christ, I don't know how you do it.' A few weeks ago, at the Student Games in Turin, I was competing against the world record holder, a Russian, and for him my kind of training is only a warm up. I get an intense amount of pleasure out of my training, but looking back I don't think I've ever done enough."

At Turin he finished 16th again. Maybe it's because he enjoys it all too much? "Oh, I don't know," he smiles. "That Russian could run 10.4 for the 100 metres, that's very fast. My best is 10.8. At Turin he jumped 56'7"', but he didn't look to me to be in agony...."

Derek Boosey says he is now training harder than he has ever done before. Not because he has the kind of job that allows him plenty of free time, but because he is making his training fit around his work.

Self discipline

"If I have a free moment maybe I'll dash up to the playing fields for a work-out, then come straight back. But its no good saying to myself: 'Crikey, I've got too much work on today, I'll have to miss training.' You can't get to the Olympic Games like that. That's where self-discipline comes in; but I never know just when I'll be able to train. Today, for instance I hope to have a session in the gym - weight-lifting. I do that about three times a week. Then three times a week I do bounding from one leg to another, high bounds each about 11-12 ft. You build up a rythm. I total them up, trying to average about 1,500. Last week I averaged 1,500, bounding along like a kangaroo, really. Then there's the more specialised steps, hop, hop, hop, step and then jump; again its building up a rythm. Now what I really need is animal strength. I've got to pile it on, then of course, there are circuits, sprinting, long runs.... I think to myself now that I don't just want to get to the Olympics in '72, I want to do something when I get there. After all I'll be 30 then. That's not necessarily old enough to retire, people in my event have gone on to 38, but because there are other things in life I want to do.

Business

Thus far there has been little room for anything except the business of athletics. He does not regret the amount of time and effort that he has invested over the last 14 years of his life, or the single-mindedness demanded by an athletic event that is something more than just jumping into sand; it has taken him to thirty-five different countries, offered him VIP treatment in the best hotels. But it has been a nomadic existence; he's never spent more than three years in one place, and now Derek Boosey feels he would like to stop running – at least as far as his private life is concerned.

He is engaged to a girl at Madeley College, and they hope to marry next year, get a house in the area, and settle down. "I've always been on the move, and I want to stop for a little while and consolidate, play a bit of golf, table-tennis and rugby, or be able just not to do anything for a week."

Nevertheless it is hard to imagine Derek Boosey not doing anything. Even sitting in a chair, and looking marvellously relaxed, he has the stillness of a caged spring, the steely quality of the born athlete. And he
continues to drive himself on, intellectually as well as physically. In January he starts a B.A. in Education course with the Open University, and he has been lecturing at Brighton College of Education.

Of course he hopes that his presence here will serve as some incentive to the Athletics Club, and there are already signs that it will help to build further bridges between Town and Gown - something that sport does so well. He has been asked by the Withdean Club to become a member, and asked to encourage students to join as well.

Nevertheless Derek Boosey is careful to stress that his job is concerned with all aspects of sport, and that he is equally ready to help the Chess Club and the Cross-Country Club, while conceiving that he hopes to put "just a teeny bit more" into the Athletics Club.

"Athletics has been a bit flat here," he says, "and I would like to get the Club on their feet. But once they're on their feet, I will not have much to do with them. It's their club and its up to them how they run it. I'll just advise and encourage, and coach wherever and whoever wants it."

Derek Boosey says his first weeks at Sussex have been busy and challenging. It is the kind of challenge he enjoys; and his carefully-tempered enthusiasm certainly will prove infectious in the months to come. Many would say that he has proved already that a world-class athlete, or at least a world-class athlete like Derek Boosey, has as much if not more, to contribute at a casually sporting University like Sussex as at institutions where greater emphasis is placed on excellence and competitiveness.

He is not going to be judged, nor is he going to judge himself, by the number of sporting victories he can help the University achieve; nor even by the numbers who may be encouraged to undertake some form of exertion as a result of the facilities that he, along with Mike Banks, is providing. But if a few more running, jumping, bounding figures begin to appear it will be seen as a major blessing at least by one Member of Parliament who considers that the reason students become Revolutionaries is through not taking enough exercise.

NEW SCHOOLS
1. a proposal for a School of World Studies
by Roderick Ogley, lecturer in International Relations

The University's plans for the next quinquennium seem to be based on the assumption that the main weight of expansion will be in social science, and that this will probably be enough to sustain either the splitting of the present School of Social Sciences into two, or the creation ab initio of a new school in this intellectual area. If so, I want to suggest that the new school should be a School of World Studies.

The case for a School of World Studies rests on two claims: first, that certain theoretical and practical questions, some of them highly urgent, can only be adequately considered in a global context; and secondly, that no School at present constituted does allow them to be considered in this way.

I have in mind four kinds of enquiries. First, enquiry into the non-human environment, and the effect upon it of our human enterprises. It seems reasonable to argue that the contamination of the air or sea, the exhaustion of natural resources, and the extinction of animal species, should be studied as global problems, rather than those of any smaller unit. Secondly, there is the question of the size and distribution of the world's population. Of the four, this is perhaps the most amenable to being considered as the sum of a set of national problems; but only by ignoring migration and the possibility that one state's population policy depends on how populous other states appear to be getting. Thirdly, there are world economic questions. Economic relations between any limited set of countries, e.g. European integration, are almost bound to affect third parties, which are liable to include all states except the totally self-sufficient. Here, surely the world is the obvious unit of analysis. Fourthly and finally, there are questions relating to the world political system - in the sense of the inter-relations of the constituent political units and the extent to which they are affected by the superstructure of international organisations, regional or 'global', no one of which now embraces the governments of more than three-quarters of the human race.

Each of these four enquiries (and there may well be others of which the same could be said) is topical, urgent, and susceptible to rigorous scientific analysis. For each of them, we need to map, in some consistent way, what is now the case, and to discover the propensities from which we can deduce what will probably happen and what might occur under specified conditions. They are all, therefore, questions for the social scientist, though some may require the collaboration of natural scientists as well. Moreover, they complement each other.

Each should contribute to the undertaking of the others.
Clearly some of the present Sussex schools can provide such a global context for the study of social science. The Schools of African and Asian, English and American and European Studies consciously limit themselves to a less than global context. That of Cultural and Community Studies is not concerned with the study of the world community (if there is one!). The best candidate among the "Arts and Social Studies" Schools, that of Social Sciences, has in recent years become more parochial rather than less. "Contemporary Britain" has been one of its two compulsory contextuals, and "World Population and Resources" has ceased to be even an option, although it was once a half, and then a third of a compulsory set of contextuals "The Contemporary World". The signs now are that this trend will be reversed somewhat, but even if it is, it is highly unlikely that the School would ever go as far as would meet the needs I have outlined. Its main emphasis, and rightly so, is on the philosophy, theory and techniques of the social sciences; and, insofar as it is concerned with their application, on their general application, which is not the same as their application to the world as a whole. A School of World Studies could thus offer something of academic merit and practical importance, which no other school now provides, or is likely to provide. In it, students might major in Politics, International Relations, Economics, Law, History, Geography, Sociology, Religious Studies, and possibly some of the natural sciences. Much depends on how many of those who now study these subjects, as students or faculty, want to do so against a background of knowledge about the world in its entirety. To some, even in Sussex, it may now seem extravagant and outlandish; but in fifty years time it will surely be a commonplace. The sooner we create a framework committing some of us to apply our wits, and to teach others to apply theirs, to the problems (and not just the political problems) of world society, the most chance we have of dealing with them while they are still manageable.

2. A proposal for a School of Cognitive Studies

by Dr Aaron Sloman, lecturer in Philosophy

As several readers of Professor Sutherland's article (in Focus, January 1970) outlining his proposal for a School of Cognitive Studies appear to have been mystified by his very brief explanation of the intellectual focus of the School, I shall try to explain why I regard it as the most exciting and important of the proposals for new schools. What I say is based on the proposal submitted to planning committee in July. This differs from the original proposal in that the suggestion that English language and literature should be included has now been dropped, and a major subject in mathematics is now included. The following are therefore currently proposed as major subjects:

- Computing science and artificial intelligence
- Experimental psychology
- Linguistics
- Logic and Philosophy
- Mathematics.

What I shall try to bring out is the way in which these subjects can collaborate in the study of knowledge, more specifically in the study of the acquisition, storage, application and communication of knowledge. First of all, there are several problems close to the centres of two or more of these disciplines. Secondly, recent developments have led to a methodological breakthrough which makes it seem likely that progress in these areas will now be much more rapid than ever before. A great deal of our knowledge comes through perception, what is learnt must be stored in some symbolic or representational medium. The form in which information is acquired may be different from that in which it must later be used, and therefore facilities are required for its manipulation, or processing. The acquisition of new knowledge is considerably influenced by what is already known, since this restricts, among other things, the scope for raising questions or hypotheses or planning exploration or experiment. In addition learning must be limited by the basic mechanisms available (e.g. genetically determined) for use in perception, or storage and manipulation of information. Starting from this framework of assumptions, we can now formulate several inter-related problems, whose solutions require collaboration between the disciplines listed above. Here are some examples:

1. What is perception? How do perceptual systems in humans and other animals work? How does perception yield knowledge? What criteria must be satisfied if artificial perceptual systems are to work (e.g. in robots)?

2. What are the particular features of the environment used in various kinds of perception and learning and how are they used? What sorts of prior knowledge are required by their use?

3. What are the features of linguistic and other systems of representation (e.g. maps, pictures, mathematical notations, computer data structures) which make it possible for them to be used for the storage and manipulation of various sorts of information? What are the relative merits in theory and practice of different sorts of representations of the same thing?

4. What are the general features of the world which make it possible for us to learn, think, and talk about it to the extent that we do? How are these general features related to the general features of language, of human psychology, of various sorts of conceptual systems?

5. How exactly do we, or can we, perceive and manipulate sentences and other symbols and representations? How can artificial devices be made to perform these functions?

6. What are the precise forms of organisation employed by human (and other animal) minds or brains for storing the enormous amounts of knowledge each of us possesses, including knowledge of the multiplicity of
types of things that can occur in the world and knowledge of particular occurrences, persons, places, states of affairs, etc., of those types? Are there alternative systems of organisation, and what are their relative merits? Which sorts of organisation for various artificial knowledge stores (e.g. libraries, computer stores)?

7. What kinds of physiological mechanisms are involved in various sorts of cognitive processes, and what influence does the nature of the mechanisms have on cognitive performance?

8. How do we reason, or solve problems of various sorts, including logical and mathematical problems? What are the relative merits of different problem-solving strategies? What are the relations between the means of expression of a problem and the efficiency of different strategies?

9. How do various kinds of perceptual, linguistic and conceptual competence develop in children (and perhaps other animals)? How much learning is due to new 'input' and how much due to reorganisation of what is already known? Are there parallels between the cognitive development of individuals and the scientific or conceptual development of a community? What sorts of teaching and learning strategies are possible and what are their relative merits? How can machines be designed with a general capacity to learn a variety of different things, as needed?

Connections

I hope this overcompressed summary has made it clear that there are very important connections between the first four proposed major subjects. I, for one, have been amazed to discover, during the past year, just how strong the connections are between traditional philosophical problems and recent developments in the field of artificial intelligence, for example. I believe the links between these subjects are much stronger, and much less in need of artificial 'bridge' courses than the links between subjects in some of our existing schools.

Mathematics is also centrally relevant to these topics insofar as a mathematical approach is required for the systematic study of such structures as sets of generative rules (e.g. grammars), learning and problem-solving strategies, conceptual frameworks, perceptual mechanisms, computer programmes, etc. New sorts of mathematics may have to be developed, and it is to be hoped that, far from being a 'service' course, the mathematics taught in this school will become an exciting new growth point.

Relevance

So much for the mutual relevance of the five subjects. The methodological breakthrough which makes it likely that this collaboration will be increasingly fruitful is two-fold. Firstly, the recent development of generative grammars in linguistics, building on earlier work by logicians and grammarians, shows that it is possible to make explicit and to express in precise symbolisms, kinds of competence which we frequently deploy but which have hitherto seemed too complex and disorganised to be usefully formalisable at all. That this kind of thing is possible has been established even if the grammars so far constructed are not correct in detail. A similar approach is now being used in the study of visual perception. Secondly, the development of computers and computing science has shown that structural complexity of theories need not be a barrier to adequate testing, elimination of weaknesses, etc.

Computers

Many people think of computers simply as machines for doing large numbers of numerical calculations very rapidly. What is more important, in the present context, is their ability to survey, represent within themselves, reorganise, and solve problems about very complex non-numerical structures. An example of such a complex non-numerical structure is a language, or your present visual field. The prospect of combining these two breakthroughs with the older approaches of psychology (e.g. controlled experiment and observation) and philosophy (e.g. analysis of unacknowledged presuppositions and conceptual links) is very exciting. The application of human intelligence in the natural sciences has yielded a vast, highly organised, and immensely fruitful body of knowledge about the world we live in, despite the ever-present dangers of misuse of this knowledge. The humanities and social sciences have yielded insights, at various levels of breadth, depth and precision, concerning the products of human intelligence (intended and unintended). But what that intelligence is, how it works, what its untapped resources are, how it develops, how its development can be facilitated, are problems largely shrouded in mystery. The time seems ripe for a new concerted effort to unravel some of the mysteries. Others will be making this effort in any case, and it will be very sad if Sussex does not make use of the splendid opportunity provided by the system of schools of study to join in this endeavour. My hopes for progress in the field are very high; after all, what we'll be studying is something very familiar to all of us.

Note

In view of the rush to meet the copy date I have not had time to consult Professor Sutherland, and this article should therefore be understood to express only my personal views. However, I have tried to base it on the report of the working party on cognitive studies, of which I was a member.
Help towards higher education has been, for a long time, a prominent feature of assistance given to underdeveloped countries whose own economic and financial problems are matched by a shortage of adequately trained local university teachers. The numbers getting through to university are still small, and the need for university teachers, great though it is, has to take its place in the demands made by other fields, such as politics and administration, where the need for top talent is even more urgent. Various faculty secondment schemes, which enable university teachers to spend a year or more at universities in Africa and Asia - usually at no cost to the overseas institution - are operated throughout the country, and Sussex has its own unique scheme financed by a Rockefeller Foundation grant. The measure of success achieved under the scheme is that since 1966, when the Foundation made its first grant of 150,000 dollars, some 5% of faculty in the Arts and Social Studies have been on secondment.

Indeed, whereas the Foundation bargained for 6 man-year secondments in that first five-year period, 10 were in fact managed, and in addition 6 or 8 more outside the scheme. Now the Rockefeller Foundation has given the University a further grant of 175,000 dollars for secondments to East Africa and Asia to cover the period 1971-6, and it seems certain that the scheme will continue to grow; it is hoped, too, that the secondment programme will expand to include scientists.

Much careful organisation has been necessary to mount and maintain the scheme; recruiting faculty, fixing up housing and ensuring that the overseas institutions have the right to agree, or not to agree, secondment proposals. In the past the grant has been supplemented by allowances paid through the Inter-University Council for Higher Education Overseas, which may cover such items as children's school fees and air fees.

A four year programme of secondments in Geography
faculty secondment cont

to Makerere University College, Uganda, is now under way.
The first member of faculty to go from the University financed by the Foundation grant was Dr. Guy Routh, Reader in Economics in the School of African and Asian Studies. Dr. Routh went on one year's secondment to University College, Dar-es-Salaam in 1967 and stayed for two years. He went out to Dar-es-Salaam accompanied by his wife, daughter and two younger sons, having just finished the summer term here ready to start University College's term which began in July. As he points out he missed the long summer vacation that year.

'The year at University College starts in July and finishes in March, so although I missed the vacation that year I had two long vacations together when I left. The University itself is about seven miles from Dar-es-Salaam, beautiful buildings designed by a London firm and built on a series of hills. Combined with the special construction of the houses this meant that we did get the cool sea breezes so welcome in temperatures of 25-30 centigrade. All the students lived in hostels on the campus and the faculty houses had been donated by various governments. For example the house we lived in had been put up on a Rockefeller grant.'

Not unexpectedly there are numerous differences between campus life at University College and at Sussex. Dr. Routh stresses the different teaching methods, and the lower teaching loads which leave more time for research. Out of the allowance from the Rockefeller Foundation, Dr. Routh was allowed £500 a year for travelling and research purposes.

Different methods

'Teaching methods are very different over there,' he says. 'We had very intensive lecture courses accompanied by seminars twice a week during which we discussed the problems raised in the lectures. Seminar groups comprised 15-25 students and this method worked well. The students were older than at Sussex, they had taken their 'A' levels when they were 21 or 22. They are also terribly hard working. Teaching loads were comparatively quite a lot smaller. I taught about seven or eight hours a week compared with twelve here. The staff/student ratio is also more favourable over there, about nine to one in a university of about 12,000 students.'

Dr. Routh considers that one of the most enjoyable aspects of teaching at University College was the fact that the faculty members in Economics were of very mixed nationalities.

'The Professor of Economics was a Hungarian and there was also another Hungarian lecturer, an Italian, a Norwegian, an American and two Africans. In the Social Sciences there were people from all over the world and there was a general mingling of ideas combined with an enterprising outlook on teaching problems and a readiness to experiment with new teaching methods. Perhaps this was because we all wished to make some kind of contribution to this underdeveloped country.'

Dr. Routh remembers University College as an intellectually exciting environment - and he wasn't thinking of the odd lion that strolled onto the campus - where people were really at grips with problems of poverty and development, and where there were sufficiently few people involved for everyone to make some sort of contribution.

'Here for every piece of advice one might give there are at least twelve people to say that it would not work but at University College one's advice was actually taken and so one proceeded with caution,' he says.

The cost of living in Dar-es-Salaam is very high and Dr. Routh found that paying his family's travelling expenses in school and university holidays was a costly undertaking. His salary was paid by the Rockefeller grant and there was an additional 25 per cent allowance from the Ministry of Overseas Development which also paid his air fares and his children's school fees.

other fields

Apart from his teaching at the University, Dr. Routh found he was called on to help in other fields. He worked as a consultant to cargo handling authorities at three ports, one of them Dar-es-Salaam, and to the State Trading Corporation. He also assisted government committees and advised on business and economic problems.

'I enjoyed my stay at University College and felt I was able to play a very useful part in the university teaching programme, and I learnt a tremendous lot myself. The scheme provides a good opportunity for Sussex people to learn at first hand about the problems of an underdeveloped country, and do something really useful to help.'

Another member of the University, Mr. Mel Griffith, Secretary of Arts and Social Sciences, spent four years as an administrator at University College, Nairobi under an ad hoc secondment.

'It was very challenging and exciting work out there,' he says. 'After I arrived they told me to start a medical school. I had full responsibility for the organisation, and that meant finding the money for the whole venture. The real need in Kenya is for technical assistants and professional people, architects, vets and engineers but of course there is the need too for high level teaching aid. There is as much benefit to the people who go out and help as there is to the Universities there. They add to their field work experience and of course get material for their research. Scientists are already going out under the Vista scheme but it would be a good idea to get them going out under the Rockefeller Grant Scheme. There is still a lack of people for administrative work but this is only a short term deficiency.'

Sussex is the only university in the United Kingdom to receive a Rockefeller Foundation grant of this kind. It has been hoped that the secondments scheme would work both ways with African or Indian lecturers coming to teach here but East Africa for example is so badly off for university teachers that it cannot spare them to come over.

This year further secondments have been made to University College, Nairobi, and to the Institute of Education at Makerere. Although so far only Arts faculty have been seconded it is hoped that the scheme will in future include scientists.

At Sussex the secondment scheme is now administered by Dr. D. F. Pocock, the Dean of AFRA, and members of faculty interested in the possibility of spending a year or more in East Africa should contact him.
Books

Will you be giving a book for Christmas? Since it's a seasonal topic, the books section in this issue is an enlarged one. There is one very large book, a children's book, and a do-your-thing book, among others. We would like, as a matter of future policy, to review particularly books which are the work of members of the University. Information about pending publications would be welcomed.

From "Tidy Again" by Bill Tidy, (Hutchinson: price 10s.)

'The War of Words' by Asa Briggs
(Oxford University Press £6. 10s.)

There has been—and now only can be—one conflict of nations which can merit a book entitled 'The War of Words'.

Before 1914 there was no broadcasting. Since 1945 the TV eye has superceded the simple microphone as commentator on those elements which create war and the way in which it is fought.

Hence the newest volume of Professor Asa Briggs' definitive 'History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom' (this time entitled 'The War of Words') provides what is likely to be the only scholarly survey—broad in its perspective, precise in its documentation—of how Radio was enlisted to fight, 1939-1945.

It is surprising that a book so rich in content (and also
so expensive) should be clothed in so paltry a dust jacket.

But, once inside, the ASA Briggs's flair for handling complicated theories with illuminating clarity is there in all its deceptive effortlessness. The strands of the story are complicated; very. This was inevitable. For the first time an infinitely exciting weapon of persuasion came under conflicting pressures from conflicting politicians. The truly surprising thing is that matters weren't worse, that the pressures of so many strategies and tactics were contained as well as they were.

Broadly, Professor Briggs's new book divides itself into two areas: The function of broadcasting for the people here at home: in terms of telling them accurately what was happening and, important also, of injecting the right element of escapist entertainment into homes deprived of entertainment at the very time when it was needed most.

(To many this aspect of the book will be most rewarding. It plots the rise of the nationwide radio personalities whose household-name 'rating' has not been eclipsed even by their successors on the box. It measures the forces which helped create the BBC's remarkable reputation - it is hard to put too high a value on it - for telling the nation the news without slant or dressing; it was this undeviating honesty in saying what was going on (palatable or impalatable) which did most to defuse the danger from enemy propaganda. Of all its stars, the 10 o'clock News had the highest radio following of any programme. Parallelled with the BBC's success in leading buoyancy to home-front morale, was the torrential war of words released against the enemy. Here Professor Briggs is in rich territory. This was the first war where this new electronic means for getting at the mind of the enemy could be used with unremitting force and in many disguises: understandably there were also many theories, many conflicting advocates of how this could best be done. This was a little domestic war of its own.

What, in the simplest terms, is the conclusion of Professor Briggs' research? Probably this: that the country's pathetic unpreparedness in the propaganda field was the soundest foundation for its immense strength later, when it vigorously eclipsed the far less flexible Goebbels machine.

In war (its peacetime use is not quite the same thing) propaganda is probably of little value when you are losing. Its importance is in giving that extra push to a tottering adversary.

Thus the ineffectiveness of Britain's Political Warfare before Stalingrad, the North African invasion and El Alamein was arguably of little account. (What Professor Briggs does, at a lively pace and with customary thoroughness, is to show how political rivalries were scrutinised on the spot and (well, largely) resolved; how, from so modest a beginning, the different weapons of propaganda were developed with surprising skill; and perhaps most important of all, how the policy discordance between the United States and Britain, was brought under cohesive control, with devastating effect once Eisenhower was deep into Hitler's Fortress Europa.

The publishers are right to claim that this fascinating story covers an area 'strangely neglected by historians'. The next volume should be just as intriguing, moving now from war to peace. For it has been a very weird 'peace'.

1 How excellent that Oxford University Press, who publish the book at £6.10s., ignore the growing practice of putting footnote references in some unreadable appendix at the back of the volume rather than at the foot of the page where they arise - and belong. I notice that Professor A. J. P. Taylor is currently, in the 'New Statesman', in argument with the publishers of the 'Eamon de Valera' biography on this same point. Professor Taylor should be supported: the place for footnotes is with the text, as might be expected of a major work of scholarship 'The War of Words' is an exhaustively footnoted book, lavish in source reference and comment.

2 The jacket is based on a thoroughly uninspired photomontage of familiar home-front radio 'faces' - C. E. M. Joad, Tommy Handley, J. B. Priestley, Lord Haw-Haw, Vera Lynn etc. Its concept is archaic, its execution crude and slovenly.

3 Though Sir Robert Bruce Lockhart, in 1941 appointed head of the Political Warfare Executive, is recorded as saying: 'These were times, indeed, when there was more political warfare on the home front than against the enemy'!

4 Professor Briggs does, however, pay higher tribute than one has seen elsewhere to the effectiveness of Germany's star radio propagandist, 'Lord Haw-Haw', William Joyce, later hanged for treason. The author explains how the name 'Lord Haw-Haw' was created by a radio columnist, Jonah Barrington. What he does not disclose is that Jonah Barrington was also a pen-name itself - for Cyril Dalmahie later Dalmahie changed his name by deed poll to that of the 19th Century diarist - Jonah Barrington.

Harold Keeble

"Do It!" by Jerry Rubin

(Jonathan Cape 35s.)

The militant protest movement in the U.S., which this book is about, has produced some very dramatic characters but only one good writer, Eldridge Cleaver. It is unfortunate for Jerry Rubin that Cleaver has written the introduction for this book because it shows one fact very clearly. Cleaver can write and Rubin can't. It is distressing to review a book wherein my sympathies are entirely with the writer but where my critical faculties are assaulted on nearly every page by the sophomoric style and really execrable English. To paraphrase Voltaire: Jerry, you old mother, I agree with
what you say but wish to hell you could find a better way of saying it.

Cleaver writes in his introduction that Rubin "almost bubbles right through the (phone) receiver the way he bubbles through this book..." Well, Rubin bubbles all right, the way a baby blows bubbles (I find Spiro Agnew's style infectious) but he bubbles as well. He goes for the short sentence and seems almost reluctant to write a paragraph. Here is a sample of Rubin's non-style:

"The energy drained from the antiwar movement.

The VDC house rattled like an old skeleton.

One day a bomb blew half the building away.

The spirit once ours was restored to Mother Earth." You dig? Damned if I do.

But Rubin is that rare bird, a man who will take risks for his beliefs. He helped create the Free Speech Movement for students at Berkeley, California and his activities led him many times into direct clashes with the police. He was arrested, served time, was subpoenaed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities... (what, by the way, is an un-American activity?) and then dressed up as an American Revolutionary War soldier for his appearance before that committee. He wasn't allowed to testify. He was seized by the arms and legs by Federal marshals and then charged with disorderly conduct.

He created the Yippie movement and is its acknowledged leader. He writes that "The Old Nixon was a yippie; the New Nixon is not." This assumes that it is possible to tell the old from the new Nixon, which I don't believe.

He helped organise the demonstrations at the 1968 Democratic Convention in Chicago, which he spells "Czechago" just as he spells it "Amerika" throughout the book. I think these tricks defeat the purpose; the eye stops at the mis-spelling and the continuity is broken.

He was, of course, a defendant at the trial subsequent to those demonstrations which became perhaps the most highly publicised trial of the decade. The book seems to have been written before that trial because no mention is made of it.

The yippie vocabulary, shared with the hippies, is a very small one. About 5 so-called obscenities are used over and over and Rubin concentrates mainly on 2 of them. But when all five, plus a few more, have been printed in the Observer, the Guardian and the New Statesman, they can't really be expected to have much shock value.

He has a touch of the McLuhans as well. Language, he says, prevents communication and he should know. He gives one superb example, though.

"CARS LOVE SHELL

How can I say 'I love you' after hearing:

'CARS LOVE SHELL'."

He quotes a few others:

"'A REVOLUTION' IN TOILET PAPER.

'A REVOLUTION' IN COMBATING MOUTH ODOR!

'A REVOLUTION' HOLLYWOOD MOVIE!

Have the capitalists no respect?"

He's a good man and a brave one. If made to choose between Jerry Rubin and Mayor Daley for a companion to share a desert island, its quite obvious whom I would pick. I admire much about the Yippie movement and hope it succeeds in unstuffing a few shirts, at least. But as for "Do It!" Its the kind of book that once you put it down you can't pick it up.

Larry Adler

"The Contractor" by David Storey

(Jonathan Cape, 25s.)

This is the book of the stage play. As you open the book on the inside page are wonderful reviews from the critics. They range from seeing it as a "subtle and poetic parable about the joys of skilled labour to "the best British play I have seen in a long time". Well I found none of these joys in the book and I wondered if perhaps it was because I hadn’t seen the play. I don't think so, I remember reading Eugene O'Neill plays, long before I saw any of them. Even in book form, O'Neill's characters laughed, cried, danced and made love, without the aid of any human jockey.

Again knowing the immense difficulty that a writer has to even write tolerable rubbish, I was prepared to be indulgent. But Storey's play sticks in my craw; I found it tedious and disgusting. I think it is a play that reflects the appetites created in a consumer society. It's a sort of middle brow Brian Rix farce.

All the old stock characters are there. A blunt Yorkshireman putting up a tent for his daughter's wedding. Two funny Irishmen. An educated son leaving poor old hard-working dad. A self-acknowledged idiot who, to add to his problems, stutters and is fed occasional bits of cake by Ewbank. Ewbank's father wanders around looking for his lost length of rope.

Ond of the critics, while admitting "There is no superficially dramatic incident," goes on to say "yet it awakens in us a sense of infinite mystery". Mystery is how on earth do you find all this in a play when the high spots consist of a man taking off his socks amid juvenile laughter about smelly feet.

I search, but I cannot find the subtle joys of skilled labour, or mutual effort in the putting up of a tent by a gang of human drop-outs who are constantly threatened by Ewbank that he will "Kick them up the arse if they don't get on with it". I don't object to workers or any one else being made fun of. I object far more to the idealised view of workers that sends Jean Paul Satre to a Paris dustbin, asking workers to be his judges. All I ask of a play in this context is that it shows the whole man. His stupidities, his dignity, his acceptance
of life, and constant attempts to break the iron circles that grip his soul. A play that asks the why of life. I find Storey's play objectionable because in it I see a pandering to theatre-going cretins who despise Brian Rix, but only seek for a Sunday Supplement alternative. So long as plays are written with the West End in view there is no hope for a major rebirth in the British stage. Contrast the situation with Russia. There the dissident writer has to write in the shadow of the madhouse. Yet great stuff is emerging, the writer is in fact the spokesman for the future. The play should be for the author, written without hope of public acclaim but rather as an extension of himself. A rocket to the stars. I feel the critics are doing a grave disservice to the theatre by their strange cavortings round Storey's empty tent.

Brian Behan

"The Truck on the Track" by Janet Burroway. Illustrated by John Vernon Lord.

(Author's note: I would like to thank Janet Burroway for allowing me to use this quote from her book."

A few years ago in a discussion on children and their books, Alan Bennett or Jonathan Miller or Peter Cook or Dudley Moore said quite seriously that you could reasonably divide the world into the Pooh-reared US, who on hearing the phrase, "the more it snows..." would automatically answer "tiddlypom", and the presumably literary starved THEM, who on hearing the same absurd sentence wouldn't know what the hell you were talking about. Only one of them delivered the pronouncement but all four and the rest of us in the group were in complete agreement because for our generation A.A. Milne's output was not so much a wealth of books, but more a way of life. When a writer produces rhythmic, repeatable, unforgettable lines like "James James Morrison Morrison", which scream out to adults as well as to children that they can only be followed by "Weatherby George Dupree", then he or she has achieved that rare piece of literature: a good children's book. And Janet Burroway, author of "The Truck on the Track", is one of the rare. She has written a delightful rhyming-prose story which neither talks down to children nor coyly simpers up to grown-ups. There is an amusing juxtaposition of ideas in the text, like an ancient Arab Sheik spinning along in a crazy modern circus truck, accompanied by such strangely assorted passengers as a Yak, a Cook, a Cock, an Imp, and a Grump. (No, I didn't know what a Grup was either, but by the second reading its quite obvious that in the sticky situation that develops when the truck stuck, the Grump growled 'grump' of course, or more probably 'thump', while the Yak yakked, the cock struck the Imp stamped.) Much of the book's charm is that even when translated from its deliciously offbeat rhyme to workaday prose the adult reader will almost inevitably keep to the writer's particularly catchy words: "The Sheik got out and took a book............................

"The Sheik said 'Eek' We're out of luck, / This truck is stuck. / This truck is broke. / We'll have to walk."

Fairly irresistible is: "The Grump began to growl 'Grump' / I'm in a temper, / I'll thump his bumper, / You mustn't pamper / The lazy lump. / The Grump thumped. / The Cook struck / The Imp stamped."

No luck. / The truck stuck."

The story is constructed on the lines of the House that Jack Built, with more and more curteous and curteouser passengers hopping out of the stationary truck with madder and madder ideas of how to get it into motion again, all illustrated in aptly lurid colours and absurdly appealing figures by John Vernon Lord and the book tumbles delightfully to this conclusion: "The imp began to slump and whisper, / I'm Imp and damp / My coat is rumpled / My crumpled crumpled / This truck is cramped / Let's camp / The Tramp jumped out and set up camp, / The Hawk chuckled / The Grump thumped / The Cock struck / The Imp stamped."

NO LUCK / THE TRUCK STILL STUCK."

Janet Burroway, who is married to Walter Eysenck, Director of the Centre for the Arts, has dedicated the book to Jo, Timothy, Katie, Toby and Corin, two of whom belong to her and three of whom belong elsewhere. I should like to add to that dedication: To Carole, Peter, Wendy and Marmont, aged 29, 24, 21 and 3 years......who all belong to us, and who have all learnt to say "The Imp stamped!"

Sally Cline
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