inside this issue:
Hair, Fulton, Education—
plus news & views
This publication is intended for members of the University of Sussex. Extracts from it should not be published without the editor's permission.

While every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of the information which is passed on, readers will appreciate that this is a news magazine and not an official publication.

Correspondence relating to Focus Magazine should be addressed to the editor, Essex House.

Designed by the Media Service Unit
printed by the University of Sussex Printing Unit
TWENTY-ONE AGAIN?

Ten years in the history of a university is a mere hiccup; three years and twenty-one issues of a university magazine is conceivably an even less eruptive landmark. Nevertheless ten years, and no more, have passed since a handful of students embarked, from a house in Preston Road, on the first University of Sussex B.A. Degree course; and Focus has been published for something under a third of that period.

Yet more has happened in ten years of Sussex history than might have passed in a hundred elsewhere: from fifty students - only in those far-off days they were called undergraduates - to four thousand, a dozen faculty to over six hundred, and £14 million worth of capital expenditure on buildings and furniture.

But what was life like in those early pioneering days? Why, as pressing, as contradictory, even as fashionably unsatisfactory as today - at least if the views of the University's first generation of students are to be accepted at face value.

Under the heading "Why not spend a year at Sussex" a 1963 issue of Wine Press advises its readers: "Here you are shielded from the stresses of the modern world... lots of exciting ceremonies, invitations from the V.C. Forget about H-bombs, apartheid and all that boring stuff - most people here haven't even heard of it!"

In the same issue, an article on "What is Wrong With the University" bewails "the clawing, strangling air of bureaucracy and committees" and the "cliques" in the Union.

A further issue draws attention to the social inadequacies of campus life, the need to make Falmer House more attractive, and tentatively suggests that mixed Halls of Residence would be a good thing, although the writer stresses: "I'm not suggesting that in any corridor male and female rooms should alternate..." But hopefully on-campus accommodation would bring the University alive after the witching hour of 5 pm.

In the following year an article points out that "residential universities tend to be isolationalist" and that an awareness of society would be better promoted "by living in Brighton rather than being buried in the cosy Falmer world".

Over ten years problems and attitudes do not seem to have changed that much, and historians of Sussex may well conclude that in a university, history has a habit of repeating itself more frequently than elsewhere. Yes, a great deal has happened at Sussex since 1961; and there's every chance much of it will happen again.

F.N.
formulation of administrative reform programmes under different economic and social conditions. The proceedings were held in English, French and Spanish, using the I.D.S.'s newly acquired simultaneous translation equipment for the first time.

The United Nations Public Administration Programme is designed to help governments carry out through-going administrative reforms through technical cooperation and through the collection, analysis and exchange of information. A series of regional seminars on public administration held in Asia, Africa and Latin America preceded the inter-regional seminar at Sussex.

U.S. EXCHANGE

The University has once again concluded exchange arrangements with a number of American Universities and applications are invited from undergraduates now in the second year of their courses who wish to spend a year in the U.S.A. for the 72/73 session. The Institutions at which places are available are Brandeis, Mass., Rochester, N.Y., Smith College, Mass., and California. Further details from and applications to Miss Hilary Everett, Room 46, Essex House.

ADMIN. REFORM

Administrators from forty-six countries met at Sussex last month for the first world-wide conference on major administrative reform. The Institute of Development Studies was host to the conference, which was organised under the United Nations Public Administration Programme, and held in England at the invitation of the British Government.

The seminar provided an opportunity for the developing countries in particular to compare their experiences in administrative reform among themselves and with other countries. Delegates from forty developing countries in Africa, Asia and the Far East, Latin America, Europe and the Middle East were present, together with delegates from Australia, France, Great Britain, Japan and the USSR.

Lord Fulton, who presided over the Commission on the Reform of the British Civil Service, was chairman and Sir William Armstrong, head of the British Civil Service, gave one of the main papers. The seminar stressed the importance of adaptability in administration, if governments were to respond rapidly to the accelerating pace of change in societies today. Guidelines were worked out for the

BOOK LOSSES

In the year ending 1970 the University Bookshop suffered stock losses of .8%, well below the average that any bookshop has to expect. But the Bookshop Accounts for 1970/71 record stock losses running at 3.2% - a disturbing increase and a loss of books amounting to £2,775. Certain security measures have been taken and their success or otherwise will be known when a further stock-taking is carried out at the end of this term. But if the present level of losses is shown to be continuing additional security precautions will have to be taken. The most probable course of action, agreed by the Bookshop Consultative Group at a meeting last month, will be to engage a security firm to provide 'store detectives'. It is not a proposal which the Bookshop Manager, Mr. R. Marshall, or the Business Manager, Mr. C. Hill are anxious to adopt. On the other hand the Bookshop cannot afford to continue to carry the kind of losses it suffered during the last financial year.

IN BRIEF

Please keep off the grass; that's the appeal from the hard-working grounds staff who point out that at this time of year turfed areas can be badly damaged. So if you want pleasant lawns to sit on in the summer, you are requested not to walk over the grass now. . . . That Arts Minibus, we are asked to point out, may be hired by any member of staff, not just faculty, providing it's used for University business, of course. . . . The Director of the Health Centre, Dr. A. Ryle, has leaflets available explaining the symptoms of V.D. Some people, he says, worry unnecessarily, others don't worry when they should. The leaflets may be obtained in the Health Centre waiting room, or by sending a stamped, addressed envelope to Dr. Ryle. . . . There may be only one graduation ceremony next summer instead of the usual two. The change is being recommended to Senate by the Ceremonials Consultative Group, which also suggests that a recital should be part of the ceremony, and that a programme of events be organised on the campus in the afternoon. Numbers attending Graduation have been falling steadily - only 43% of graduates in 1971 as opposed to 88% in 1967.
Ten years ago Sussex University opened its doors to its first students. While the first buildings at Palmer were still going up, the fifty-two under-graduates were attending tutorials in two houses in Preston Road, Brighton. Today, with over 4,000 students at Sussex it is hard to believe that the idea of rapid expansion was once considered highly controversial. Its acceptance was largely due to the convictions and persistence of Lord Fulton, first Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sussex.

HISTORY
"The history of our universities before Keele had led planners to expect universities to take forty to fifty years to develop fully. My previous experience made me doubt that this was necessary. In the end we were proved right and we reached a total of 3,500 students in only six years. We demonstrated that you don't have to develop slowly. You have to reach a critical size to get going, not less than 3,500 students, otherwise you don't get a full range of studies and a variety of people. The quality of the people who came to Sussex was to some extent the product of growth. A small college doesn't give you the same background. You wouldn't have got the people to come to a place with 500 students. You wouldn't have got the range and numbers of colleagues and students.

We jumped the gun when we opened our doors in 1961 instead of 1963. That two years was vital. 1962-67 was a period of great expansion for universities and we were right in it. Had we started in 1963 it would have been a much more touch and go affair".

John Scott Fulton was himself an undergraduate at St. Andrews and at Balliol College, Oxford, and his own experience as an undergraduate convinced him of the great value of personal contact with academic staff and the tutorial system of teaching. After two years teaching at the London School of Economics he returned to Oxford as a Fellow of Balliol to teach Philosophy and later Politics. The concept of the Schools system at Sussex was undoubtedly influenced by the Oxford tradition of the multi-subject honours courses, Greats and Modern Greats, which combine different but inter-related subjects.

"There is a tremendous difference between Oxford and Cambridge. Cambridge courses are a precise instrument providing an immaculate training. Oxford gives you the chance in Philosophy, Politics and Economics to study your subjects in a wider context. The Oxford system produces Prime Ministers, Cambridge produces dons. At Sussex you get a choice of frameworks. You will be a different person with different intellectual interests according to the context in which you have studied your subject. You don't study Economics alone; you study it against a background of contemporary Europe or Britain or the Third World".

IMPORTANT
Lord Fulton believes that if a new approach to undergraduate courses was necessary in the 1960s, it is even more important in the 1970s. "Before the war, universities were basically supplying people to fill the gaps in the professions. There were about 50,000 students in British universities before the war. By 1980 there will be about 450,000. In the past it could have been argued that you were slotting people into a society where their place was prepared for them. In the 60s we were starting a university for people who would be doing jobs that were not so very different from those of previous generations of graduates, and our concern was to prepare them for a rapidly changing world and to give them a different intellectual background. But today you might need at most 150,000 graduates for the professions."
FULTON ON SUSSEX cont.

By 1980 there will be up to 350,000 graduates who will not have prepared places waiting for them in the learned professions, and who will have to go into new fields. We have now got to give a great deal of thought as to how the first degree course will accommodate people who aren’t going onto research or into the learned professions. I still think that the years from eighteen to twenty-two are the time of life when you form your intellectual ideas. No-one thinks that early maturing has altered the significance of this period as the vital stage for coming to terms with basic concepts and ideas. British universities have always been better than any others in providing for this age-group. The real problem is are you going to throw out those students who are not of the same pattern as pre-war students? Will you put them in different institutions? My view is that what has given our society its particular character and cohesion is that the people of action have been educated from the age of eighteen to twenty-one at the same institutions and on the same courses as the scholars. This has produced a close-knit society with strong links between men of learning and men of action.

I should want to preserve the unity of higher education. I don’t want to separate teachers, technicians and artists into different institutions. When we started Sussex we wanted one university to include the college of education, the polytechnic and the art school. I was very keen on having an arts centre at the University. In the past, if you had anything to do with creative art, you didn’t go to university. Universities have never had much to do with two great fields of activity – the arts and productive industry. I think we must fill these gaps.

The universities today must work out what sort of preparation is best for solving the problems which this generation of students will have to face. The problems of the future – the environment, closing the gap between the rich and the poor countries – will involve people from all disciplines. They will be immense enterprises.

DEVELOPMENT

We must educate people to feel that they have the kind of material in their intellectual development to tackle them. We must make problem-solving a much greater component of university education that it has been in the past. If undergraduates become estranged from universities they can only be brought back by making universities more concerned with problem-solving.

While Lord Fulton does not believe that students would be well enough qualified to decide on the details of curricula, he believes they are entitled to responsibility for the subject of discussion. “I would want to bring in the young to ask them what does move them. I should want to be sure they would join in the identification of problems. They have got to feel that what you are trying to do is what they are interested in. People at Sussex took a tremendous amount of trouble to communicate their ideas. Perhaps it’s not what students today mean by participation, but there was a great deal of discussion. I believe in successive generations making their own way. You want to see them doing better than you did”.

UNIVERSITY CLOSURES 1972

The University offices and teaching buildings and the Library will be closed on the following days in 1972:–

*Thursday, 30th March 1972
Friday, 31st March 1972 (Good Friday)
Saturday, 1st April 1972
Monday, 3rd April 1972 (Easter Monday)
*Tuesday, 4th April, 1972
*Wednesday, 5th April 1972
Monday, 29th May 1972 (Spring Bank Holiday)
Saturday, 26th August 1972
Monday, 28th August 1972 (Late Summer Bank Holiday)
Saturday, 23rd December 1972
Monday, 25th December 1972 (Christmas Day)
Tuesday, 26th December 1972 (Boxing Day)
*Wednesday, 27th December 1972
*Thursday, 28th December 1972
*Friday, 29th December 1972
Saturday, 30th December 1972

On the days asterisked above there will be a skeleton staff working in administrative offices in the mornings, and the University switchboard will be manned during the mornings, but other buildings will be completely closed unless special arrangements are made for any part of them to be open at any particular time. On all days, certain staff will be on duty and science laboratories may have to be kept open with a skeleton staff of technicians to be arranged by the Laboratory Superintendent concerned.

The Refectory will be closed on the following days (but may be required to open on some of these days for conferences):–

Friday, 31st March – Tuesday, 4th April 1972 Inclusive
Saturday, 26th August – Monday, 28th August 1972 Inclusive
Saturday, 23rd December – Sunday, 31st December 1972 Inclusive

It should be noted that this notice only refers to the days on which buildings will be officially closed: a separate notice has been issued setting out how these closures affect the holidays of members of staff.
ADMISSIONS

a report on applicants who declined offers of a place

Two reports have recently been issued by the Admissions Office as part of the continuing review of admissions procedures, one concerned with interviewees' reactions to the university, and the other concerned with the practice of making pass-level offers to candidates of apparently outstanding intellectual ability.

In a 30% random sample of applicants who declined offers of places for entry in 1976, the report claims that applicants receive too little information, particularly about the university's non-academic characteristics, had too little opportunity to meet current students, found the university impersonal and unfriendly, the campus dead, the students they met unprepossessing. The report suggests that much more effort is needed to supply the informational needs of applicants, and to ensure that they meet with a civilised, if not friendly, reception.

INFORMATION

In Arts and Social Studies, where little is provided apart from an address from one of the Deans and the interview itself, four applicants wanted to meet students but found nothing laid on, and one complained at being interviewed during a vacation. Two candidates mentioned that there was little information given about contextual courses, and two others wanted to know how to change course. Three felt the lack of an organised tour of the campus and three wanted more information about student activities; and one was worried about the drop-out rate, because it appeared to have been kept secret. One interviewee (French) felt "that all the information that I required was well covered in the 'welcoming lecture' - the interview was also interesting and informative", though this might be exceptional - the interviewer concerned scored a 'hit' with several interviewees, one of whom exclaimed "...but it was a GREAT interview. Really - I mean it!"

PROSPECTUS

Although the prospectus was praised more often than it was criticised - and it was mentioned by a remarkable number of interviewees - one applicant remarked that he 'found the prospectus virtually unintelligible (certainly uninformative) and consequently five of the seven minutes for which I was interviewed were devoted by the interviewer to explaining the grounds for joining one school rather than another. I should have liked to receive - as I did from other interviewees in Oxford and York - some impression of what it was like to be taught the subject in the university. Factual information was given, but this in itself was not enough'. One girl (English) was rather more self-reliant, however: she wanted information about cultural activities "though the copious notice-boards gave some indication". In Science, as in Arts and Social Studies, our interviewees wanted more contact with students - 9 mentioned this. One chemist wrote at length: "Out of the three universities (Cambridge, Bristol and Sussex) which I visited, I feel that it was Sussex which made me most welcome..." (He accepted Cambridge firmly and Bristol as insurance) particularly in the fact that I was shown round the campus by a postgraduate student, who was of some help in giving his impressions of the University. However, the visit was arranged on a Wednesday afternoon, which I believe is the quietest day of the week around the campus, which made it rather difficult for me to sense any 'atmosphere' and to gain impressions of life there. It would perhaps be useful to candidates if they were invited down to Sussex by the undergrads (via the Union perhaps) so that they may talk with the students and thus obtain the students' views of the university". This question of interviews being held in 'dead' periods was also mentioned by two other scientists. On the practice of making offers merely on condition that entrance requirements are met (normally two E grades at 'A' level), report No. 4 notes that such offers are commoner on the Science side of the university, and that high preference applicants are no more likely to receive them than low preference applicants. The report further finds that such offers are more likely to be accepted than standard conditional offers, but that the main difference occurs in the very high provisional acceptance rate. "Given that these applicants will enter the university only if they fail to meet the conditions of an offer elsewhere, they represent a potential risk."

PERFORMANCE

The report also finds that those in receipt of pass-level offers, despite the fact that interviewers regard them as outstandingly able applicants, do not perform significantly better than other students in the Preliminary Examination, are only very marginally more likely to get a good degree, and are just as likely to drop out; and this despite the fact that they perform better at 'A' level. Given the position, if low, correlation between 'A' level results and degree performance, the effect of the pass-level offer on examination performance at the university appears to be nil. The argument that such offers will attract outstanding students to the university is not supported by the report. The evidence suggests that such students are not easily distinguishable academically, and that they are only marginally more likely to accept firmly the offers they receive.

The reports are a further contribution to the review of admissions procedures which was initiated in the Spring of 1969 by the Admissions Committee, and which is expected to continue throughout the session.
The University Grants Committee itself has recently pointed out that difficulties in student housing may well be the biggest single obstacle to the expansion of higher education in the years ahead. Relatively speaking, the situation at Sussex is not yet critical. Compared with some other Universities in which a substantial number of students are at present housed in totally unsuitable circumstances, even to being forced to sleep on floors, we are quite fortunate. But given a 50% increase in student numbers over the next five years, and possibly a doubling in size by 1981, the position could rapidly deteriorate.

Ten years ago, when the University was founded, one of the main arguments for locating it near Brighton was the pool of holiday accommodation that would be available for student use during term time. In its heyday the Guest House scheme had nearly 800 students, or two-fifths of the entire student body, living in this type of accommodation. But this was 1965/66, and since then the scheme has shrunk so that there are now fewer than 300 students resident in Guest Houses. Patterns of accommodation have changed over the years, but the problem remains the same - a shortage of good accommodation at the level of rent that a student can afford.

The first serious attempt to plan the pattern of accommodation for the University was in 1963, when an Accommodation Committee under the Chairmanship of the then Senior Tutor, Professor Corbett, made a number of recommendations for the long-term development of on-campus residences. Their report examined possible types of accommodation - halls, grouped study-bedrooms, flats, student houses, and even hotels. Their conclusions were that a wide variety of different types were desirable, mixed up as much as possible and including accommodation for student and faculty families. Also recognised was the need for shopping and medical facilities.

FINANCE

By 1966 the four original Park Houses were completed and the Accommodation Committee had begun to examine the possibilities of a student village in the north field. A Committee on Housing was set up by Council to consider the provision of residential accommodation on the site, and in the same year Social Policy Committee launched a new Working Party, again under the Chairmanship of Professor Corbett, which later confirmed that no further halls of residence should be built at that time. By this stage, however, funds for student accommodation were extremely scarce, the U.G.C. would not finance further residential buildings at Sussex and it had become clear that neither Building Societies nor the Housing Corporation were likely to assist either.

During 1967 and 1968 approaches were made to a large number of private developers in the hope that a financially viable scheme might emerge. Sir Basil Spence, Bonnington & Collins, presented a plan: Mr. Thomas, the University Architect & Engineer, surveyed 39 post-war Halls of Residence at other colleges; and the University Staff Architect, Mr. Green, also completed a survey.

It is during this period that the possibility of loan-financed development was seriously considered. A paper by the Bursar and Finance Officer on self-financing schemes was approved, first by the Social Policy Committee and then by the Finance & General Purposes Committee, in May 1967. In March 1968, Planning and Building Committees set up a project Sub-
Committee for the building of Kler Stage I, thus launching the Park Village. Throughout this period, the University grew steadily in size. There was a growing reaction by the student body against Guest Houses, and great pressure on the diminishing number of flats available to students in Brighton. The decline of the Guest House scheme is in some ways a curious phenomenon. Although most student Executive Officers have been opposed to Guest Houses in principle, surveys showed that the vast majority of students resident in Guest Houses were relatively contented. A study in 1965 by Michael Kendal, of the Research Unit for Student Problems (University of London), found that Guest Houses played an important role in the social formation of Sussex. Coincident with the decision to proceed with the Park Village in March 1968, a report appeared, prepared by B.M. Smith of the Socio-Educational Research Unit, which listed amongst other statistical information, student aspirations in terms of accommodation. At this time, modified Park Houses (36%) emerged as first choice, followed by flats (26%). A later (January 1970) but smaller-scale survey put the Park Village in first place of preference.

ON-CAMPUS

Where do we now stand on the Accommodation front? The present situation is that two stages of the Park Village have been completed, and two further modified Park Houses have been approved, in addition to the four already in existence. Park House V is under construction, and Park House VI will be started as soon as a suitable loan is forthcoming. In April 1972, when the new administration building is completed, Essex House will become a student residence. By October 1972, this means that there will be about 1,200 students resident on campus. There are no detailed plans as yet for accommodation beyond Park House VI. Clearly, there must be considerable development over the next decade, since Planning Committee agreed to a target of 40% on site by 1976-77, in order to stabilize and reduce the pressure on low-priced residences in Brighton. The precise form of this new accommodation will be subject to consideration by the Accommodation Advisory Group this term and next. Sociologically, there are good reasons why a new type of accommodation should be developed, different from both Park Houses and Village. Whether this is built further "up the Valley" or is integrated with future academic projects remains to be decided.

HOLLAND HOUSE

A pointer to future development off campus may be this year's new venture - the purchase of Holland House, a ninety-room hotel on the Brighton-Hove boundary. Bought after a two-year search for a suitable property, it was occupied by students in October, 1971, a little over a week after finalization of the purchase. Because of the rapid occupation there were a number of teething problems. However, once these are resolved, it will be interesting to see whether this type of accommodation recommends itself as a pattern for the future. Like the recent Park Village developments, Holland House is loan-financed. Government policy is still intransigently against providing direct money for student accommodation, but the U.G.C. has now agreed to give a grant amounting to some 25% of the cost to viable self-supporting schemes. The University is not expected to make a profit, nor is it allowed to make a loss on such ventures.

PROPOSALS

Another development that has not yet attracted much attention, but may be very important in the future, is the proposed Joint Housing Association. Discussions have been taking place during the past year between representatives of the University, Brighton Polytechnic, the College of Education and the Technical College. Staff and students in all four institutions are enthusiastic about such a scheme, and the next month or two may well see a joint Association form and commence operations. It is planned for students to play a major role in the management of the Association. Apart from the obvious ideological virtues of such joint cooperation, this may provide the means whereby joint student social facilities in Brighton may come into being.

At least one further avenue remains to be explored - student housing organised and administered by students. In Scandinavia the last decade has seen a dramatic rise in the number of student housing associations, sparked off by a change in the Housing Acts which allowed student associations access to loan capital, student-owned housing has proliferated. Standards of accommodation are high and most are run economically and efficiently. At present student housing associations in this country are unable to obtain subsidies and loans for similar schemes, but there does not appear to be any good reason why a similar scheme might not work here.

SUPPORT

Perhaps the most encouraging trend that has developed in recent months is the emergence of consumer groups, Park House Committees and Tenants Associations, as vital organisations. Half of the membership of the current Accommodation Working Party consists of members of the newly-formed University Tenants Association. Active criticism, encouragement and support from representative parties such as these makes the planning of residences a more effective process. New accommodation is needed both on campus and in Brighton. Rapid progress is essential if a student housing crisis is to be avoided.
EDUCATION FOR WHAT?

by JOHN FLORENCE

Penguin, often the cheapest, but not always the first, recently beat the field with the issuing of five books in their Educational Special Series. Educational reform is desperately in need of rational and radical thinking, and these books go a long way in preparing the ground and direction, and of opening possibilities of such thinking.

Significantly, the authors of all the books are American. Social problems are, in almost all cases, more acute in the U.S, than they are in Britain, in the sense that explicit conflicts and tensions accompany those problems, so that they cannot be hidden (however distorted they may appear to the public view). The "educational problem" is, however, hardly less acute in this country - if we want to talk about the purposes and efficiency of the system - it simply exists in a social context that masks its deficiencies more than is possible in the U.S. Not everyone (of course) will agree that there are grave problems in the educational system, or, rather, problems that show the very essence of the system to be morally and educationally at fault. Yet the very belief in the failing of the educational system in the West today, draws the authors of these books, as different as they are, under one banner; the banner under which "The Little Red School Book" fought (and temporarily lost), that of educational revolution.

CAPITALIST

Everett Rieimer ("School is Dead") is convinced that schools as they exist today, from primary to university level, contribute virtually nothing to the "education", that is, the process of living with growth and thought in our own society, of the individual. The role of the school is, he feels, generally "to propound orthodoxy rather than to provoke exploration". Children, from the earliest, are trained in schools to be passive, accepting, unquestioning, uncritical, and generally conservative. They learn, primarily, how to lie, to give the teacher what they think he wants, rather than to be honest towards their own feelings. They are taught to distrust those feelings, and to suppress them.

Yet these criticisms of the kind of product the system creates (we will find these recurring often in these books), are not the only objections Rieimer offers. He also explores the myth (for those of us for whom it needed exploding) of "equality of access" in education. The very assumptions and attitudes upon which education is based, are the assumptions of the capitalist society. Why, we may ask, are only 15-20% of university students working class? Obviously because the filtering system that operates ensures that those who know and recognise the rules of the game get through. The "outside" world of the working class child is vastly different from the middle-class world of order and morals he finds at school. A great amount of resources are allocated to a system that is ultimately based on privilege. The net result being that the privileged get more privilege. We only need to consider the world situation in education to see how true this is.

Granting that something needs to be done, the author argues that to hope to raise the general standard of education in the world by extending such a system is something short of stupid. Alternatively, if the resources which are available now, were to be liberated from the established channels (i.e. school building, school beauracracies and so on) and were diverted into more fluid methods of education - there would be the chance of a more equal and rational form of education, which may be accessible to all. Rieimer doesn't leave it at that. He gives examples of where and how this money could be employed. Nor is he blind to the revolutionary nature of the changes he is proposing. What would a world with an educated populace be like? How long could capitalist or totalitarian systems survive in such a world.

BREAKDOWN

Here is the crunch, the reason why so much emphasis is being put on change in the educational system. Society in the West is at a crucial point - a point of change, or of breakdown. Each of these writers is aware of, and concerned with this crisis, and of how best to emerge intact and with social justice from it. Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner ("Teaching as a Subversive Activity") state this most directly, and with the greatest conviction. Their book, they claim, is based on two assumptions; one "indisputable", and one "highly questionable". These are:

"a) in general, the survival of our society is threatened by an increasing number of unprecedented and, to date, insoluble problems;

b) that something can be done to improve the situation".

The reader, it is to be hoped, knows which is which. We have reached, the authors say, a time of technological change, and of massive escalation of world problems which renders any comparison to the past invalid. In this situation, we are (to borrow their analogy) driving at 100 mph into the future with our eyes fixed firmly onto the rear view mirror, seeing only where we have come from. In this situation the school system can be compared to the Medieval Church for its tenacious and thoroughgoing grip on the life of the people; only more so. Time is running out for 20th C. man, and the author's question which is posed and explored with rationality and calmness, is

"how do you change the thinking of culture with enormous speed?"

for it is only a change of this dimension that could carry this society at all into the future. They believe that the present educational system is totally inadequate for this task, and that its whole orientation is towards the past, believing that its knowledge and its attitude will be sufficient for the future. It is because of this "tenacious and unavoidable hold the educational system has on our lives, that change must come there.

8
Postman and Weingartner suggest a breaking down of all distinctions in subjects, distinctions which are, in any case, distinctions in language rather than in reality. The call is to eliminate tests, course requirements, administrative bodies, and so on that serve to perpetrate the system. The aim is the creation of

"an actively inquiring, flexible, creative, innovative, tolerant, liberal personality who can face uncertainty and ambiguity without disorientation", and would hence have a chance to exist in the rapidly approaching future.

**MISEDUCATION**

Paul Goodman ("Compulsory Miseducation") is no less firm in stating his beliefs. The compulsory 10 - 13 years of attendance within school walls "dose", he says, "positive damage to the young". Our over-consumptive, qualification-crazy society demands and creates the kind of conformist passive mind that it thrives on. Goodman sees the system as a trap; an educational, social, economic trap that devours privileged and under-privileged alike. The myth that education is irrevocably bound to the institutionalized compulsory experience that makes up school has, it would seem, mesmerized us all. The individual student in this situation, his hopes and fears, are merely left out of the equation. This omission is all the more inexusable and mystifying when related to young adolescents who, for the first time, may be seeking personal identity, and may be coming to their first sexual awareness in an environment that refuses to even recognise the existence of such processes. The author emphasises how much confusion and uncertainty must be created in each child by his suppression of these first glimmers of awareness in what is supposed to be a learning situation. The "learning" here is, of course, totally unrelated to the learner. Like the other writers he doubts the ability of the present school system to prepare anyone for the future, and, in turn, offers a number of solutions in which school, as an institution, is by-passed. The emphasis should, he insists, be on making our total environment a more educationally fruitful one. A partial list of his seemingly viable alternatives may only bias the case. But, like the other writers, he doesn't rely on exciting verbalizations, but states plainly and with detail on how the situation may be remedied. Above all, he feels, the honorific use of education in society is invalid; "education" must not be for diplomas and certificates which leave aside so much of what is human and include so much of what is institutionalized. It should be for the life of the individual, and the life of a society which can avoid a 1984.

**SOCIETY**

Jules Henry's "Essays in Education" are built around a structure of detailed and carefully compiled research and investigation into the educational system as it existed at the time of writing (1969). The over-all impression is one of detached reportage, rather than the impassioned analysis that marks out the other works looked at. Nevertheless, Henry shows the very definite and deep commitment that distinguishes all of these writers, and finds no qualms in saying that, "our children get the best level of education compatible with a society that requires a high level of stupidity in order to exist as it is".

The content of the essays vary from social analysis to the reporting of an investigation with under-privileged children, to compiling comparative lists of educational methods and attitudes. The author throughout attempts to achieve objectivity, even at the risk of understating his case, which he often does. After very careful compilation he finally comes to the conclusion that children, in the main, are not interested in being "educated", but, "the children are not interested in being educated because of the lack of unity between education and the rest of the social sphere".

**HARLEM**

This "lack of unity" (a typical understatement) is, perhaps best illustrated, not by Henry, but by Herbert Kohl's passionate, moving work, "36 Children". This is a personal testament of the success and failure of the author while teaching a class of 36 negro children in a Harlem primary school. It is a story not only of what the children learnt with the teacher, but of what the teacher learnt, of education, of life, of himself, with the children. The 36 kids, in a school with virtually no equipment, state text books, revived year after year to impose their facile and one-sided dogmas upon the children, were, before Kohl, asked of nothing, expected to produce nothing, condemned of nothing. With Kohl their talents, interests, their lives, even, penetrated into the atmosphere of free learning and mutual exploration which the class developed. It wasn't all idyllic, but, by disregarding the set syllabus Kohl got positive results of such a quality (the book has many extracts from the children's work) as to surprise even those hopeful of what can be done. The children learned to play checkers, and chess, to read music, put together a class magazine, wrote novels, all without Kohl telling them to do anything. But the picture isn't all rosy and successful. After the children leave Kohl, he realises what a tiny, almost useless step his individual effort becomes in the context of an entire repressive system.

**FINAL COMMENT**

All these writers offer encouragement, hope and inspiration as well as exciting despair, anger, and desperation. Perhaps the final comment of all, to sum up the effort of these writers, should be left to one of Kohl's children. This is Alvin's plea at the beginning of his novel, "The Boy in the Shuma":

".....do me a favour (just as a friend) tell other people about this Book and maybe they may be encouraged to read this Book".

Try reading, and acting on all of these books. Just as a friend.

The books reviewed are, in order of review:

"School Is Dead", Everett Reimer.
"Teaching as a Subversive Activity", Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner
"Compulsory Miseducation", Paul Goodman.
"Essays in Education", Jules Henry.
"36 Children", Herbert Kohl.

Over thirty years ago anthropologist Tom Harrison founded Mass Observation. As the first of the organizations for assessing and tabulating public opinion, Mass Observation accumulated an enormous amount of material. Mr Harrison is now spending three years at Sussex sorting through the data he collected during the 12 years he personally ran the organisation. While working at Sussex he has also been looking into 'What a Sussex Undergraduate Looks Like'. Here are his findings:

During May and June, 1971, an attempt was made to provide information on the very simple question, "What does a University of Sussex undergraduate look like?" This arose because so little seems to be known about anything behind the academic and basic home information about the student here - or anywhere else, for that matter. And because there was clearly considerable confusion between University students and others in the surrounding communities. This could even have a practical application at certain times. Elaborate sets of descriptive criteria were prepared, and initially tested on small samples in various parts of the campus. It was soon found that many of these were negative or not very meaningful, such as classifications of footwear, material carried in the hand, what was on the upper parts and so on. It was also found that for purposes of initial exercise, it was much easier to classify men than women. This is relevant, because in fact the work proved to be extremely slow and difficult - particularly difficult to get large enough samples in one place at one time, and difficult also, partly because of inexperienced observation, to do the work without attracting undesirable attention.

Eventually, two main groups of criteria, skull and face, were considered, with special reference to the hair on each of these parts of the anatomy.

The main counting was done by a graduate student, Barry Scherer, with regular discussions with TH, who also did a smaller sample in the vicinity of the Vice-Chancellor's office on several occasions, bringing the total of an acceptable analysis at just under 1,000 head. Since there is very considerable interior consistency between different sample groups at different places and on different days, and by both observers, it is believed that these are broadly representative for preliminary purposes. In addition, BS did one sample at the Brighton College of Education, 125 persons; TH did other samples at the University of Birmingham (208) and at Brussels Free University (204). The basic figures are given on the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To shoulder</th>
<th>To nape</th>
<th>&quot;Normal&quot; (to ears)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sussex University</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton College of Education</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham University</td>
<td>32 (4)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58 (6)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

(1) There is a higher degree of "normalcy" than some people realise. On the other hand the 25% shoulder-hair really are long, full locks, often associated with full beards as well (see next Table). Only a quarter of the undergraduates have hair length acceptable in the British Army, for instance. Further study will subdivide this by faculties, etc.

(2) A big drop in very long hair, but the transference
is to longish (nape) not to short (cf. note 8).

(3) Same proportion as Sussex University; we will further explore this "normal quarter" (a sort of Silent Minority?).

(4) Though one had to classify 32% as shoulder, and this shows the Falmer pattern is by no means specialised, it must be noted that the Birmingham shoulder-hair is generally less lavish, less associated with full beards, or other "hippy" stereotypes (cf. note 9).

(5) Still, the normals at Birmingham are noticeably low. Of course, the sample needs extending.

(6) Brussels is basically much more "normal looking" than the other three, and the clothes support this (very conventional mostly). Even so, there is a clear trend towards long hair here; it is creeping down the nape in a way that would have been barely acceptable in this bourgeois community even when I first came there (2 years ago).

Percentage of sample who had cheek hair extending down to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full beard</th>
<th>Trimmed beard</th>
<th>Moustache without beard</th>
<th>Cheek only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sussex University</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton College of Education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18 (8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12 (9)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

(7) This category was subdivided, and further details are available.

(8) Thus Education College actually had more beards than Sussex University, though more of them were trimmed (cf. note 2).

(9) This was pronounced difference at Birmingham, as was the noticeable absence of big beards despite long hair (cf. note 4).

(10) Again, Brussels was most but not very "conventional".

Further study is in hand, including counts in France and elsewhere this summer. Also study of the "pseudo-student", artisan hippies etc., in Brighton; conversely the "pseudo-artisan" here and elsewhere.
LONG & SHORT: BUT WHO IS WHAT?

Following Tom Harrisson’s research findings on birsute homo sapiens recorded on the preceding pages, we conducted our own survey on the campus and in Brighton. The photographs below represent a selection of hair-styles. Can you decide which are students and which are not? Answers at foot of page.

A

B

C

D

E

F

KEY:

A Window Dresser  E Unemployed  C University Student  D Brighton Poly Student  B University Student  F Photographer
Although to all outward appearances the recently-opened Education Development Building, overlooking the former’s land between Arts B and Arts C is architecturally indistinguishable from its neighbours it reflects the increasing importance of the University’s contribution to a wide range of educational training and research activities.

FLEXIBLE

It provides, with the use of UGC funds and private benefactions, one centre within which there is both space and equipment for social psychologists, for those involved in the study and development of aids to teaching, and for a variety of courses for in-service teachers and student teachers.

A feature of the design is the emphasis which has been placed upon flexible use of space, and many of the rooms have interchangeable uses, either for display, conference, seminar or common room purposes.

Among the building’s occupiers are a number of units which had been previously scattered throughout the University. For example the School of Education, the Centre for Continuing Education, with its particular responsibility for the organisation of extra-mural courses, the Centre for Educational Technology and the Media Service Unit.

Rising from the ground floor through two floors is the television studio and an adjacent lecture theatre, two large areas which form the central core of the building. The television studio, measuring 44ft by 44ft, compares in size with some BBC studios. A somewhat vertiginous spiral staircase provides access from the studio floor to the control room over-looking it on the first floor.

Among the studio’s regular users at present is, of course, the ITVS student news programme, and the increased capacity which it provides now makes it possible for other student and faculty productions to be accommodated as well as usage for educational purposes.

Adjoining the television studio is a large lecture theatre equipped with a retractable inclined floor. With the seating ramp withdrawn the theatre could then be used as a workshop, exhibition and free activity area.

Two further sound-proofed studios, a workshop and an electronics workshop, form part of the complex occupied by the Media Service Unit, which is responsible for the provision of central audio-visual services, including television, photography, graphics, film-making, film previewing, sound recording and the distribution and operation of equipment.

The Photo and Graphic Unit itself is situated on the ground floor of the Education Development Building, and access to it is by way of Arts C.
EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BUILDING  cont.

On the first floor is a section devoted to Social Psychology.

There are six carrels for interviews or experiments involving two persons - an observer and a subject. These booths have audio, visual and data links through which signals may be transmitted to a monitor room. A typical experiment which could be carried out in these booths for example, might be concerned with performance in different kinds of communication networks, and how these facilitate or inhibit performance. Another experiment might involve the response of several individuals to the same type of instructions and stimulus materials - for example in solving problems.

The carrels themselves look out on to a large room, enabling the occupants of the booths to observe a 'social event' in the larger room, or be observed themselves, from it. The social psychologists, undergraduates and graduates, who use the rooms are setting up in controlled conditions some of the typical interactions which take place in a more complex way in everyday life.

The Nursery, formerly in the Refectors terrapins is on the first floor, too, but, because of the split-level design - the building merges into sloping ground at the rear - its windows open onto ground level and a paved playing area.

DEAF CHILDREN

Next to it is the section of the Education Building financed by Mr. Reginald M. Phillips, to be used for the research on the education of deaf children. Facilities here include a seminar-observation room, a workshop and classroom, and facilities for audio-visual work. The Research Unit is concerned with observing deaf children in learning and play situations and will be developing new learning programmes. The Unit also envisages work with subnormal children involving psycho-neurological testing and therapy, and with therapeutic treatment of reading and learning. The Reginald M. Phillips Deaf Unit which opened in September 1969 has as its objectives research into educational technology including problems such as human learning, conceptual development, psycho-linguistics and media organisation.

Priorities for future development are research into audio-visual systems of teaching and modes of learning, and research into other areas of special education, such as educational subnormality, brain damage and sensory handicaps. The Unit has already established that one can teach information and language structure with programmed learning. It is already engaged on two film projects. One of these 'Television and Film Learning Modules' involves the development of multi-sensory modules for the deaf which make use of synchronised auditory visual and verbal learning methods. A deaf child will be able to look at a television screen, talk into a microphone and see 'word images' on the TV monitor. The unit is investigating ways in which such a method can be programmed and used in learning situations. Deaf children from schools in the county will be using the classroom on this floor.

DISPLAY AREA

The top floor of the building is partially taken up by a Science laboratory and the offices of the School of Education. There is also a large display area which may be used for a variety of purposes and is large enough for lectures. The Primary Creative classroom is shared by various groups in the University. This is a home base for Postgraduate Certificate of Education students going into Primary schools, and for future secondary school teachers who engaged in creative work as part of their course.

The room itself is expected to work as a 'simulation' classroom but is also used for seminar workshops and discussion groups, as well as painting, clay modelling and music making. Previously crafts have been practised by these students and teachers in a small and inadequate crafts room in Arts. Although Certificate of Education students and in-service teachers will use the classroom most, it is not restricted to these groups alone.
Part of the Continuing Maths Project Exhibition

The National Council for Educational Technology founded in 1967 by the Department of Education and Science was given specific functions. These included investigating the possible uses of a variety of media (tapes, film loops, slides etc) in education at all levels, and the setting up of projects which would show the possibilities of a systematic approach to education taking full advantage of the use of these materials. The Council then looked for an area which had a definite need for this type of approach. It chose the teaching of mathematics. The aim was to provide self-instructional material for sixth-form pupils who were not studying maths as a main subject. Basically this is what the Continuing Maths Project here at Sussex is all about.

There were several offers from all over the country to house the project and it was not long before the representatives from the University of Sussex, Professor J.F. Scott and Mr. Norman McKensie were persuading the committee concerned that Sussex was the right place for it. The availability of space in the new Education Development Building no doubt was a factor in influencing the committee. And last month the Continuing Maths Project was formally opened there.

The project aims to produce some 200 hours of self-instructional material for use in sixth forms, Colleges of Education and Further Education necessary in a subject where there is a national shortage of teachers for work of this kind. The material the project will provide will be primarily aimed at arts students or those taking subjects such as biology or economics, although once the material is produced, it is unlikely that its use will be limited to these groups. It will not aim at a very high level of mathematics but hopes to appeal to the new kind of student who will appear increasingly in sixth forms in the future. That is the student who will not necessarily be taking A levels. The project in fact intends to keep firmly in mind the growing awareness in schools and in industry of the need for a general level of numeracy as well as the accepted need for literacy. The basis of the project's activities is a feasibility study published in 1969 by Dr. M. Ernest from CET and Dr. A.G. Howson from Southampton. Work has begun on a set of modules which will eventually be tested in schools, locally at first, in the nearest five or six education areas in Surrey and Sussex, and when work has progressed, on a national scale. The first module is being developed as an introduction to calculus, another nine are planned. Once a text has been produced the project members work in collaboration with the Media Service Unit to add tapes, films and slides, where these will make learning easier and of course within the kind of budget which schools can be expected to afford.

At the moment the project team consists of two full-time members, its director, Mr. Bill Fuller, and Dr. H.M. Semple, and two part-time members, Dr. M. Ernest and Dr. A.G. Howson. Financial support comes from a number of sources, principally the Schools Council which has a long-term interest in the project. The remainder of funds come from the National Council for Educational Technology, the Department of Education and Science, the Scottish Education Department and Industry.

Why do we really need a continuing maths project at all? Says Director, Bill Fuller: "All kinds of people are being affected by the new uses made of mathematics; managers in industry, anybody who is concerned with the use of computers. The division between the arts and science sides at school has been deplored by many people and it is highly likely that it will not be long before we adopt a less specialised pattern of education of pupils between the ages of sixteen and eighteen. With the shortage of maths teachers, there is a clear need for self-instructional material."
ANARCHY & APATHY

Mrs Margaret Anne Rooke, a Sussex graduate, is the author of 'Anarchy and Apathy' (Hamish Hamilton, £2.50). In the book she says of Sussex: "It has failed in its elementary duty to make its students think".

We asked her to expand this comment. Mrs Rooke writes:

Dear Sir,

It is the duty of a university to ensure that its students are sent into the world with at least some factual knowledge that might be useful to themselves and to the community, and, more important, some spirit of enquiry and some capacity for individual decision. In short the gift which a university is supposed to bestow is the ability to think. For this ability to develop a student has to learn about things in which he is not interested, facts which he resents and attitudes of which he disapproves.

Sussex University has failed in that it has allowed its students to shut out from their minds things, facts and attitudes they dislike and do not want to know about - except as targets for hysteria. This moral weakness has best been shown by the University's condonation, in 1969, of the students' exclusion of Sir Archibald James from union premises and by that of Major Patrick Wall's exclusion the following year. The university authorities preferred not to know. Nobody could accuse them of being brave to the point of foolhardiness in defence of freedom of speech,

The sin imputed by Sussex students to Sir Archibald and Major Wall was that of condemning racialism in Rhodesia. It did not occur to these students that ignoring the existence of reprehensible views is hardly the best way to deal with them. One wonders how some Sussex students will deal with racialism and racialists when they are compelled to come into contact with such feelings and people on leaving their ivory tower for the big, bad world.

As one who, when a Liberal candidate for the GLC in 1970, was shouted down by the National Front I have some right to question the wisdom of allowing Sussex students to seal themselves into a little world of their own where nothing is allowed to challenge accepted views.

This is why I think that Sussex has failed its students. It has encouraged self-importance, self-indulgence and uniformed intolerance in political and educational matters.

It was after Sussex students had claimed that they had the right to exclude speakers that he authorities gave them a larger share of power. By yielding to mass hysteria, the great attraction of which is the prospect of being able to behave badly without being called to account, Sussex university authorities have failed in their duty. The principle that each student is responsible for his convictions and the actions to which they lead him has been obscured. This hardly fits them for life outside. The authorities have not even the excuse of believing in student "idealism" as an excuse for the exclusion of Major Wall and Sir Archibald. Rhodesia has long been forgotten as an occasion for excitement and the present negotiations with the Smith Regime have provoked virtually no protest. The sufferings of the black Rhodesians have outraged their excitement value and Bangla Desh is the fashion.

Excuses and condonation are usually all that Sussex authorities and faculty offer. They seem to have a persistent hope, repeatedly proved vain, that better public relations can diminish very natural public hostility. They dare not tell their students a few home-truths. Some bracing self-criticism is needed by both staff and students at Sussex. Some Sussex teachers seem to feel timid about criticising student excesses. The fear of being thought "illiberal" makes them muddle-headed and easily persuades them to condone what no university community can condone without forfeiting its right to be considered a university community. A society of scholars is not made up of amateur totalitarians and those who say weakly "They are good lads at heart even if they go a bit far sometimes." Though there are honourable exceptions this seems to be the prevailing mood. I conclude by saying that any university circular asking Sussex graduates for money will receive a terse and negative answer from at least one addressee. The money spent on Sussex University would be more usefully spent on primary schools.

MARGARET ANNE ROOKE

MARTLET....

Dear Sir,

May I complain in the strongest possible terms about several aspects of several articles in "Martlet" of 28th October last?

To begin with a bit of subjectivity, the article "Peacock Pick Parade" (P6) was the most hideous to come to my notice for some time. Obviously people are entitled to express whatever opinions they like about their own and other people's garb, but for you to devote space to an article such as this oozing with petty bourgeois attitudes is in my opinion a gross waste of time and money, and an insult to any intelligent reader's intellect.

Not wanting to be hyper-analytical about this article (because you can destroy anything by scrutinising it in detail), in a way which was never intended (see "Ox" trials), the echoes attached to an article of this type is one of the middle-class sods who thinks that what he wears actually should make a difference to the other middle-class sods. "Everybody said they were being themselves, that their dress was an extension of themselves" reveals that this particular everybody can afford to dress as they like (while at University anyway)!

Everybody must think that people actually deduce from the cover the book, and how perturbing is this moral? But enough of this criticism - on with the facts.

Your article "NUS Chief Here" (P1) implies either an atmosphere of mutual mistrust between Jacks and myself, or one of plot and subterfuge, or, indeed, both. Do you publicise it everytime somebody you know comes to see you? Isn't it a surprise to anybody you haven't told? "President Dave Feintuck gave the official reason...." is a load of cock - I don't need anybody's permission to see whoever I like, in whatever capacity I like. Nor do I have to, nor do I, produce "official reasons".

You deteriorate to "Telegraph" standards mentioning "£500 to Bangla Desh" and £800 to be given for school milk". That the £500 is going to the British Aid Consortium for aid for refugees and that the £800 is earmarked for suggested action from a Committee to the Union in General Meeting are vital legal points, and well you know it. That I was allegedly "not enthusiastic" about the Jacks meeting is also nonsense;
I am pleased to hear everybody's point of view and advice, be they pro or con the Union. That the visit was designed to pressure us into following NUS line is a downright untruth. NUS is there for us to use and for us to unite under. I despise the sensationalist outlook which calls a conversation, informal to the utmost, a "conference!"

Your other front-page article "Wooden Spoon Winner" is another example of cheap gossip-mongering and twisting facts to feed gossiping mouths. It begins with a (quite rightly) cynical account of "University Challenge"; this being a manifestation of our obscene educational system. The comments with respect to the team's late arrival are absolutely false; the team members had been at Granada since early afternoon; I accompanied the spectators, and not the team, and the beer was consumed by none of the team on the trip up.

The most disgusting and foul-mouthed remark instigates Chris Stankiewicz's performance was a major factor in our team's defeat. We were told by producer Douglas Terry, when he visited Sussex (another "surprise and unpublicised" "conference"?) that the essence of winning this absurd game was based on interrupting "starter" questions if you had any idea at all of the answer, which Chris, in my opinion, did to the best of his ability and quite correctly. If the author of this snide remark thinks he or she could have done any better under the circumstances, they're a bloody sight cleverer than most.

Might I conclude, therefore, that the cheap sensationalism, factual irresponsibilities, and deep-rooted middle-class attitudes on display revolt me personally. Your paper receives Union funds, and yet is independent; it reminds me so much of the big boys papers. Your staff is playing at being reporters in a macabre way; the service it provides in this issue under attack I feel is worse than none. The standard of "Martlet" had better improve drastically in the near future, or I will do all in my power to wipe this paper and any hangers-on-with-the-media-man-image off the belly of this Union, where they presently parasitically sojourn.

Yours faithfully,
David A. Feintuck
Union President

AND A REPLY

Sir,

Mr. Feintuck raises the question of "service" in his letter of October 28. May I outline what I believe this service is, and how Mr. Feintuck's criticisms of "Martlet" relate to it.

Above all I have fought to make 'Martlet' a newspaper this year, and not just a magazine. This is why 'Martlet' is published weekly now and in a tabloid size. That neither the visit of Digby Jacks nor the result of our 'University Challenge' contest against Corpus Christi were mentioned in 'Unionews' justifies, I believe, our running the stories in some detail, and supports the argument that Sussex must have a regular newspaper that remains independent of the Union. As to the charge that these stories were inaccurate, the only factual error we made was to say that the team travelled with the supporters and was therefore late for the taping. We have printed a correction in the following issue and apologized for this inaccuracy.

Mr. Feintuck's other challenges on factual grounds are, however, unfounded, and I believe he and I are now agreed on this point. Thus there seems little need to elaborate on the meeting in which Mr. Feintuck described in no uncertain terms his feelings about his meeting with Mr. Jacks.

The other criticisms which Mr. Feintuck makes are clearly matters of opinion and taste, not of fact. Such criticism often tends to the extreme phrases, and thus 'Martlet' is accused either of being too boring and of too limited interest, or of being too sensational and riddled with middle-class attitudes. Sensationalism is pernicious exaggeration, and we are not, I believe, guilty of that; the visit of the NUS president-elect is significant (whatever its motive), and the Union reception was unenthusiastic. Nor is the University Challenge report "foul-mouthed" since clearly the story was at least part tongue-in-cheek, nor is it "insinuating"; on the contrary, the story is quite clear in its critical account of the contest.

Finally, on the subject of the fashion article, may I say only that my personal tastes are not stamped on every article that 'Martlet' publishes, nor should they be. This is what I understand as a 'democratic newspaper'. 'Mutatis mutandis', the Union executives are not within their rights to set the course of 'Martlet' according to their own tastes and attitudes.

The service which 'Martlet' provided in the October 28 issue was "worse than none", says Mr. Feintuck. To the Executive, certainly. But then 'Martlet' is not written for the readers in the Union office alone (they have a sufficient number of minutes to peruse) nor is it supposed to defend the Union before its members (that is what 'Unionews' should do). 'Martlet' is published to inform the members of the University and the College-in-news, comment, features, the arts, and this I believe is the 'service' we should provide.

Before the Executive sets out "to wipe this paper... off the belly of this Union", he might remember that the Union is itself often accused of providing a "service" worse than none by some students, faculty (and also some MP's) simply because the Union is seen not to be catering to their particular interests. If this undemocratic attitude is to be challenged, wherever it appears, it must be first rooted out at home.

I recognise, of course, that Mr. Feintuck's last paragraph is at least partly tongue-in-cheek (rather as our 'University Challenge' report), and thus it would be sensationalistic of me to construe it as an attack on the autonomy of the Union's independent newspaper.

Yours sincerely,
Doug Gerwin,
Editor, 'Martlet'

NOW WE KNOW

Dear Sir,

We all must have wondered at some time or another what Sussex is all about. Clark Kerr has described the modern University as being essentially a series of individual faculty entrepreneurs held together by a common grievance over parking. All is now revealed; Sussex is unquestionably a modern University.

Yours sincerely,
Tom Forester.
Nearly 5,000 people at the University of Sussex carry a Union card. The great majority of these make up the membership of the Students' Union, which is not only the largest but also the richest of the representative organisations on campus, with a budget of £51,000 this year. It should also be the best informed, since it has more seats on University committees than all the other organisations put together. The glare of publicity within which it operates tends to overshadow the other representative bodies on campus, but there is provision for representation on campus for every grade of staff from tea-lady to Vice-Chancellor.

The manual workers and skilled craftsmen are represented by two unions, the National Union of Public Employees (NUPE) and the Electrical and Plumbers Trade Union (EPTU). Clerical and secretarial workers belong to the National Association of Local Government Officers (NALGO) and the purely Sussex based Staff Association. Technicians and academics may for the most part be found in the Association of Scientific, Technical and Managerial Staffs (ASTMS) and the Association of University Teachers (AUT).

The University of Sussex, like other British Universities, is at present in the process of defining and formalising its relationships with the unions. Under the 1970 agreement of the TUC on "spheres of influence", NUPE was given sole organisational rights among manual workers at the University. Similar rights for technical staff were given to ASTMS and for clerical workers to NALGO.

The University has always recognised the right of its staff to join Trades Unions or other associations, and has now accepted the TUC's recommendation that within the University these three unions recruit members from the appropriate groups of staff and represent their members. The University has also agreed that when a union can show that the majority of the relevant staff are members, it may then represent the whole of that category of staff in consultations with the University.

The University has already recognised ASTMS, which has a membership of over fifty percent of the technical staff on campus, as representing the technical staff as a whole, and ASTMS officially represents this group on the University's Consultative Committee for Technical Staff. When NUPE's claim that the majority of the manual staff are members has been confirmed, the Union will also become the accredited representative of that group of staff. Only a minority of clerical and secretarial staff at the University are NALGO members, and for the moment therefore, the University does not recognise NALGO as representing the whole group of staff.

**NUPE**

Chairman: Mr. A. Paine.
Secretary: Mr. G. Akehurst

The Union for manual workers and auxiliary staff, including porters, cleaners, groundstaff, boillermen and canteen staff, is NUPE. The National Union of Public Employees is the fastest growing manual workers' union in the country, with a membership rising by over 60,000 since the dustmen's strike of 1970, to over 333,000. On campus the NUPE branch has 165 members, about 70% of those eligible to join.

At present University porters work a five and a half day week, and NUPE are currently campaigning for a five day, forty hour week for university staff. NUPE is also pressing for an improvement in holidays for its members, who are at present markedly worse off than the technical and secretarial staff.

The chairman of the campus branch, Arthur Paine,
welcomes any moves to invite the participation of his own and other unions in University affairs. Unofficially, the branch already represents the general staff on General Staff Consultative Committee and on the Community Services Committee and its advisory groups.

"I feel it saves a lot of misunderstandings. At least you know what's going on. At least half the things that come up on the Consultative Committee arise from misunderstandings. In a big place like this, we get a big grapevine going, which is often very misleading and can get people very upset. It's very important to get to know people, so you can go to them with your point of view".

EPTU

Shop Representative: Mr. E. Nicholls

Most of the craftsmen on campus belong to their own specialist unions. The largest group belong to the EPTU, the Electrical and Plumbers Union, which has one representative on the staff side of the General Staffs Consultative Committee. He also assumes an informal responsibility for the other craftsmen on campus, such as the carpenters and painters. The University accepts the nationally negotiated EPTU wage scales, and on conditions in universitites the EPTU works very closely with NUPE.

Like Mr. Pain, Eric Nicholls, the EPTU shop representative at the University, is all in favour of being brought in to University committees.

"We are rather on the forgotten side. Perhaps because we wear overalls, we're not accepted as much as the technicians. But things are certainly better than they were seven years ago when I began working here. We are brought into the picture much more now. The committee we'd like to get into is the Planning Committee, so we can see where the money's spent".

ASTMS

Chairman: Mr. D. Rumsey
Secretary: Mrs. J. Atherton

The Union for technical staff, ASTMS, was formed in 1968 when ASSET (the Association of Supervisory Staffs, Executives and Technicians) amalgamated with AsCW (the Association of Scientific Workers). The combined membership of the two unions was then 80,000. ASTMS now claims over a quarter of a million members. The overwhelming majority of University members are technicians, but ASTMS also took over some of AsCW's members who were academic staff on the science side.

Recently, the ASTMS has begun to actively recruit academic members and it now has organized groups of academic members at many major universities, in response, it says, to a demand for a "more valid professional trade unionism amongst academics".

ASTMS has a branch on campus with 185 members, about seventy percent of technical staff eligible to join. Several academics have recently joined the Union.

For the past two years, ASTMS have been negotiating a new nationally agreed wage scale and structure for technical staff in universities. "Technical staff in universities have been consistently underpaid in comparison with technicians doing equivalent jobs elsewhere", says David Rumsey, Chairman of the University branch.

David Rumsey would like to see the Unions with some real power on campus. "The Consultative Committee has no power at all. It can make recommendations to the Science Committee, which then go to Planning Committee and eventually to Senate. It's a very long process. The Consultative Committee only meet once every four months and there is no formal machinery for putting forward suggestions between meetings". He thinks that given the chance, all the staff would have something to contribute to the University. "I see no reason why technical staff should not have a full say in the running of this University. I'd like to see some real participation".

AUT

Chairman: Dr. L. Allen
Secretary: Dr. E. Lilley

The Association of University Teachers is the organisation of university teachers, administrative, library and research staff. It is recognised by the Government as the national negotiating body for faculty salaries and conditions of service. It is not affiliated to the TUC and last year in a national ballot, members voted two to one against joining.

At Sussex membership amongst teaching, administrative and library staff is high. About eighty percent of those eligible are members. Last year the University branch held a recruitment drive and AUT now has 450 members on campus. About 700 people are eligible to join. The biggest gap is among research staff on short-term contracts, who feel, perhaps, that their stay at universities may be too temporary to warrant joining the Union.

While there is uniform, national system of salaries and conditions for teaching staff, different grades and salaries operate for administrative, library and research staff in different universities. The AUT is trying to implement a national policy to simplify the system, facilitating moves between universities for all its members. It is also trying to upgrade and improve conditions for administrative, library and research staff.

The AUT represents faculty on the Community Services Committee, and as individuals, members are closely involved in the running of the University. While some argue that faculty have plenty of opportunities and channels through which to make their views felt, other AUT members on campus feel that AUT as such could play a more active role in University affairs. Dr. Edward Lilley, Secretary of the Sussex University branch says, "Senate is not a democratic body. It doesn't represent the general view. We would like to know what's happening, to be consulted and to have influence".
UNIONS cont.

STAFF ASSOCIATION

Chairman: Mr. C. R. Kelley
Secretary: Mrs. D. Young

The Staff Association is a non-Union body, set up in 1968 for clerical, secretarial and library staff. It has nearly 300 members and claims that nearly one hundred percent of those eligible to join are members. The Association represents its members on the Clerical Staff Consultative Committee and other university committees. It has no national organisation and no negotiating machinery but "consults" with the University over conditions and salaries.

In its introductory circular to new members of staff, it says that although it is not a militant body, it has put forward its views as forcibly as possible, "In the past three years, for example, four pay rises have been awarded, some quite substantial. These follow claims put into the University by the Staff Association, generally in line with the development of salaries of local government employees".

The Staff Association feels that the NALGO branch, which has recently emerged on campus, has little to add to the service already provided by the Staff Association. Its view is that while NALGO-negotiated salary scales and conditions of service may have favourable effects for Staff Association members, they should feel no obligation to join the Union. Chairman, Ron Kelley, says, "We don't require an agent to act on our behalf. As a body we are sufficiently large to make our voice heard".

NALGO

Chairman: Mrs. E. C. Stewart
Secretary: Miss Y. Taylor

Since June 1971 when a NALGO branch was set up on campus, membership has risen from five to over thirty. The National Association of Local Government Officers is the fifth largest trade union in Britain and with 370,000 members is the biggest white-collar union in the western world. Its membership includes not only local government employees but also clerical staffs of twelve public services and nationalised industries. Its scope was extended to cover University non-academic staff when the Colleges of Advanced Technology, in which NALGO had many members, were given University status. Unlike academic and technical staffs, clerical and administrative university staff have until now had no national wage and grading structure and no national conditions of service. NALGO is represented on the Central Council for Non-Teaching Staffs in Universities which provides a national negotiating machinery through which the unions have submitted a claim for a uniform structure for all university administrative and clerical staff. NALGO is currently pressing for a 35 hour working week and improvements in salaries, with a minimum salary of over £900 a year at age 18.

The chairman of the Sussex NALGO branch stresses the importance of belonging to the Union which is responsible for negotiating salaries and conditions. "People don't seem to realise that when they get a ten percent rise, it's not because the Staff Association have asked for it but because NALGO has won an agreement. One of the reasons I joined NALGO was because I felt I was a parasite on them. They were working for me and I was doing nothing to help".

The branch has found there's a certain amount of hostility to the idea of belonging to a Trade Union, together with ignorance about the role of NALGO in obtaining higher wages. Mrs. Stewart points out that NALGO is a very responsible, non-militant, professional union. It is affiliated to the TUC, but makes no payments to any political party, and is proud of its political neutrality. "It's not a union you hear very much about in the news. But that doesn't mean they are not getting on with it".

STUDENTS UNION

President: Mr. D. Feintuck
Secretary: Mr. P. Lamb

All undergraduate students automatically become members of the Students Union when they enter Sussex. The Students Union at Sussex is an autonomous body, and is independent of the National Union of Students. Dave Feintuck, this year's President explains, "It is a constituent union of the NUS rather than a branch. The NUS is itself a federation of unions, and is only the average majority view of the constituent unions".

The Union's large income comes from a student contribution of £14 per head per year, which in the majority of cases is paid by Local Education Authorities to the University as an integral part of tuition fees. Neither individuals nor Local Education Authorities can opt out of paying this sum, as the Union's existence is written into the University's Charter. The Students' Union is thus guaranteed the hundred percent membership for which the Trade Unions on campus strive, but at the same time it has no right to expel any of its members. Only a minority of the members take an active part in the Union's affairs. Dave Feintuck says, "I shouldn't think more than one-third of the students at the University have ever been to a Union meeting. Students are so pampered and pampered to when they get here, they don't feel they need to belong to a union".

The Union's role, is to protect and develop the interests of its members, and this, says Dave Feintuck, can take on a lot of shapes and forms. "We're a bad social club with political overtones. If members feel all the money should be spent politically, not on dances, that's up to them. We're not a services union. We believe that the Universities should provide a lot of the facilities that unions are financing".

At present Sussex University Union's major campaign is the fight against the Government's consultative document, "The Financing of Student Unions," which would abolish payment of fees by local authorities.

"It's worth equating this so-called consultative document with the Industrial Relations Act. It's typical Tory divide and rule policy".
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BOOK REVIEWS

Two Worlds: An Edinburgh Jewish Childhood.
A Third World. Both by DAVID DAILCHES.
Sussex University Press, 1971. £1.75 and £2.50.

Temperamentally, Professor Dailches has an advantage over the rest of us. The world to him is manifestly a good place, in which hopes are realised and achievement rewarded. Both these books might be described on the analogy of "embittered", as "ensweetened". Of a period when his father, the rabbi, was the victim of concerted calumny Professor Dailches writes: "My father, who had conducted his side of the business with a fine dignity, won in the end, as he was bound to". Even when it is based on hindsight, such confidence is enviable. When a writer views the world through rose-coloured spectacles, the general effect is one of winsome simplicity, like when a writer views himself in the same manner (and this is an autobiography) we smoke complacency and, on occasion, worse, Professor Dailches tells us too often of his facility and brilliance, and when one comes to the account of his first lecture at Cornell, the gory rises; it seems that Dailches took over from a less gifted predecessor in mid-lecture, so to speak: "A certain romantic aura surrounded the new young British professor. I strode to the platform.... I spoke with vigour and eloquence.... Years later, when I lectured at the Sorbonne, one of the professors there said to me afterwards: 'Vous avez éclaté vos étudiants!'. I think the same could have been said of those Cornell students". He adds charmingly, "I was showing off, I suppose", but we are not appealed. Significantly, the passage comes from the second volume, which costs more and is worth less than the first.

"Significantly", because the first volume is saved from egotism by the presence in it of Professor Dailches' father. Here, all the anxiety and pride of scholastic attainment is altruistic; young David, striving to shine for his father, is a more acceptable figure than the grown-up David, who shines alone. Yet the second may deserve our sympathy more than the first. Curiously, the book itself sets a high standard in such matters, for towards his father (whose venial faults appear to have included a fondness for the self-glorying anecdote) Professor Dailches is never less than loving. The story of his gradual growth away from the Jewish faith, his attempt to argue with his father and his subsequent acknowledgement of its futility, is suffused with an unforged charity. Until he was eighteen or so, his social and sexual life seems to have been pretty fiercely circumscribed by his father, but this is never construed as oppression. The various evidences of generation-conflict which lie about us today look jejune beside this narrative, which challenges comparison with Gosses's Father and Son. Our sense of the author's egotism is shaken when we read how, against his inclination, he resigned his Balliol fellowship and went to America, purely to save his father embarrassment. Winning prizes to please is one thing, but this is something else. Ambition should be made of sterner stuff.

The second volume, about the years in America, is a jollier book but, somehow, emotionally bleaker than the first. The most curiously unconscious title (which is given an extra charge of inadvertent satire by a cover depicting the monuments of Washington - not, I presume, chosen by the author) is the first signal of a reduced awareness. Now that his father is dead, Scotland becomes an emotional focus and Scottish Scholarship the new holy grail (I am surprised, by the way, to learn that Daiches prefers Homer, the poet of heroic despair, to Virgil, the poet of exodus, exile and filial piety). The book tells the story of the years at Chicago, New York, Washington (at the British Embassy) and, with the return of peace, Cornell. This is in part an intellectual journey, and the story of Daiches' subtle intransigence in the face of the grandiose austerities of New Criticism is deftly told. But the only real intellectual excitement occurs in the cliff-hanging narrative of Elizabeth's formula (the problem: to reconstitute from National Dried Milk the baby's formula, based on Carnation Milk). One magical chapter describes going home in 1944. There is a touch of Orwell in the description of Queen Street Station, Glasgow, of the sharply reminiscent self-locking mechanism of an Edinburgh front gate, of finding the parents huddled over an electric fire in an upstairs room. But lesser excellences abound; both books are full of marvellous anecdotes - of the Edinburgh "trebleurs", of the Early Birds Breakfast Club in Washington, of Nabokov at Cornell, Professor Dailches is first and last a raconteur, though he is many other things between.

TONY NUTTALL

"In Haste from Tibet" by Rinchen Dakpa and B.A. Rooker.
Robert Hale, (£2.10).

This is the story of Rinchen Dakpa's childhood in Tibet and his escape in 1957 across the Himalayas to Assam. It has no pretensions to be anything other than a personal account of life in Tibet, as experienced by a young boy. Rinchen Dakpa was twelve when he left Tibet, and was hardly aware of the significance of political events in his country. The Chinese appear in the book simply as a threatening presence and later as a terrifying enemy at the heels of the fleeing Tibetans.

Rinchen Dakpa was born on a farm in Bhakar, a village in Central Tibet, where his father was headman, and the peaceful, well-ordered life of his earliest years are described with great charm. His family was well-to-do but hard-working. Lhasa, the nearest town, was three days ride away, and the family relied on their land, their yaks, chickens, sheep and goats for food and clothing. Itinerant traders and craftsmen brought tea and salt, pottery and wooden tea-bowls, carved to order and lined with silver. When he was six years old, Rinchen Dakpa left the freedom of his country home for Lhasa, where his uncle was an official at the court of the Dalai Lama. Under the guardianship of his uncle, he began his formal schooling. He spent his last two years in Tibet in the South-East, where his uncle had been appointed Governor of Kungpo province, and it was there that Rinchen Dakpa's flight from the Chinese began.

The second part of the book relates the adventures of Rinchen Dakpa and the party of Tibetans from his uncle's household on their journey to India. Without guides or maps, gradually descending all but the minimum of baggage and provisions, they made the slow and arduous crossing over the Himalayas. They followed the course of the Syiom river, a tributary of the Brahmaputra, and their way was frequently blocked by impassable falls of...
Inheritance was carried as discrete, stable, material units in the chromosomes. Consequently, there was a direct clash between the Mendellians and the Lamarckians; both groups, being human, having their prejudices as well as their experiments to rely on. William Bateson, the founder of British Mendelism, is the centre of Koestler's stage as the main anti-Lamarckian, although there were many younger experimental zoologists like Huxley, Fox, Hobgen, Crew and others who entered the fray, post-war. He paints a picture of Bateson as the cunning, but sometimes obtuse, establishment figure, opposing the amusing, artistic Kammerer when he should have settled down to repeat Kammerer's experiments, like a good scientist. Every researcher has to decide what he will do with his limited time, and anyone who has looked at Bateson's notebooks will know that he then had more on his hands than he was ever able to complete, as well as his own battles with the zoological establishment for facilities to do it. But Koestler also protests that, even to this day, no one has repeated Kammerer's work.

Geneticists have had more fruitful things to do! Although Kammerer did a number of Lamarckian experiments, those with the midwife toad are the best known. Alytes obstetricians is a toad about 2 inches long found in SE Europe, which has the peculiarity of breeding on land, not in the water like other toads. The male carries the eggs on its back until the tadpoles mature and are ready for an aquatic life. Ordinary male toads develop a nuptial pad on the hands (a horny, spiky, pigmented growth) so that they can better grip their slimy, wet mates; but the male midwife toad has lost this adaptive structure.

Kammerer succeeded in forcing Alytes to breed in water, and after a few generations males developed nuptial pads. In fact, Kammerer did not claim that this stasis was an acquired character, but his supporters and opponents did; and Kammerer was forced to make his case on this reversal of breeding habit and structural acquisition. The argument over the authenticity of the nuptial pads lasted for over 15 years, (some Alytes have pad-like structures) until an American visited the Vienna Institute in 1926, examined the nuptial pads of the last remaining preserved specimen of Kammerer's Alytes and found that its hand had been injected with Indian ink. We shall never know if this was done by Kammerer, by someone intending to discredit him or by a technician; but most drew the obvious conclusion when he died six weeks after the publication of this finding. This book is an attempt to rehabilitate Kammerer by suggesting that the faking was done by someone (not Kammerer) anxious to improve a decrepit specimen.

It is hard to tell if Koestler believes in Lamarckism, and, therefore, if he wants to make a general case as well as reinstate his hero. He clearly recognises that "If every experience of the ancestors left its hereditary imprint on the progeny, the result would be a chaos of forms and a bedlam of instincts". But he also wants to leave room for a "Mini-Lamarckism" as an explanation for "some limited and rare evolutionary phenomena". Stuffing beliefs and opinions into the gaps in our edifice of knowledge is an old habit among the Impatient, but it does not advance science. So it is surprising that Koestler, who must know this, should attempt to revive Kammerer's view and to overlook, and remain ignorant of, the great advances which have taken place in evolutionary genetics since these ancient days. But if he became familiar with these developments he would have to give up being an anti-Darwinist; and that is the key to this piece of journalism.

J.H. Sang.