COMMENT

Still the biggest problem

We end this academic year by returning, on this page, to the topic which we discussed here last October. Accommodation remains, in our view, the most pressing problem facing the University as it enters the last year of the quinquennium.

What progress, if any, has been made in the last eight months? And how much nearer, if at all, is the University to its self-imposed target of 40% on-campus accommodation by 1976/77 when a student population of 5,400 is anticipated?

Despite heavy pressure from the universities, many of which have far worse problems than Sussex, Government policy has not changed radically. Still no money is being made available, either through the departments of Education or Housing, for the construction of student accommodation; and borrowing money from other sources such as Local Authorities or Building Societies is still hemmed about by numerous restrictions.

A little progress has been made. It is now established that a legally constituted Housing Association would qualify for loans and subsidies from Local Authorities, and here Brighton is willing to help. There are two snags. For some months now discussions have been taking place between the Polytechnic, the College of Education, the Technical College and the University on the formation of a joint Housing Association which could purchase properties in the town - existing guest-houses and hotels - for student use. As yet the Housing Association does not exist. Furthermore when it does it will qualify for loans only for the housing of married students, again because of restrictions.

The University is itself looking round for suitable guest-houses or hotels in the town which it could purchase; as yet no such property has been acquired.

On campus the picture is more encouraging. At present there are 688 places in the Park Houses and the Park Village. By October, with the completion of Stage II of the Park Village, the total will rise to 934.

Next month building is scheduled to start on a fifth Park House to the East of York House. This development, financed largely by a loan from the Midland Bank, together with the reversion next year of Essex House to accommodation, will bring total campus accommodation to 1,134 by 1972/3.

The University needs to find an additional 200 places each year over the next six years if the 40% target is to be achieved. Unless there is a shift in Government policy it is hard to see where the money is to come from; and if no large sums are found the present scramble for flats in the town, with all its social and economic implications, will become more intense still.
'COMEDY'

An ape-devil, who forces his minions to perform for the benefit of the audience, is the subject of a new play by Gabriel Josipovici. Or as the playwright himself points out "Perhaps it is about a director pushing on his actors. Or about any author struggling with his material. Or about what we all of us do with the space and time given us by life. Any and all of these things".

Mr. Josipovici's most recent play, "Evidence of Intimacy" was awarded a prize after the last National Student Drama Festival, where it was performed by the UoS Theatre Club. The new play, "Comedy", will be directed by John McKay, with music by Eric Roseberry. It will be performed at the Gardner Centre on July 12th, 13th and 14th at 7.30 p.m.

Gabriel Josipovici, who has been writing the script in very close co-operation with all those involved, comments, "I have been thinking about this play for a long time, but it so clearly needed close co-operation between myself, the director and the actors, that I have not had the chance to set to work on it before. I am delighted that the chance has now come in the form of an invitation to put on something for graduation day in the Arts Centre."

"The play will be anything but an improvisation in its finished form. It will, I hope, be tighter than most plays, much closer to a piece of music. Indeed, music which will to a large extent be performed by the actors themselves, will be playing a major role in the finished product. Eric Roseberry will be working very closely with John McKay and myself."

University plans

The Senate and the Planning Committee have now settled the University plans which will form the basis of a bid to the University Grants Committee for monies for the period 1972-7. The actual submission to the UGC will be drawn up by the Vice-Chancellor during the summer and will be sent off in September.

The University will not be informed of the UGC's decision until later in 1972. Until that time the University plan is very much a statement of hopes and the decisive planning cannot take place until after we receive the grant from the UGC.

In the meantime, the year 1971-72 will be used to discuss further some of the proposals (e.g. the creation of 'Programmes' of studies within the Schools in Arts) and some of the problems raised during the year's planning process (e.g. the relationships of research centres and institutes to the University). The main immediate affect of the quinquennial planning process will be changes in the organisation of the University for 1971-72, details of which will be available after the June meeting of the Senate.

Details of the plans now approved are contained on the Senate papers in School Offices. In the main, the Senate accepted the proposals which had been worked out through the year in the Arts, Science, Social Policy and General Areas. The plans do not include site and building developments; they are the subject of separate negotiations with the UGC which should come to a conclusion by the end of the Autumn Term, 1971.

newsletter

The Medical Consultative Group is to publish a newsletter which will be of interest both to members of the medical profession outside the University and to those inside it concerned with medical research. The publication committee which consists of Dr. Peter McEwan, Director of the Centre for Social Research, Mr. W. Sims, acting Chairman of Science, and Mr. R. Alderton, secretary to the Brighton and Lewes Hospital Management Committee, will be pleased to receive any contributions. These should be sent to Dr. McEwan in Arts C.

The first issue is to be published later this month.

shopping

Social Policy Committee has recommended that work should go ahead on the development of new shopping facilities in the York House undercroft.

If Senate approves the recommendations, work will start shortly on converting two bays of the York House undercroft into two shops. Since the beginning of this term a stall selling fresh vegetables and fruit has been operating in the undercroft on an experimental basis. It is now clear that it is satisfying a real demand. Further developments in the York House area envisage the location there of other shops such as a hairdresser, a chemist and a branch of a Building Society. However plans for this new precinct, part of a proposed new Park House, have yet to be finalised.
If nothing else, the last issue of Focus managed to get itself talked about. I, personally, regret that it got talked about for all the wrong reasons. What I had hoped Focus 17 would stimulate was further discussion on what its guest editors had to say; and they did have something to say. In the event what seems to have provoked the most widespread reaction is what they were not allowed to say, or rather print, within the magazine - namely a few lines of four-letter words quoted from 'The Little Red Book'. This is a pity. Not only did the determination of the editors to reproduce the quote as a subsequent insert succeed in colouring the rest of their contributions in a glow of 'pornographic' accusation - it has, as I knew it would, offended some members of the University - it also threatens to jeopardise any future attempt on my part to repeat this experiment. Here I think I should make clear how and why the decision was reached to 'hand-over' an issue of Focus. The idea arose at a meeting of the Publications Advisory Group, consisting of myself, Dr. D. Pocock, Mr. M. S. Jamieson, Professor R. W. Cahn, Dr. P. J. Ambrose and a Union representative who was not present.

I quote from the minutes of that meeting as follows: 'The Advisory Group felt that Focus suffered from the handicap of appearing to be the establishment magazine, and an official organ of opinion. It was suggested that, as a matter of policy, Focus should be seen to be independent.

The Information Officer fully concurred with this point of view, but added that he had never been requested to publish articles aimed at 'selling' official policies. Suggestions for mitigating the present Focus image included an occasional issue to be edited by a guest editor...'

Following that meeting, which took place in December, 1970, I duly made the offer in the January/February issue, stating that it was open to any member of the University, or any group within the University, to submit a proposal. From 6000 members of this institution I received a total of three requests. The first came from the group who published the last issue. Two further requests came from individual students - Keith Suter and John Coldstream. Not only was the 'collective' first to stake its claim, it seemed the only one of the three with sufficient support to produce an issue at that time. I told the editors to go ahead. Their working methods were somewhat alien to me, not to mention my hard-pressed secretary, who spent a good deal of time typing and duplicating drafts which the group then circulated among each other for discussion. However their enthusiasm was never in question. In the process I had several ideologically discussions with the group, which naturally were mutually unproductive. We decided I was unconvertible. My consciousness was not fully awakened. I did come to life, however, when they told me they were proposing to quote an extract in one article from 'The Little Red Book'. I told the group that I was not prepared to allow the extract to be published for a number of reasons. The first, and to my mind least contentious, was that 'The Little Red Book' is the subject of a legal prosecution on the grounds of obscenity. Any extract printed from it is 'sub judice' and therefore carries a risk of contempt of court proceedings. Secondly, whatever appears under the Focus title, whether produced by myself or others, remains my responsibility.

I felt the quote added nothing to the article. On the other hand I feared that its inclusion, as I have already stated, might serve only to bring the entire experiment into disrepute. Therefore because I was anxious that other individuals or groups should, in future, have the same opportunity to express their views, I asked the editors to omit the passage in question. They agreed. After the issue was printed, and before they distributed it, the extra page was put in. Undoubtedly the next meeting of the Publications Advisory Group will discuss the results of the suggestion made last December. I do not feel myself that the experiment has been either a 'disaster' or a 'failure'. On the contrary that it could have happened at all says a great deal, it seems to me, about this institution. I hope it will happen again, and I would be pleased to hear from any member of the University interested in producing a guest issue in the next academic year.

Below we reproduce a selection of letters we have received commenting on Focus No.17.

Dear Sir,

I must protest in the strongest possible terms about the latest copy of Focus. I base this protest on two main points. First, and mainly, on the duplicated insert containing the censored...
material. I wholeheartedly approve of the reasons which caused you to censor it in the first place, and it is a complete violation of these justifiable grounds for censorship to use the distribution system of Focus to circulate offensive, obscene and childish material. There is no difference that I can see between a duplicated fly-sheet and the printed page of Focus. Secondly, on the whole content of the issue. It is a purely political content which sets out "to influence to sway issues; to take sides" in direct contravention of your reported function in publishing Focus. The material is so immature and juvenile that it is unlikely to have any influence except adverse, but this is irrelevant. The issue should not have been published under the Focus imprint. The production of this copy was an abdication of responsibility which I must wholeheartedly deplore. 

Yours sincerely,  
Professor J. F. Scott.

Dear Sir,

Why all the fuss about Focus? I personally found the latest edition trivial, entertaining, doctrinaire and a waste of money - rather like the "Spectator" in fact. But why the protest? Presumably the contents are either valid or invalid. If the former, publication was not only a reasonable action, but almost a public duty. If the latter, publication will have done harm to the originators and no harm at all to the rest of an academic community presumably able to distinguish truth from fiction, dogma from logical thought. I am sure the edition will have annoyed many conservative elements in the University, but there's no harm in that - it's about time we started thinking again instead of merely re-acting. And it's no use our going on - on and on - about freedom to express a point of view if we promptly deny that right when someone we disagree with claims the same. The fact that your authors are similar to Professor Beloff's students "who hold callow and often dimly-grasped notions about society and education" has nothing to do with the case. Don't suppress them, convert them!

Yours faithfully,  
E. H. Cox.

Dear Sir,

Judging by the wide spread adverse comments concerning the latest edition of Focus, it would seem that the idea for a 'free for all' has proved to be an utter disaster. Focus was widely thought to be in decline and one assumes that the idea of allowing a layman to do the job might prove exciting. We should first ask ourselves why Focus was gradually dying on its feet. Certainly the editor should not be blamed for this state of affairs. His prime job is to edit, and if no one bothers to send in copies, of course any publication will fold up given time. A complete lack of interest in practically every sphere of activity is a malaise of the 20th Century. If we can find the solution we should be doing a great service. When this offer to take over Focus was made it may not have been realised that this was a golden opportunity for the extremists to move in; they were not slow off the mark. Twenty-four pages of extremist propaganda, framed in pornographic filth just about sums up this first pitiful production. It is just possible that we have learnt our lesson the hard way and some may now feel inclined to support this once worthwhile University magazine, and find time to contribute something stimulating, fit for everyone to enjoy.

G. W. Masse,  
Laboratory Superintendent.

Sir,  

As someone who is always involved with the production of Focus, whoever edits it, perhaps I may be allowed a few comments on Gerald Masse's letter (above). I would agree that there have been wide-spread comments on Focus No. 17 (unlike most Issues) which should be welcomed. One could wish that Gerald's criticism was as constructive and objective as most of this has been. In the first place, it is rather difficult to understand his real objections since, on the one hand he complains of the "complete lack of interest.........a malaise of the 20th century" (a statement that does not bear examination) and then proceeds to complain about the only group of people who came forward with sufficient interest and enthusiasm to produce a complete issue of the magazine. Unfortunately from the tone of his emotive phrases, one is led to believe that it is the political opinions expressed that Gerald really objects to, which is a different matter altogether and while he is entitled to his own views, one would hope that he would allow others the same right. I am sure there are valid criticisms that could be made of the last issue of Focus but these are not included in Gerald's letter. Nevertheless, in his last paragraph he vindicates the whole project, for if Focus No. 17 stimulates others to contribute and become involved, rather than simply criticise, then it will have served its purpose.

Yrs etc.,  
David Rumsey,  
Designer, Focus.

To the Information Officer:  

Dear Sir,  
The distribution of the last issue of Focus was handled by the collective guest editors. It seems that many of the magazine's regular readers were unable to obtain a copy. These are members of the University on the internal 'mailing list' and some 200-300 people outside the University, who are sent copies through the post. These copies are sent out by the Information Office, which normally retains 500 copies for this purpose. However the distributors of the last issue removed all copies of Focus from the Printing Unit, leaving none at all for individual mailing purposes, or, if it comes to that, for members of the Information Office. I understand that the issue has caused some comment. If anybody has a spare copy perhaps they could send me one, so I can see what all the fuss is about.

Yours sincerely,  
Fred Newman,  
Usual Editor of Focus.
LA VIE EN ROSE

by Peter Brown

For the first time, language minors in the School of European Studies are spending the third year of their course at a foreign university. This is an account of the experiences of one of them.

Queues. For food. Queues. For documents. Queues. For registration. Queues. For everything. Queues seem to emphasise national characteristics. Think of the English commuter queue by an early morning bus-stop. Silence, ordered procession, dignity, formality. In a French queue, it is otherwise. The smell. Is it garlic or is it armpits? Not that the English don't smell in a crowd, but you can't remember noticing it. The pushing. Is this person behind me aggressive, or just terribly sensual? And the enjoyment. The French like queuing, and the more pushing, sweat and smell there is, the happier they become.

It was my first visit to France, and I had chosen Grenoble, a campus university which makes Sussex look like a toy model. I thought of ski-ing, and I thought of travelling in summer. If nothing else, I was going to enjoy my year abroad. A dissertation of ten thousand words was the only evidence anyone required that I had not let the world of the Academy fade away with the white cliffs of the English coast. The only obstacle to my enjoyment seemed to be the people. It is surprising what vehemence you can put into a word. The French.

Six of us arrived for the first term, four for the second. Now there is talk that some will go back early. It seems a pity after all we went through to establish our status. For three weeks, we braved hell and high water to collect the necessary documents, to become bona fide students. It became a struggle between 'us' and 'them'. We clung together for moral support, comparing notes at intervals. Each morning, forward to the fray, forward to the haggle, forward to the bureaucrats. In the evening crawling back, limp, disillusioned, homesick, repelled by rubber stamps. After the obstacle course was over, we felt we had achieved something. Each of us possessed some thirteen authorisations, each with its identity photograph and appropriate stamp. This collection is called your 'papiers' but it is more like a pack of cards. Thankfully, we abandoned ourselves to the cafe existence. For me it was an easy life to justify. My major subject is English, and if anyone asked me why I spent so much time lolling about, I devastated them with a piece of logic that would have done a Frenchman proud: literature is life; life is to be found in the cafes; therefore here I am, apparently idling, but in fact studying my subject at a most basic level.

nostalgia

There we found some thirty or so English students, people like ourselves, mostly from Reading. There were a few Frenchmen scattered about, and the entire proceedings were presided over by a tall, name-dropping lady whose double barrel escapes me. On the wall, pictures of the Royal family. The atmosphere was a nostalgia for an England that none of us knew or cared about. We consumed the wine and food and left, thinking that it would be better to make the effort and speak to the natives than rally round the flag in this anomalous way.

But it is this sort of caricature of the English and their institutions that the French love dearly. The Royal family is a source of endless amusement. During the electricity strike, a national newspaper made much of the speculation that the queen would be obliged to take afternoon tea by candle-light, and that Prince Philip would have his fuse repairing prowess proved to the full. As for Lord Snowdon and Princess Margaret, their marriage has undergone so many front page ruptures that I fail to understand why there is never any mention of it in the English newspapers here. One week, their marital calamities provided the staple diet both for France-De-Manche (the French equivalent of News of the World) and Paris-Match, with one correcting the mistakes of the other. In the first paper, the sordid details appeared under the heading: CA VA TRES MAL A BUCKINGHAM - ELIZABETH CHASSE TONY DE LA COUR. Underneath was a photo montage of the Queen looking her sternest at a dishhevelled Tony Armstrong-Jones, who appeared to be having more than a tête-à-tête with a lady who was not Princess Margaret.

Contacts with real live Frenchmen developed by chance. It first began when one of us was begging for meal tickets in the foyer of a university restaurant. The person who yielded up some seemed interested in us. It turned out he was of North American origin, but he did speak French. Slowly, the circle widened to include native born students, and - being careful to make the distinction - with native born people.

The concierge of my residence shouts "Salut l'Angleterre!" each time I pass his desk, and the cleaning woman comes in for a natter and lemon tea in the afternoon. The second answer that comes to me as I sit brooding over my drink is that I have come here to do some...
The relaxed ambience lures like a siren

A rubber stamp shop. A gargantuan bureaucracy supports a score of them in Grenoble

Political slogans deface university buildings but . . .

they also reflect traditional French characteristics

La vie en rose cont.

academic work. I did try attending courses that interested me, but at the second attempt, sitting amongst fifty other students, waiting to be asked a question on the notes that had just been dictated, I was overcome by a sense of panic. It was not that I was unable to answer the questions, not that I could not struggle through in a foreign language. I just could not avoid the feeling that I was back at school.

I thought I would make some progress with my dissertation. Its subject, the poetry of Spenser and Yeats, had remarkably little to do with France, yet I hoped that the English department and the various libraries might have something in store for me. My way was barred. I had not joined the library. Nor could I, since I needed to show my birth certificate which was in the possession of the registrar until the end of the year. Could I have it back? Only if I left the University. I penetrated as far as the index, to find that the number of relevant books was minimal.

The English department itself is not one of the university's most virtile sections. When one of us asked a professor for a reading list on a particular aspect of Chaucer, she was told to go away, read everything to be found in the library, and come back when she had something to discuss. The concept of personal tuition is unknown to them below first degree level. Discovering that she had been face to face with well-known Sussex don who for argument's sake I shall call Professor Lerner, the reaction of this Grenoble academic can only be described as disbelief.

What with bureaucracy and overcrowded classes, it is not difficult to understand why the students rose in revolt in May 1968. But if this is after the revolution, God help them before. Politically, Grenoble is reputed to be second only to Paris for student agitation. As the second term wore on, demonstrations became more frequent. The fire was fed with news from Paris of police brutality. It was alleged that riot squads had deliberately blinded Maoist student, Richard Deshayes with a point-black tear gas grenade as revenge for the wounding of one of their own colleagues.

The Grenoble students were moderate in their demands. In the circulated pamphlets they asked for the establishment of an independent committee to look into police conduct. But such demands, backed up by a demonstration, are enough to call out the local riot police from their garrison in vanloads. A protest march becomes an elaborate but dangerous pantomime. The students chant, the soldiers watch passively or scream around in their armoured buses. No one is quite sure when the tension will snap.

I hold my glass of wine up to the sun and think of Sussex. It seems a distant and a peaceful place. I am looking forward, after this fallow year, to some serious academic work. I have ideas to discuss with my tutors. We shall all be glad to get back. And by the way, if you happen to be standing in a queue sometime next year, and there is a commotion as a laughing and evil-smelling stranger elbows his way through, be patient - it will only be me.

"Garçon!"
Mediation is never easy, least of all when it involves students and landlords. Norma Wilson, the University's Accommodation Officer not only accepts the mediating role but does so with obvious enthusiasm. Good landlord-student relationships, as she sees it, are a way to smoothing out accommodation problems.

Norma Wilson literally worked all round the world before arriving at Sussex in 1962, as an administrator in the Middle and Far East for the W.R.V.S. and running a hostal for nurses in the biggest hospital in North America at Vancouver. "When I came back to England I wanted to do a job dealing with young people of all nationalities and I've certainly found that this job fulfills the requirements. It is endlessly interesting. It was particularly exciting at first with a new place growing up around one. I started on my own and had the students before the records"., says Miss Wilson.

There were only 450 students at Sussex when she arrived and most of them seemed to be waiting to complain or enquire at the new Accommodation Office.

Today with a much larger volume of questions and demands to deal with she is also faced with the growing crisis over accommodation in Brighton, where the shortage of flats and houses for students is becoming acute. First years, this year are still asked whether they prefer to live in a Guest House, a Park House or private lodgings but they are given the option of finding their own accommodation:

"Really a small number, not more than ten went off on their own and found flats although we do make it clear now in the letter we send that they are free to find their own accommodation. We can't offer to look for flats for them otherwise there would be none left for second years and finalists. I only wish we had an inexhaustible supply of them." Norma Wilson makes it quite clear that she herself does not make the decisions on these kinds of questions on her own but has various committees to help her. In fact she sent round for comments on the choice given to first years, from various people on the campus including the Bursar and student representatives.

"I try to make information about Guest Houses as clear and factual as possible. In fact the students did a survey at the beginning of the year on Guest Houses and the main conclusion drawn was that on the whole students living in them are fairly satisfied." On her accommodation register, Miss Wilson has Guest Houses both under and not under contract and feels that this is really the best arrangement providing for some degree of movement for students who do not wish to remain in the same accommodation all year. The problems arising from students living in Guest Houses are not only varied but also difficult to tackle and the question of finding some security for both students and proprietors is the key one. Miss Wilson sees the solution as an attempt to keep both types of Guest Houses on her register but this does not prove as easy as it
Norma Wilson cont.

sounds. "I do understand that it is annoying for a student to have to stay in the same Guest House for a whole year if he doesn't want to. But there were 90 students in Guest Houses not under contract this year and already 51 of these have trickled off to find their own alternatives. By the end of last term, of those who had left these Guest Houses did so because they had closed down or changed hands to a proprietor who is not willing to take students. I feel there is little real hope of this type of arrangement with these Guest Houses. Of course, they are not going to have the same arrangement next year if by Christmas their students have left them with unoccupied rooms. But then the student has no security of tenure either."

Miss Wilson points out that Guest Houses will only let to students if it is a viable and commercial proposition. Those who have been let down will obviously not do the same thing again. She therefore foresees that it will be an even more difficult task for her in future to find proprietors willing to offer student accommodation outside the security of a contract. It has not in fact been confirmed that the Guest House Scheme will be the same next year. The waiting list of Guest Houses who were willing to take students and wanted to be put on the register is now considerably shorter because of the increasing number of conferences in the town and despite the fact that last year more of them wanted a contract.

independence

Lodgings offer Miss Wilson yet another problem, although she fully sympathises with those students who prefer to take the kind of accommodation which offers them complete independence. In a sense the same situation arises here as that concerning the Guest Houses not under contract. Landlords and landladies whose students move out during the course of the year will think twice about taking student lodgers again. Norma Wilson comments: "There were 127 students in lodgings this year but only 88 are still in private homes. People with lodgings are letting their rooms to make a little extra income and of course if they are left by students half way through the year they will look into other possibilities of letting them".

Flats are perhaps the main bugbear of any accommodation officer in Brighton and Norma Wilson has more than her share of difficulties although she tries to keep optimistic about the possibility of encouraging people to invest their money for the student tenant market. But this year the flat situation is becoming grim and there seem few indications that it is likely to get better. Not only is Miss Wilson involved in looking for new accommodation and meeting the demands of students who pile into her office, she is also in the unavoidable position of middle-man between landlords and tenants and as such becomes involved in any dispute over rights or rent. There are few vacant flats on her books and although there are some for faculty, and bed-sitters are still a possibility, there is little new flat accommodation coming in.

"Saturation point is bound to be reached soon. Although we always hope to encourage people to invest money in property for students and people do come to Brighton to speculate, these are professional landlords and in general the publicity, which has been given to students taking landlords to a rent tribunal recently, has concerned this type of proprietor and not the people in business on a very small scale. Even so there have been very few cases of this, it is simply that recently the publicity given to these cases has been great. This may be due to the Housing Action Group which I think has been working in a very responsible way."

tribunal

The Housing Action Group has encouraged students to take their case to the rent tribunal when their rents have been considered too high. So far there have been 12 cases and not all of the accommodation concerned has been on Miss Wilson's register. In situations of this kind she herself remains "quite objective" and feels that in many of the cases so far the rents have certainly been very high. She regards students as citizens with their own rights and capable of safeguarding these and this is the type of dispassionate standpoint she tries to adopt when irate landlords contact her in an attempt to involve the Accommodation Office in the dispute. She points out: "We try to help both sides, landlords as a race don't like this sort of thing. They lose their confidence in students. The smaller people are naturally very worried that it will affect them and seeing their investment in danger, think of selling up. I try and advise them to keep the whole thing in perspective but as they look upon their property as a means of making money, say for their retirement, they are naturally anxious."

The Lodgings Officer dealing with the Brighton Colleges has no cases involving the rent tribunal and Miss Wilson stresses this means that landlords may let their accommodation to these students and not to the University. This kind of bias against Sussex students is what Miss Wilson hopes will be avoided, as the struggle to find suitable flats is difficult enough without this kind of prejudice.

The University's Housing Action Group is in touch with the Federation of Brighton students over the question of high rents. Miss Wilson however is realistic about the number of flats available: "I'm afraid nothing will change. This year's first years are just as anxious to get flats as ever. And flats found through agencies are those with the high rents. Of course I'm not a rent assessor. In certain cases I will tell students that the rent is high but if they really want a flat they move in anyway. The landlord on the other hand may have borrowed the money he has invested and if he rings stating the rent, I may say students generally look for something cheaper, but he actually fixes the rent. I aim of course to get rents as low as possible and I can tell landlords the register of rents fixed by the tribunal but I can't actually approve the rent. If I can't get a rent any lower I just leave it up to the students. I can't say of everything on the register here that the rents have been approved by us."

costly

Despite Miss Wilson's advice, students do take flats which she considers too expensive. In certain cases landlords tend to think that she is not supporting them enough but she certainly stresses the importance of good landlord-student relationships. Students want flats or houses, the University hasn't the money to buy sufficient property for its students and Brighton's population continues to grow. There are more commuters buying houses in the town and the rest of the town's student population has followed Sussex students in wanting to live in flats. Miss Wilson herself suggested to the Social Policy Committee that a survey should be carried out in an
attempt to find out the ultimate capacity of the town as far as accommodation is concerned and to establish exactly what types of accommodation are available. Now a pilot survey is about to take place. The whole problem of students and housing in Brighton is a delicate one and the Corporation is worried about the possibility of small terraced houses being occupied as flats when they might suit one family. Many of the flats in Brighton are really for summer holiday-makers and are not suitable for families who are likely to be looking for unfurnished accommodation and the problem of finding this is a critical one.

The University is in fact hoping to form a Housing Association jointly with the Brighton Polytechnic and the College of Education to buy property for students which the Brighton Corporation advises should be hotel accommodation rather than houses. Another way in which Miss Wilson thinks the flat situation might be helped is by expanding the catchment area with students who are willing to live further away from the University and not just in Brighton.

"But of course the University is hoping to build more accommodation up here and by the end of the Quincentennium there should be more houses in the Park Village." Despite all its frustrations and drawbacks Norma Wilson clearly enjoys her job as the University's Accommodation Officer and copes daily with a vast assortment of seemingly insuperable accommodation problems. She finds it fun working with students and is helped by a staff of four. She foresees difficulties in having a Federation Accommodation Office in Brighton, pointing out the necessity of allocating Park House and Park Village places on the Campus.

"We do give help to faculty and visiting faculty apart from the constant queue of students so there are definitely pros and cons for a central Brighton office and we should really be very careful before we leap head-first into such an arrangement." She thinks the pooling of manpower in this case would be a good idea, as at the moment many landlords are on both Brighton and University registers, and she feels there certainly must be ways of working more closely.

In her own 'temporary' accommodation in the Refectory terrace she puts forward the pros and cons of her own job: "I most enjoy working with people and particularly young people and I enjoy the variety work offers. But it isn't always pleasant to occupy a position in the middle between landlord and tenant."

No Accommodation Office at all? - "Students would have to spend a lot of time looking for flats and it would leave them at the mercy of the town's agents. It might be chaotic...........still in the future who knows."

They say things never happen at the Unifarcity and perhaps they don't. But the launching of Starship at Falmer House on June 12th and 13th is a happening in the right direction. 'Music, street theatre, light, lifestyle, trash, art works' you name it and Starship has it (or hopes to have it).

This second June Benefit Concert - proceeds to help set up a new community magazine in Brighton - is being organised by a multifarious group of students and people from the town. Starship will have music which will include Roy Harper, Formerly Fat Harry, Red Head Yorke, the University Group, Big Ben Turner and, hopefully, Peter Green will be over to jam. Apart from groups there will also be street theatre with Jane Arden's Holocaust and a dress rehearsal of the Theatre Club's 'A Midsummer Night's Dream'. On a stand outside there'll be an opportunity for everyone to do their own thing with a light show, environmental sculpture, pictures and posters. The conference which is also part of the show will be on Rock Music and an Alternative Press with representatives from the Underground Press, from Ink, Oz and others.

Food and drink will also be served from Falmer House although if the weather is good many of the events may be outside. The whole weekend costs 85p and for a single day, 50p. If it all happens, and that of course will depend on the turn-out, it should be good. Where else can you eat, drink and dance surrounded by lifestyle, trash and multi-circuit reincarnations?
THE NEW BUILDINGS

Although the University Grants Committee has indicated that the only new teaching building it would finance in the next quinquennium is an extension for the Arts A, B and C complex, a number of buildings are at present under construction for which agreement has already been secured.

In addition, the University is to undertake further building, financed from sources other than the UGC. Below is a guide giving details of present and future construction.

The Education Development Centre:
This is the large square block adjoining Arts III. It will be used primarily by the School of Education, the Centre for Educational Technology, the Centre for Continuing Education and the Media Service Unit. Apart from the many offices and rooms for these, the building contains an impressive television studio, a large lecture theatre and on the top floor a library to replace the School of Education library at present in the University library basement.

One wing of the new Education building has been financed by Dr. Reginald M. Phillips and Esso. The middle floor, which Dr. Reginald M. Phillips has financed is to be occupied by the Reginald M. Phillips Research Unit. The net building cost will be £290,000 - the costliest building being erected at the moment - and it should be completed by the beginning of the Autumn term.

Sussex House:
This is the partially completed structure surrounded by scaffolding at the service road entrance to the University. Sussex House is the new administration building. It will cost £237,000 and although behind schedule, should be ready for occupation by mid 1972. Moving the administration over to the new building will free Essex House for student accommodation for which it was originally intended. The new building will house Barclays Bank and the post office as well as members of the administration. In design the building follows traditional Sussex architecture. There will be once large multi-purpose room available for occasions such as Senate meetings, and examinations.

Park Village Stage II:
This should be finished by September of this year.
Stage I of the Park Village has twenty five single houses
each with twelve flats. The four married houses have four flats each. Stage II is being built on the same loan-financed scheme whereby the income from student rents will be used to pay off the loan and finance maintenance costs. This second stage will have six married flats, each with three rooms and a bathroom, and thirty married flats each of two rooms and a bathroom. There will also be 168 single rooms. Stage II will constitute towards solving student accommodation problems and hopefully towards 'socialising' the campus after five o'clock. It will cost £216,000.

The Brain Institute:
Work on this building, situated on the east side of the Experimental Psychology building, and designed by Spence, Bonnington and Collings, is proceeding. The Brain Institute will be used by experimental psychologists and will also house bio-chemists. The floor given over to Bio-Chemistry will in fact be used by Dr. T. Blundell who, after working for some time at Oxford with Dorothy Hodgkin, on a project designed to look into the shape and structure of insulin, will start an entirely new research programme at Sussex. The project will involve X-ray investigations on proteins. Bio-Chemists attach great importance to this work which allows the shape of proteins to be examined. The Brain Institute which will cost £190,000 will also house a computer. The building should be completed by late 1972.

The Vandergraph Accelerator Building is to be constructed following a grant of £200,000 from the Science Research Council. It will be a special underground building designed to house the three million volt accelerator, capable of firing atomic particles at speeds of over one million m.p.h. at specimens in the laboratory. Constructed in the hillside, the structure will be especially designed to ensure that radiation cannot escape. The Vandergraph building, paid for out of the grant, will cost £40,000 and is scheduled for completion by October, 1972.

The Boiler House is being extended in order to increase the boiler capacity by a further 24 million Btu/h. The building itself will cost £14,000 and the equipment

Vandergraph Accelerator Building

Brain Institute

£30,000. This should be finished by November of this year.

Work on an extension to the Nuffield Building is expected to start shortly. Nuffield II will provide extra space for Arts teaching until the Arts extension is ready. This extra space is vital in order to free Essex House for residential use when the Administration moves out. Nuffield II should be finished late in 1972 and will cost £132,000.

Among plans and designs being looked at, is one for a new (Midland) bank. This will be situated at the northern end of the Refectory. Barclays will of course move to Sussex House. Other designs discussed include a possible fifth Park House. This would be located on the eastern side of York House. Work is also being carried out on a design for the building of the Southern Medical Research Centre. A site has not yet been chosen for this building.

Chemistry III is another important building in the planning stage. UGC funds will be available. Next to it will be an adjoining unit for the Agricultural Research Council. These two buildings together will cost £250,000 and will be completed some time in 1973. Looking into the future, Arts IV and V are now being planned, with a completion date somewhere between 1974-75. Together it is estimated that they will cost £800,000.
At a national level concern for the training and development of University administration has grown considerably over the past two or three years. Recently the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals set up an Administrative Training Committee and they have already published their first interim report in which they recognised the responsibility for meeting training needs at present fell largely on the individual universities. Prior to the publication of this report the Association of University Teachers (AUT) had drawn up proposals relating to the overall conditions of service for administrative staffs. This University’s Administration has always recognised the importance of improving its performance and set up late in the last Autumn Term a project team to ‘design a framework or system within which the recruitment, training, evaluation and development of administrative faculty can be established’. The team, representing members of the Administration of varying backgrounds, age and specialisations, consisted of Bob Nind (Project Leader), Bruce Claxton, John Davies, Geoff Lockwood, Pat Tear, and Anne Warde, together with one member of the academic faculty, Tim Leggatt. Meetings of the team were held in the Spring Term and a draft report has been presented to a meeting of Administrative Staffs held a few days ago when its proposals were discussed.

At an early stage the team recognised the need to help individual administrators to relate their functions, career aspirations to the needs of the University and it was in this context that its work was set. Members of the Administration seek to meet the University’s needs through exercise of professional skills and judgements; and as its needs grow more complex so the development of recruitment, training, and evaluation procedure becomes increasingly important. While it was agreed that the senior members of different sections had a responsibility to oversee recruitment, training of their staffs, given the unified nature of the Administration consideration was required and that might be best effected by the appointment of an Administrative Staff Officer. It was not envisaged that the person appointed would need to spend all his time in this work and so therefore an existing member of the staff might be invited to take in this work.

Specific recommendations related to recruitment - operation of a ‘post system for allocation of new posts or vacancies on their advice, preparation of job specifications for all current and new posts, use of common recruitment practices in all sections of the Administration; to induction and initial training - recognition of the needs of new entrants to University Administration and the more experienced staffs; to an appraisal system - to provide opportunities for discussion of work performance, potential, diagnosis of training needs, etc. - all of which it was recognised would have some bearing on the annual review of salaries; to in-service training - making time available for study leave, developing specific training courses, perhaps in collaboration with other universities; attending external courses (e.g. B.I.M., R.I.P.A., etc); to mobility/transfers or administrators within the University to provide opportunities for individuals to gain experience of different areas of work, specialisations; to periods of probation and the need to treat this more seriously, and other conditions of service.

Following this team’s work it is planned to set up, on a second stage, another group to develop the detailed contents of a training programme, which it is hoped might be introduced in 1971/72.

Decisions on other aspects will be taken in the light of discussions held in the University.

---

**Russian Churchman**

An unusual distinction for Sergei Hackel, lecturer in Russian in the School of European Studies, Mr. Hackel, a priest of the Russian Orthodox Church, was one of three British representatives of the Church to travel to Russia last month for a historic meeting of the Church’s General Council. The council, which is the supreme legislative body, last met in 1946 when it elected Patriarch Alexi, who died last year.

At the meeting which took place at a monastery in the town of Zagorsk, some 20 miles from Moscow, delegates from Western European countries and from Russia itself elected a new Patriarch.

Mr. Hackel, whose parents were both Russian was himself born in England.
Sussex has changed much in the last four years. This is not only inevitable, but to a very large extent, desirable. But in view of the effect on many of the students, not all the change, however well-intentioned, has been for the benefit of all concerned. The changes which over the years have had so much effect on the life of the average student are those which have taken place within that nefarious organisation known as the Union. If there is one thing lacking at the moment, within the student body, it is a sense of humour, a sense of fun. The ability to laugh at others is desirable, but it is essential that any group which even pretends to take itself seriously, must on occasion take the opportunity to laugh at itself. Whilst it must be difficult to enjoy oneself whilst carrying the burden of the problems of the whole world, laughter and fun are surely necessary. Think about it - when was the last time you saw one of the Union's socialists smile? (A new campaign for the summer - make a little smile).

But what has changed so much in the last four years? It is not, as some would maintain, the fact that there have been three Sabbatical Officers running the Union - there have been that many since 1967, yet the number of people participating in Union activities has declined. In the snow of December 1967, the Union managed, on a Friday afternoon, to get forty or fifty people to help with snow clearing, with entertainment, and to assist the catering staff. The University abrogated its responsibility, so the Union took over. Could that happen now? I doubt it.

victimisation

The following year, in February, 1968, 1600 students turned up to deny allegations of victimisation over the 'Red Paint' incident. When 50% of the Union turns up to a UGM, that is democracy, not 200 members of the Socialist club talking about something in which the rest of the Union clearly, by its non-attendance at UGMs, is not really interested; or more likely, realises quite rightly that what the Sussex University Students Union says is going to have precious little effect on events on the other side of the world, or even in Whitehall. Attendance does improve when matters are relevant to students in their transient existence at Sussex. But when it comes to actually taking action, following a pledge of 'full support', the loudest mouths are those which are furthest from the action. Ask any of the people involved with the Squatters crisis in December 1969. It wasn't the loudmouths from the Rents Project who slept in Falmer House, and got up at 6.00 a.m. And it wasn't the Rents Project who helped to move the families when accommodation was found for them.

background

Over the last two years, more and more of the discussion at UGMs has been about subjects far removed from the lives of the average student. So is it any wonder that people have said "Why bother, it doesn't effect me, let them get on with it." But one thing in addition is significant; over the same period of two years, where involvement and interest has dropped off so dramatically, there has been no regular independent newspaper to keep the average student informed of what is going on around him. What is the good of the Union fighting off price increases in the Refectory if no-one knows about it? Background to debate is also essential if proper decisions are to be made. But in addition, a newspaper has a duty to dig out the 'dirty washing' of an organisation, and to air it in public. No group will tell of its own mistakes, and criticism is difficult without information on which to base that criticism.

Perhaps the root of the malaise lies deeper than lack of concern. Perhaps Sussex, which has always been fond of its liberal image, has been too generous, too easy-going, and left the majority with such a feeling of well-being that an air of soporific contentment has pervaded the atmosphere. And where discontent has arisen, in many cases quite rightly, the system, such as it is, has quietly swallowed the grievance into the elaborate bureaucratic machine, and the result has emerged so far removed from the original problem that it has gone unrecognised. The search for real causes has gone so far that most are now so sullen as to be unrecognisable except to those who wish to spend their time provoking confrontations. The number of students who actually looked at their files is so small that it makes a mockery of the whole event.

It has been suggested by some that involvement is related more to personalities than politics. The personal charisma of Union leaders has not declined greatly over the last few years, merely their ability to play the game by the correct rules. And when all
is said and done, student politics is a game, played by children just out of school. Just how infantile some of them can get is shown by one event during the last Presidential election. One candidate went to a great deal of effort to put two large posters in rather prominent places on the campus. Certain people turned a blind eye, but they were removed on the Monday night by someone who simply didn’t like the look of them. Even a three-year-old doesn’t smash his playmate’s toys. No names, no pack drill, as they say, but it is believed to be someone who ought to know better.

To return to the subject of UGMs, what incentive is there for proper debate when opposition is howled down and on occasion physically attacked, simply because they hold different views? I always thought that one of the prerequisites of democracy was the right of a fair hearing for all sides. But after four years at Sussex I am inclined to think that Socialism and democracy are far removed from eachother. Persuasion by rational argument seems to have been superseded by social intimidation, which is more subtle and more dangerous than physical threats, though those too on occasion have been used. Small wonder, then, that most students are content with involvement only in peripheral Union activities, like sport, music and cultural societies. When I first came to Sussex, it was still basking in the glimmering limelight of its ‘colour supplement’ image, with a good social life and a progressive group of students running the Union and the media. As I leave, I find the social atmosphere lacking, the media failing miserably in their duty, the majority of students totally apathetic to life in general, and a Union which is visibly crumbling. This situation is neither necessary or desirable. I refuse to believe that the quality of the students at Sussex has altered radically. Therefore, where are the students who can reawaken the sleeping masses? One thing is certain, they are not planning the revolution. Possibly they are working.

THE
BLIN-STOYLE
REPORT

Some reports disappear into limbo. Often they deserve to; they are bad reports. Some, because of their intrinsic worth and/or timing, lead to immediate action; here the Robbins Report is an example.

There is, yet again, a third category. Often a report appears to have failed to make an appreciable impact in terms of immediately changing policies and procedures, and in affecting decisions. The aftermath of Crowther, Swan and Dalholt conjured up no thunder and lightning. Yet though there was no obvious storm, each of these reports produced very real changes in climate. They influenced the way people thought and their attitudes towards the issues raised.

Over two years ago, here at Sussex, a report on Counselling Services was produced under the leadership of the then Acting Senior Tutor, John Simmonds. That report was never ‘officially’ published. Nevertheless it led directly to the appointment of Sub-Deans, and thus to a reinforcement of the counselling fabric.

In March of this year, under the chairmanship of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor Roger Blin-Stoyle, the Vice-Chancellor’s Group on Undergraduate Teaching produced its final 69-page report. What will be its fate? Will its many recommendations ever be implemented? Or will it, like so many other reports, be quietly buried and forgotten?

If it is, it will represent an incalculable waste of time. The Group, set up by Planning Committee in November, 1969, spent the best part of 1970 working on thirteen different projects, ranging from an examination of the way faculty spend their time to the effectiveness of lectures and tutorials.

More than 120 faculty and students were directly involved in membership of these project groups. Many others replied to questionnaires and contributed informally to the work of the Blin-Stoyle enquiry.

In April, a special joint meeting of the Arts and Social Science and Science Committees was convened to discuss the final report. With the Vice-Chancellor in the chair, the meeting spent four hours in considering
its various proposals and observations.
That gathering was, in itself, an indication of the potential significance that the Blin-Stoyle report holds and the influence it could exert in securing far-reaching changes in teaching methods, in the problem of communications between different subjects and between Arts and Science, and in the relationship between students and faculty.

inadequacy
One recurring theme of the report is the inadequacy of information. It exists not only about what courses are being taught and why they are being taught in a particular way - e.g. tutorials, seminars, lectures. Again the report refers to the lack of feedback'. Many students would like more information on their own progress at more frequent intervals, and more opportunities to discuss curriculum content.
Inevitably the first major review of teaching methods since the University was founded ten years ago, has uncovered a number of areas where procedures are no longer adequate, or where new procedures may be needed to keep pace with the University's growth. The Arts-Science meeting felt it would be wrong to lay down norms for securing feedback, but suggested that each School and Subject Group should devise its own methods for the improvement of student-faculty communication, whereas the Blin-Stoyle report had recommended that course tutors should provide information 'much more systematically'. So, what happens now?
Since the April meeting, Professor Blin-Stoyle has been asking himself just that question. Nearly all the recommendations made by his group, together with the comments of the Arts-Science meeting, are now being referred for discussion and, if agreement is reached, implementation to different groups within the University. For example the suggestion that Personal Tutors should spend a minimum of two sessions each term with their students, commenting on and discussing their academic work, is to be referred to the School Sub-Deans.

outline
On the other hand it is Deans who will be asked to consider a proposal that students be given an outline of their programme of study at the outset of each course. And the question of encouraging and formulating new procedures for feedback within Schools is to be discussed by Teaching Co-ordinators.
The Teaching Co-ordinators, whose creation for an experimental period of two years was approved by Senate following an interim report of the Blin-Stoyle review in June last year - it has therefore seen one of its recommendations already implemented - will also be organising discussion in the Science area on a proposal to reduce the time spent by students in laboratory work and increase teaching time as opposed to laboratory supervision.
At the Arts-Science meeting it was stressed, particularly by the students present, that what could become an important new development in the teaching-learning process had sprung up informally in the University. In some subjects, such as International Relations, students had begun to work together in small groups. This development, said the Blin-Stoyle report, should be encouraged, and the Arts-Science meeting has suggested that individuals interested should approach Course Convenors, and that assistance might be provided, for example in the way of secretarial and duplicating facilities, for students wanting to organise their own work programmes within the syllabus. Here, as with many of the report's recommendations, implementation of particular proposals will rest not with any across-the-board University Committee, but with individual tutors, Deans, Sub-Deans, Subject Groups etc., However some of its suggestions, for example those affecting the terms and conditions of service of faculty, are now to be discussed by Planning Committee and Senate. That is the case as far as the report's recommendations on promotions should be specifically as falling into one of three categories: primarily teaching, research and teaching and primarily research, and that each should be given equal weight as a basis for promotion.
The discussion of some other proposals, such as establishing criteria for assessing probationary periods, and for introducing machinery through which certain basic principles - for instance what is the minimum required of a member of faculty in teaching, research and administrative responsibilities - can be operated, may have to await the outcome of a review now being undertaken at national level by the AUT. What now remains to be seen is how soon, and with what enthusiasm, all the various proposals are considered by the relevant groups throughout the University? At the very least, the review has served to question a good many of the assumptions that have been accepted without question for ten years.

tutorials
Are tutorials the 'best' way of teaching? Undoubtedly they are the most costly in terms of resources. Are students as informed about their own work programmes and progress as they ought to be? Are they, in fact, 'enlightened' in what is said to be the enlightened Sussex structure? How much weight should be attached to research work in deciding faculty promotions? And last, but not least, just what is the University for? What are its aims and objectives?
That may well be the 64,000 dollar question and, In the first instance, it has been referred to the Vice-Chancellor. The Vice-Chancellor's Group on Undergraduate Teaching has undertaken the most extensive review of teaching. It has produced its report. It's chairman, Roger Blin-Stoyle, can now only prod, push and encourage. There is some evidence that it will succeed in influencing the course that Sussex follows in the next quinquennium. But if things are to happen, rather than to get talked about, no amount of prodding and pushing can succeed without a willingness on the part of a good many people to be prodded and pushed.

Prof. Blin-Stoyle
Lady Reading

The Dowager Marchioness of Reading, who died last month at the age of 77, was a valued friend of the University. As a member of the University Council since 1962 she brought to that body a wealth of experience in social work and a sense of care for the individual which led to her being regarded with both respect and affection. When, in 1968, the President and Secretary of the Union began regularly to attend Council meetings, they found in Lady Reading a friend and ally. Never slow to speak out and speak her mind on issues that many might have considered too 'delicate' or 'controversial' on which to take a minority stand, she stoutly supported the action of the Union and Brighton Rents Project in bringing three squatter families to live temporarily in Falmer House. Behind the scenes she helped to arrange interviews with housing organisations and the WRVS, of which she herself was the founder, in an attempt to find the families permanent homes. Lady Reading possessed the happy ability of making anyone she encountered feel immediately at ease. When the Park Village first stage was opened she wandered about asking questions of its new residents. What concerned her was not so much how nice the buildings looked, but what they were like to live in? Were the rents reasonable? Was there enough space? She wanted to know and she went to find out. She was always involved, and believed that young people should also be involved. She was interested in, and supported, the student organisation Link-Up; and when the Union began to investigate the possibility of setting up its own Housing Association, the then Student Treasurer found himself inundated beneath a stream of pamphlets and documents which Lady Reading supplied. Later, over dinner at her home in Swanborough, she and the Treasurer would pore over them together. And then, on finding that the position of student Housing Associations was not at all clear, she raised the matter in the House of Lords. She played her part, too, in formal University activity. As a member of Council she sat on more than her fair share of Chair-Appointing Committees. Lady Reading wasted no time in academic argument. Her concern was with the every-day and the practical. When one President of the Union told her he found it difficult to get about, she offered to buy him a motorbike. The offer, in the event, was gratefully declined, but it was typical of Lady Reading's approach to any problem - matter-of-fact and to the point. She cared about many things. Most of all, it seemed, she cared about people. And many people here at Sussex will miss her.

A LETTER FROM L. TROTSKY, ESQ.

Dear Sir,

It was with no little concern with which I read your article, "Focus On The Wardens," since I am referred to by one of the Wardens as "an habitual offender" for which they would like to have additional powers. Judging from my own experience with the Wardens, the power they now have results at least occasionally in the suffering of abuses and invasions of privacy which one could assume would only increase with an expansion of their powers. Let me speak from my own experience, since there is a direct reference to me in your article. Warden George Saunders is quoted as saying: "Now there's this bloke, an habitual offender, who comes in with no road tax or anything, and he's still getting by and we can't find out who he is. He's a student and when we ask his name, he says "Trotsky"." Since I am Trotsky, I know just how nasty and officious the Wardens can be when they decide to be. I have no idea why Mr. Saunders believes Trotsky to be a student, because he is not. But more importantly, I am concerned that Mr. Saunders has described Trotsky as "an habitual offender." The car to my knowledge has never been involved in a violation of any kind. It is true that there is no parking disc on the car, however, since Trotsky is neither a student, nor an employee on this campus, he is not required - nor entitled to have - a parking disc. After being harrassed a number of times about not having a parking disc, a friend of mine went to Essex House and was given one, explaining my plight, "to keep the wardens away". A short time later, however, I was stopped yet again. When I showed the disc to the Warden, he snatched it out of my hand, accused me of stealing it, and threatened to call the police. I suspect that what riles the Wardens is not the fact that the car has committed "habitual offences," but that it "comes in with no road tax or anything." Naturally, since the car has German registration plates, it is not required to have a road tax. Perhaps the Wardens have a residue of dislike for Germans left over from the war. It is better to be unable to deal effectively with what the Wardens admit is only a small majority of trouble makers, than to provide them with even greater power to harrass and invade privacy. The only power that the Wardens are justified in having is the same as that which anyone should have; to be able to have vehicles moved which are blocking access that may be needed by emergency vehicles. I very much hope that this letter will be reproduced in Focus and will be passed on to the officer in charge of campus security.

Thank you very much,

L. Trotsky.
TOWARDS A MEDICAL CENTRE

About two years ago the Vice-Chancellor suggested that the idea of links between members of the University and members of the medical profession in the county would be a useful one. Soon after this the University Medical Consultative Group was set up and from a member of this body has come the suggestion for a Medical Research Centre. The Southern Medical Research Centre, as it is temporarily being called - its name may be changed later - is still an idea. But those who are concerned in the venture believe a research centre of the kind envisaged at a university like Sussex, which has no Medical School of its own, would be unique in Britain. The idea of actually having a medical research centre was that of Dr. Peter McEwan, Director of the Centre for Social Research. After the suggestion itself had been approved by the Medical Consultative Group, consisting of members of the University and those of the Medical Profession, committees were set up to guide its progress.

money.
Local industrialist, Mr. W F Gannon, former managing director of Business Computers donated a sum of money to the Centre, which enabled the scheme to get off the ground. More money is of course still needed but Dr. McEwan points out that when the Centre emerges, "It will be concerned initially with the three areas of research of medical interest which are being most actively looked into at the moment in the University". These areas are: (1) Bio-Engineering, which is at present concerned with among other things, the development of heart valves; (2) Bio-Chemistry and (3) The psycho-social aspects of medicine.

The question of whether the Centre would be wise to limit its research to the areas of present interest has needed much thought and consideration. Would it have been more sensible to cover a particular disease such as cancer or a specific problem such as ageing?

Dr. McEwan in fact admits that "Involvement in this type of research would have made it easier to raise funds for the Centre and the research being carried out at the moment would also have been related to topics such as these." The committee, however, decided in favour of continuing with the present areas of research for a number of reasons. As Dr. McEwan says, "For example, it would be difficult to have bio-chemists working on diabetes research in a Cancer Institute; and in the same way, bio-engineers might find it difficult to develop heart valves there".

Funds need to be raised primarily for a building to house the Centre which will be extremely advantageous to those scientists who are at the moment hindered in their research because of a lack of laboratory space. A Company limited by guarantee has been set up and a contract has been signed with Hooker Craigmyre Co. Ltd. for the fund-raising side of the project. The company itself consists of a Council which is the equivalent of a Board of Management. As yet this has no chairman.

independent

He, it is felt, must be independent and the Council wants neither a member of the University nor of the Medical Profession, but someone with strong local interests and administrative experience. There will eventually be thirty council members although at the moment there are only 23. A committee of management has been elected from the council which is further divided into three sub-committees through which the affairs of the Centre will be conducted.

The present position is therefore that the company legally exists and the raising of funds will shortly begin in earnest. The fund-raising consultants, Hooker Craigmyre Co., Ltd., are to provide the Resident Campaign Director who is Col. N.P. McDonald. Mr. John Frost, the Assistant Finance Officer, is the company secretary, having been lent to the project by the University. The first employee of the company itself is the secretary, Mrs. M. Edler, who has an office in Applied Sciences. A brochure is also to be provided for the project and fund-raising activities will begin in September. If all goes well it is hoped that the Centre will be launched in 1972.

The company itself is in fact negotiating with the University for a site. The Centre will be autonomous and will be related to the University in a similar way to IDS for example. Building will start, however, only when the company is satisfied that it has enough money. A director of the Centre will be appointed who will not be on the Council and who will be responsible for research. As Dr. McEwan points out, this will be a crucial appointment. Those undertaking research at the Centre will include University scientists who do not at present have the facilities they need, and one or two members of the medical profession in the County interested in doing serious research but
who are at the moment also lacking facilities. However, staff brought in from outside to undertake research projects would probably form the largest element in the Centre. Those doing research will of course be free to decide whether they wish to negotiate with the Centre or not.

The Centre for Social Research will itself be concerned in that people may decide to negotiate with the Medical Centre rather than with the former. It might make more sense of course for the medical research to go over to the Centre.

The three individuals who have been most active in the organisation of the Centre so far have been Dr. Peter McEwan, Director of the Centre for Social Research, Dr. M. Black, sub-dean of the School of Applied Sciences, and Dr. Keith Taylor, who is acting chairman of Bio-Chemistry and a medical doctor. There is a postgraduate medical centre in Brighton, with its own library and the University Centre might eventually work with it and become involved in graduate education. The question of a title for the Centre here has been thought over and although it would seem a good idea to name it after a major benefactor, this has not been possible so far and so it has been named the Southern Medical Research Centre. This name may be changed.

A further note of interest is that the University has formally agreed to approve the titles of Visiting Fellow and the following have been made Visiting Fellows with affiliations to the following schools:

Dr. R.I.K. Elliott - School of Biological Sciences, C.S.R.
Dr. P. Hall-Smith - School of Biological Sciences.
Dr. S. Jacobson - School of Social Sciences, C.S.R.
Dr. T. Mann - School of Applied Sciences
Mr. N. Porter -
Mr. D.J. Reid -
Dr. Joanna Sheldon - School of Biological Sciences
Dr. J.A.P. Trafford, M.P. - School of Social Sciences, C.S.R.
Dr. S.R. Williams - School of Applied Sciences.

---

"Youth Up In Arms" by George Paloczi-Horvath
(Weldenfeld and Nicolson - £3.50)

One cannot help enjoying Youth Up In Arms. George Paloczi-Horvath's account of youth movements throughout the world is permeated with his infectious faith in "the 'faceless revolution' of the young" and despite the author's own part (or perhaps because of it) in the defeated Hungarian Revolution of '56, Youth Up In Arms has a blatantly simplistic optimism as the basis for its dubious brand of historicism which assumes that history is just simply waiting to be fashioned and shaped. The book is an enthusiastic combination of Mr. Paloczi-Horvath's own compelling, if slightly journalistic style and well-presented detailed accounts of the part of youth in political and social movements everywhere. It deals with youth cults all over the world from the fifties onwards to the emergence of student activists of the sixties, and the non-conformists of the 'pop' era. Mr. Paloczi-Horvath is convinced that each youth cult, whether in Japan or Great Britain, the Eastern Bloc or the U.S.A. has led up quite purposefully and
deliberately to the present moment when, as he puts it, "Youth is taking over the world, with a speed and to a degree for which there has been no parallel in recorded history". Through his interviews with activists all over the world, the author gives a detailed analysis of the youth explosion's effect on world politics, with an eye-witness account of youth's part in the Hungarian Revolution, personal interviews with some of China's Red Guards and an examination of the Japanese Zengakuren and the dishonesty surrounding Ohnesberg's death. It is not Mr. Paloczi-Hovah's individual attempts to analyse different situations and events which are in question but the conclusions which he draws from fitting these separate factors into one unified picture. The cold war between the generations, which "is likely to assume proportions that have not been previously imagined", is used to account for the anti-youth bias so predominant in the western world, with Ohnesberg's death providing an example of the way in which existing authorities acting against young people have made use of public prejudice against them.

Fanaticism among student rebels has little emphasis and even the hippie movement receives questionable credit as "the yeast of the permanent revolutionary ferment in manners and morals". The book is without doubt a tribute to young activists everywhere and despite its tenuous conclusions and its enthusiasm for riding high on the ever diminishing wave of student rebellion, it is very readable.

Gaynor Crawford.

"In the Country of the Young"
by John W. Aldridge (Chatto & Windus - £1.25)

John Aldridge is a middle-aged American critic, a professor at the University of Michigan and something of a novelist. This little book is his blast against a younger generation whom he finds revolting in more senses than one. He offers it as an impressionistic study, not a sociological analysis. The young in the United States, he says, constitute a majority. They have become the "Establishment" by virtue of their numbers and their dogmatism. Aldridge's distaste for this vast imagined tribe is transatlantic equivalent to the middle-aging attitudes of Kingsley Amis. He is fluent in his objections, sometimes witty, and makes his main case by presenting a caricature "They": shaggy, dirty, intolerant, muddled, spoiled. Spoil'd? By whom? Aldridge blames the parent generation to some extent, for being so permissive and for offering so little in the way of a preferable life style. He portrays the postwar America of the late 1940's and early 1950's as a spiritual continuation of wartime. The demobilised millions find themselves in the new housing 'tracts' (a desolate word: compare thecosy English snobbery of our housing 'estates') that resemble army encampments in their sprawling sameness. Indeed Aldridge suggests that the trouble goes far back. What Gertrude Stein said of her native Oakland ('there is no there there') could be extended to the whole country. Americans never succeeded in giving an ambience to the bare co-ordinates of space and time; when you drive across the continent only the destination matters, or else the mere sensation of movement, of having quit whatever place you were in a moment ago.

This is well said. But it greatly weakens the force of Aldridge's attack on the young. If the whole place is so awful, is not disaffection an understandable and perhaps a necessary response? If the young are rootless how could they be expected to have roots? Aldridge's contention that the United States was bad a generation ago collides too with his occasional wistful praise for his own generation. He says that people like Gary Cooper and young Ingrid Bergman were beautiful, whereas the contemporary young are witfully ugly. But standards of beauty are transient and subjective: were the Coopers morally better than their successors? Again, Aldridge's admiration for the settled culture of Europe ignores the fact that youth-protest has been at least as violent in immemorial Paris as in America's transit-camp cities. The youth-style he dislikes is international: it cannot be accounted for simply with reference to the American situation.

There is a case for the middle-aged in the United States, and for the middle Americans generally, as Norman Mailer has perceived. Many of them meant well. They tried to be generous, undemanding parents. They believed their unsellosiness extended far outside the home: from narrow isolation their country had moved to a concern for the whole world. Then everything - or so it seemed - blew up in their faces. Their painfully acquired moderation was now apparently wrong after all. Bewildered, deprived of assurance, the only certainty they retained was the conviction that no-one - including, or especially, the young - ought to feel he has the answers.

But this case tends to be presented with an adversary exaggeration. Few people have the detachment to see
the comic and sometimes tragic ironies of the collision between two highly tentative life styles, each pretending to a wisdom it does not really feel sure of. One senses that Aldridge is such a nice man that he might have managed a statement of that kind. But he hasn't. The best example I know is Milos Forman's new film *Taking Off*, which refuses to line up with either generation. Perhaps the necessary detachment is only available at the moment to a European like Forman.

Marcus Cunliffe.

"The Impossible Theatre: The Chichester Festival Theatre Adventure"

by Leslie Evershed-Martin.

(Phillimore & Co., Chichester, £2.75)

On January 4, 1959, Leslie Evershed-Martin, an oculist, city councillor, and former mayor of Chichester, happened to see a BBC programme on *Monitor* in which Tyrone Guthrie described how a group of local laymen founded and built the splendid Shakespeare Theatre at Stratford, Ontario, and how he directed its early fortunes. At the end of the programme Evershed-Martin turned to his family and asked "If they can do that in Canada, why can't we do it here in Chichester?" On July 5, 1962, the Chichester Festival Theatre, designed by Messrs. Powell and Moya at a cost of only £110,000, opened its first season under the direction of Sir Laurence Olivier. What had happened in the intervening years is described in *The Impossible Theatre*, which is a pleasant work of local history rather than a searching contribution to current discussions about the building of playhouses outside London and the creation of flexible forms of theatrical architecture.

At times, Mr. Evershed-Martin is writing for the readers of *Sussex Life* rather than of, say, *Plays and Players*. He seems to have been as excited by Chichester's plethora of royal visits as he was by the superb *Uncle Vanya* of 1962 and 1963. The story he tells is, in its early stages unusually, one of exploratory talks, encounters over very good sherry with local aristocrats and notables, innumerable committee-meetings, and dedicated, hard-headed, and imaginative fund-raising.

That all this should take place in or around the quiet precincts of Chichester has its own charm - there are moments reminiscent of Trollope. When the first architect withdrew, Evershed-Martin could go straight to the brilliant and prestigious modern partnership of Powell and Moya, because Philip Powell is the son of a Canon of Chichester Cathedral. There are revealing details. His Grace the Duke of Norfolk said he would probably come only once to the theatre, but gave useful advice on car-parking and catering. Lord Woolton, consulted about fund-raising suggested going for money in a big way or not at all - never take £15,000 from someone who could give £25,000. Sir Laurence Olivier consented to be the first director, but refused the suggested salary of £3,000, preferring to take £3,000 to show his commitment to the enterprise. When Mr. Hugh ('Blinkie') Beaumont heard that Olivier had accepted the directorship 'his jaw dropped', but he soon rallied: "I've got it! He wants to prepare himself for the National Theatre!" After the first night Moss Bros. wrote to express their regret that the management had not stipulated that evening dress be worn at all performances as at Glyndebourne.

Theatre buffs will find the book most interesting when the author tells of his growing friendship with the late Sir Tyrone Guthrie, that magisterial and mercurial figure whose innovations and experience at Edinburgh and Ontario explain the amphitheatre adopted at Chichester; and Olivier naturally looms large in the later chapters. Although priorities between the administrative and artistic direction of the theatre were firmly settled at the outset and are discussed in the book, there is a certain lack of discussion of the raison d'être for this 'impossible' theatre in a cathedral city. What kind of repertoire should Chichester aim at? Is the amphitheatrical form the ideal one for what is not, as in Ontario, a Shakespearean playhouse? Above all, whom is this theatre for - West Sussex, the home counties, the tourists, the young? Evershed-Martin whose tact towards the artistic directors prevents his going into aesthetic matters and value-judgements) ends his book with the end of the first season, but the details of subsequent productions are summarised in an appendix. After the second season the Chichester players were merged with the National Theatre Company, which ran two further seasons at the Festival Theatre. Lord Olivier here contributes a relaxed and genial prologue, frankly analysing the successes and failures of his own first season, and saluting both his shrewd successor and the founder:

"Our advance booking for the first season was a little over £30,000. We never achieved anything very spectacularly much larger than this. Last year, the fifth under John Clements' direction, the advance booking reached £140,000. He has more than doubled the interest in the place and under his management it has become a recognised part of English summer life. So...I started it off, John Clements made it good, future directors may swing its fortunes this way or that, but the credit for the fact that it exists at all will always belong to the man who wrote the book that follows."

It is a modest book, chronicling the concerted local effort against initial set-backs which preceded the creative interest of Guthrie, Olivier and Clements. Some day a critical history of the Chichester Festival will need to be written. This is its first chapter. Its publication just now reminds us that the tenth season has opened and that booking is brisk. We on this East Sussex campus - with its own mini-Chichester in August and September - are lucky to have within such easy reach in West Sussex a new theatre which has in ten years staged plays by Shakespeare, Ford, Fletcher, Shaw, Arden, Shaffer, Marston, Pinero, Strindberg, Colman & Garrick, Anouilh, Philipps, Parnes, Labiche & Marc-Michel, Ustinov, Eliot, Wilder, Brecht, Wycherley, Bolt, Ibsen, Johnson and Sheridan.

Michael Jamieson.
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