ANTIUNIVERSITY
of LONDON
MUSIC ART POETRY BLACK POWER MADNESS REVOLUTION

JOSEPH BERKE
ROBIN BLACKBURN
MALCOLM CALDOWELL
CORNELIUS CARDREW
KEN COATES
DAVID COOPER
ED DORN

STUART HALL
RICHARD HAMILTON
JIM HAYNES
CALVIN HERNTON
FRANCIS HUXLEY
NICHOLAS KRASSO
ALLEN KREBS
MICHAEL KUSTOW

K. D. LAING
DAVID MERCER
MILES
JULIET MITCHELL
STUART MONTGOMERY
RUSSELL STETLER
ALEXANDER TROCHI

AND OTHERS

OPENS 12TH FEBRUARY 1968

49 RIVINGTON STREET
SHOREDITCH E.C.2

01-739 6952

MEMBERSHIP £8

NO FORMAL REQUIREMENTS

Write for Catalogue
THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
NEWSLETTER

1. Fees - people who registered before and paid in full may register for £5 instead of £8. Paid in full includes cash and/or goods and/or services.

2. New (second) session starts 6th May and goes on till the end of June. The third (summer) session will begin 1st July and go on till the last full week in August. The fourth session will begin the second full week in September, i.e., 9th September.

3. The Action Research Project on Racism in Britain meets at 8.30 on Mondays at the Antiumversity. New participants are welcome.

4. We apologise to Jakov Lind for misspelling his name. We also would like to bring your attention to the fact that Jakov Lind will be meeting with people on Tuesdays at 6.30, beginning 7th May, and not on Mondays as stated in the catalogue.

5. We also apologise for the delay in printing catalogues. Please note that a few other changes in schedule have been made. On the reverse side of this sheet is the correct schedule as of 3rd May.

6. We would like to mention once again the three meetings at the Antiumversity -- listed in the catalogue -- to discuss the direction and purpose of antiumversities in general and this one in particular.

7. A financial statement will be published in the next newsletter.

8. The Antiumversity was created in December 1967 by an ad hoc committee who meet irregularly to co-ordinate the ongoing organization and programme of the Antiumversity. This committee includes

   Alan Benveniste
   Joseph Berke
   David Cooper
   Allen Krebs
   Juliet Mitchell

   Stuart Montgomery
   Aubrey Raymond
   Leon Redler
   Morty Schatzman
   Russell Stetler

   The secretary of this committee and co-ordinator of the Antiumversity is Allen Krebs; the treasurer is Joseph Berke. The Secretary of the Antiumversity, responsible for regular work flow and responsible to this committee, is Susan Stetler. She can be telephoned for information weekdays from 3 to 9 p.m. Registrations can be accepted now.

9. This is the first of a fortnightly newsletter.

10. Welcome to all new participants in the Antiumversity.
Dear:

This Thursday evening, 16th November, at 6.00 p.m. at the office of the Institute, 4, St. George’s Terrace, W.1., there will be a meeting to discuss the founding of an Anti-University. The following are some ideas of Mine which could provide the basis for discussion.

(1) That it be set up as an independent unit affiliated to the Institute.

(2) It would be especially concerned with maintaining a high level of scholarship and research. The Faculty would be chosen from among a number of high calibre people in our network who manifest in their work the social critique and viewpoint that we hold in common. Enclosed is a list of people who have been suggested as possible faculty members. Please feel free to add to it and kindly bring your own suggestions on Thursday night for discussion.

(3) The University should be financially self-sustaining and provide a reasonable income for the faculty.

(4) The University could itself become a framework for inviting individuals from abroad with whom we would like to converse and whom we think relevant to meet. The opportunity to teach at the University would provide reasonable financial support to those invited to London.

(5) The University itself can sponsor evening and weekend events such as lectures, seminars, discussions, extended meetings.

(6) The University itself can provide a focus and support for research in the Social Sciences, etc.
(7) The relationship of the University to other aspects of the work of the Institute (or other Organisations with which the faculty is affiliated) should be discussed.

Yours sincerely,

Joseph Berke
Joseph Berke
The Free University of New York

In New York in recent months, a new university has come into being, created and developed by none other than a dozen people, among them faculty and student leaders, who called themselves the Free University. The rationale for its establishment is best explained by this statement which appears on page one of the Free University catalogue:

"The Free University of New York has been forged in response to the intellectual bankruptcy and cultural emptiness of the American educational establishment. It is a act to develop the concept necessary to comprehend the events of this century and the meaning of one's life within it. To promote educational experience within the scope of the social and academic and to promote the social integration of students, which scholars usually stand against.

"Passionate involvement, intellectual vitality, and physical vitality will be particularly encouraged because we believe a detached search for ideas in a dispassionate, objective position does not and cannot have

"The Free University will consist of its intellectual and political teachers. Students will meet on common ground to occupy the direction of the school, to develop curricula, create common, symposia, forums, etc.

"The Free University of New York is necessary because, in our conception, collected universities have been produced in institutions of cultural and intellectual activity. Thus, it is necessarily, educationally, and academically."

The Free University had to be self-supporting in order to accomplish this..."

The first classes

The Free University of New York was planned and initiated in New York City by a group of students who had been expelled from various universities because of their opposition to the Vietnam War and their support for those professors who had been dismissed from all prospective faculty members. A large number of the students were living in New York City, and the Free University was organized as an independent, non-profit institution.

On their return from Cuba, the Krebses announced that their school in New York was ready to be opened. The Free University had been designed to provide a place for students who were dissatisfied with the traditional educational system and were looking for an alternative form of education. The school was opened on September 15, 1965, with a small group of students and faculty members.

The opening was marked by a demonstration of support and a celebration of the new institution. The Free University was immediately recognized as a symbol of the counterculture and a challenge to the traditional university system. The school continued to grow and attract students from all over the country, and it became a center for political activism and social change.

The Free University of New York was closed in 1969, after a series of violent incidents and clashes with the authorities. However, the school's legacy lives on, and it remains a symbol of the power of education to change the world.

The Free University of New York was a unique institution that offered a different kind of education to its students. It was a place where students could explore new ideas and think for themselves, without the constraints of traditional academic structure. The school was a source of inspiration for many people who were looking for a new way of learning and living.
Jackie Lukes

The comprehensives teach-in

Jackie Lukes reports: The Oxford Union debating hall was the venue of a second teaching-in debate on October 30. This time a teacher moved from the rostrum to the measure and the subject was comprehensive schools. More precisely, the gathering was entitled “Comprehensive Education in Oxford” and the aim was to confront teachers, heads, parents and local politicians with an alternative to reorganize Oxford’s comprehensives.

For over seven hours, a congregation of 300 teachers and parents from local comprehensives, an assembly of the Oxford Teachers’ Union, politicians and academic educationalists from every party, gathered in the debating hall and aired their ideas. All the parents and teachers who attended could afford to face the dilemma between a “half” secondary modern and a “good” comprehensive school, equally sincere. They were teachers who believed and were the protagonists of a comprehensive education, who would like to spend their careers in schools that, by statute, should be comprehensive.

One point emerged most clearly in a speech given by the head of Oxford’s comprehensive school, Mr. J. A. Hall. He said he was aware of the difficulties that comprehensives faced, that they were not well known, and that in general, the comprehensives were less popular than the academic secondary moderns. However, he believed that comprehensive education could probably be more successful than the academic secondary moderns. He argued that comprehensive education was the only way to improve the quality of education in Oxford and that the comprehensives were the only way to improve the quality of education in Oxford.

On the other hand, the strongest social grounds are that comprehensive education is the only way to improve the quality of education in Oxford and that the comprehensives are the only way to improve the quality of education in Oxford.

Further, if the free universities are to be formally established as political and community tools, they must be recognized and accepted by the public. The public must be convinced that the free universities are the only way to improve the quality of education in Oxford and that the comprehensives are the only way to improve the quality of education in Oxford.

On another level, one can see the free universities as a form of protest against the social and political status quo. They are a form of protest against the social and political status quo.

Psychologist and poet, Joseph Berko, was a family friend of Emily Dickinson. He lectured on “the paradox of free will” in New York. He lectured on “the paradox of free will” in New York.

Jackie Lukes is a postgraduate student in educational sociology at Oxford.
Announcing the Fall Session of the FREE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

- BLACK LIBERATION - REVOLUTIONARY ART AND ETHICS - COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION - THE AMERICAN RADICAL TRADITION - CUBA AND CHINA - IMPERIALISM AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Robert Ante
Stanley Aronowitz
David Bernofsky
Yves de Laurot
William Erwin
Norman Fruchter
Paul Gershowitz
Martin Glass
Brad Harrison
Calvin Hicks
Will Inman
Charles Johnson
Paul Krassner
Allen Krebs
Sharon Krebs
Tuli Kupferberg
Levi Laub
Al Lee
Leonard Liggio
Albert Litewka
Gerald Long
Bradford Lyttele
Jackson MacLow
Shane Mage
John McDermott
David McReynolds
James Mellen
Alex Prempeh
Dick Roberts
James Robertson
Milt Rosen
Paul Ross
Carolee Schneemann
Barbara Schwartz
Irwin Schwartz
Martin J. Sklar
Peter Stafford
Russell Stetler, Jr.
Roger Taus
Sotere Torregian
Susan Warren
James Weinstein
Robt. Anton Wilson

REGISTRATION
SEPT. 27—OCT. 1

Write for Catalogue

TEN WEEK SESSION BEGINS OCT. 4
($24/first course; $8/each additional course; Welfare recipients free)

20 East 14 Street
New York, N.Y. 10003

Phone OR. 5-7424
The Antiuniversity of London appears in many ways as a massive failure when looked at superficially. But whether it was a terminal failure or actually an experiment that did not succeed at its specific point in history depends on how you approach this historic anti-institution. The Antiuniversity raised an enormous amount of questions. In many ways that could be viewed as sufficient in itself, if the experimental nature of this project is well-understood. Experiments are by their nature open-minded trials based on hopes and assumptions. And the key is that there is no certainty about the outcome.

Institutions are by definition conservative. That is in some respect implied in the word ‘institution’, which stems from the Latin word institutio meaning to set up, to establish. By 1400, ‘institution’ in French had assumed the meaning of something established, a system of government, a religious order. The term institution was gaining foothold with the secularisation of society in the early Renaissance, in parallel to the establishment of the first network of European universities. Institutions are not just bricks and mortar; they are part of ‘collective phantasy systems’, as the existentialist psychiatrist R.D. Laing puts it. Laing was himself involved in the Antiuniversity.

For the people around the Antiuniversity it was very much the conservatism and reactionary structures of the established universities that made them move towards setting it up. As written in the first catalogue of the Antiuniversity in February 1968: ‘The Antiuniversity of London has been founded in response to the intellectual bankruptcy and spiritual emptiness of the educational establishment in both Britain and rest of the world.’

As one of its main movers, the American psychiatrist Dr Joseph Berke writes in April 1968 in an introductory text about the Antiuniversity: ‘The schools and universities are dead. They must be destroyed and rebuilt in our own terms. These sentiments reflect the growing belief of students and teachers all over Europe and the United States as they strip aside the academic pretensions from their “institutions of higher learning” and see them for what they are – rigid training schools for the operation and expansion of reactionary government, business, and military bureaucracies.’

In many ways, such a position can be linked to the Situationists and their critique of the university in Strasbourg in the text ‘Ten Days That Shook the University’ which they issued in 1966. As one of the main forces behind the founding of the Antiuniversity Dr Joseph Berke was well aware of the Strasbourg text. Here the perspective of university’s impact on the students, turning them into depoliticised and pacified subjects: ‘Modern capitalism and its spectacle alienate everyone a specific role in a general passivity. The student is no exception to the rule. He has a provisional part to play, a rehearsal for his final role as an element in market society as conservative as the rest. Being a student is a form of initiation. An initiation which echoes the rites of more primitive societies with bizarre precision. It goes on outside of history, cut off from social reality. The student leads a double life, poised between his present status and his future role. The two are absolutely separate and the journey from one to the other is a mechanical event “in the future”. Meanwhile, he basks in a schizophrenic consciousness, withdrawing into his initiation group to hide from the future. Protected from history, the present is a mystic trance.’ (Strasbourg: Ten Days That Shook the University, in Joseph Berke, ed., Counter Culture, Peter Owen Limited, 1969)

The aim of the Antiuniversity was to open up education to a wider social reality, which was contrary to the inward-looking traditional university, an institution mainly occupied with its own survival as an institution within the given society. The critique of the university and the students it produces have to be seen within a context where especially the American universities were tightly linked to commercial interests and corporations that were underpinning nuclear armament and the ongoing war in Vietnam. Also to be considered was the general political atmosphere characterised by an institutionalised fear and repression of the Left and the civil rights movements. This political climate led to the Free University of New York, the fore-runner of the Antiuniversity, becoming the object of a congressional hearing in the preparation of “bills to make punishable assistance to enemies of the US in time of undeclared war” in 1966.

As a response to this ‘collective phantasy system’ the Antiuniversity sought to develop the concepts and form of experience necessary to comprehend the events of this century and the meaning of one’s life within it, to examine artistic expression beyond the scope of the usual academy and to promote a position of social integrity and commitment from which scholars now stand aloof.”

As stated on the promotional material from the Antiuniversity no formal qualification was needed to get involved and no degrees would be awarded. These details bring the educational aims of the Antiuniversity into a different realm than the traditional university which aims to place the student into her future role in the market, as the Situationists pointed out. At the Antiuniversity the focus was experimental and experimental. This was not only in relation to society but also in relation to the institution itself, or anti-institution to be precise.

As stated in the Strasbourg text in a somewhat enigmatic way, “the abolition of alienation is only reached by the straight and narrow path of alienation itself”. This could mirror Joseph Berke’s statement about the Antiuniversity: “In the process of making an institution we deinstitutionalised ourselves”. This somehow underlines that the social relation inside the institution was going to be key in the experimental and demystifying process that was going to become the Antiuniversity of London.

Already on the first day of the life of the Antiuniversity, this structure caused various debates around pay and fees, as well as the traditional teacher and students structure that the Antiuniversity seemed to replicate.

The catalogue of the first quarter offered over 30 different courses with a very diverse field of topics as well as teachers. A group of teachers involved with the New Left Review were running various courses in political theory and revolutionary movements. Avant-garde artists such as John Latham and Cornelius Cardew were running courses consisting of collective and practical experimentation with making artistic work. A group of poets and writers such as John Keys and Lee Harwood offered (anti-)courses in poetry. The group of existential psychiatrists such as R.D. Laing, David Cooper, Leon Redler and Joseph Berke were running courses covering aspects of psychiatry and psychology viewed from a critical social perspective. Also covered were Black Power, experimental drugs, primitivising and underground media. Alexander Trocchi offered a course with the title Invisible Insurrection, referring to his key text of 1962 on the founding of a spontaneous university, which was one of the inspirations to the Antiuniversity. And the poet Ed Dorn just declared in his course blurb that he would ‘be ready to talk to anyone who wants to talk to me’. 

‘We have to step out of Structure A to be able to see it. But one can’t step out if there is nowhere to step to.’ (Joseph Berke, The Guardian, 15.2.1968)

‘Women, Hippies, youth groups, students and school children all question the institutions that have formed them, and try to erect their obverse: a collective commune to replace the bourgeois family; “free communications” and counter-media; anti-universities – all attack major ideological institutions of this society. The assaults are specified, localised and relevant. They bring the contradictions out into the open.’ (Juliet Mitchell, Woman’s Estate, Penguin, 1971, p.32)
The Free University of New York has been forged in response to the intellectual bankruptcy and spiritual emptiness of the American educational establishment. It seeks to develop the concepts necessary to comprehend the events of this century and the meaning of one's own life within it, to examine artistic expression beyond the scope of the usual academy, and to promote social integrity and commitment from which scholars usually stand aloof.

Passionate involvement, intellectual confrontation, and clash of ideas are particularly encouraged because we believe a de-centered mind is necessary.

REGISTRATION
Registration at the Free University takes place each semester in the Student Center and in the Admissions office (January 30-February 10). During the final week of the semester, it will be possible at the Free University for students to withdraw from courses. This withdrawal will have to be made in writing and must be signed by the student and the instructor. A student may withdraw at any time during the first two weeks of the semester. Withdrawals will be processed only on the last day of the semester. The student will receive a full refund of tuition and fees paid if the withdrawal is submitted within the first two weeks of the semester.

CALENDAR
Monday, January 16: Commencement
Monday, January 23: Preparatory Period
Wednesday, January 25: Registration
February 1: Class begins

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE
20 East 14th Street, New York, N.Y. 10003
(212) 673-8600
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The Antiuniversity opened its doors at 49 Rivington Street in Shoreditch, East London in 1968. It was an initiative of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, Russ Stetter, one of the directors of the foundation, was himself on the Ad-Hoc Coordination Committee and this paved the way for reason- able rent and conditions. The Antiuniversity was inspired by the uprisings at the Institute of Phenomenological Studies, which in many respects was also one of the main forces in setting up the project. The Institute of Phenomenological Studies had the previous year organised the Dialectics of Liberation Congress where the idea of setting up an university of the wider range of London had first emerged. In the minutes of a meeting of the Ad-Hoc Coordination Committee on January 8, 1968 the building and the needed changes are described as follows: ‘Building – […] Structure = basement – one large room to take up to 40 people. Ground floor – reception area for secretary and one large room to be used as loge – small snack facilities to be installed. First floor – three small rooms to be converted to one small and one large room by removing partition. Remaining partition to be altered so as to soundproof the two rooms. Second floor – two moderately large rooms – take 20-25 people. Furniture – building comes with 13 desks, 37 small chairs, 2 bench chairs, once sofa. A minimum of 25 folding chairs to be purchased.’

It was emphasised that the Antiuniversity should be self-sustaining economically, hence the fee structure that was put in place from the outset. This organisational structure became a source of lengthy debates and the Antiuniversity’s relation to the economic realm where it was situated was later to become crucial in relation to the project’s limited financial success. It was underlined in one of the organisational talks in the Antiuniversity that it was being taken over by administrators having economic and managerial interests that went counter to the interests of the ‘community of scholars’. Although this vision was not to be exclusively focused on to open up the institution of the university to a wider social reality, the political focus of the place very much came to rest on the micro-political of the institutional structure itself. But as an experiential and experimental project it was impossible to differentiate the academic community that was conditioning the project socially, historically and economically.

Due to the publicity as well as the need for a meeting place of the counter-cultural scene in London more than 200 people signed up as members of the Antiuniversity for the first quarter. The courses were either weekly or bi-weekly and most of them took place in the evenings to make it possible for both students and teachers to attend after work. Attempts to recruit locally among workers were less successful and the relationship with the local community was tense. Due to the focus on Black Power, the attempt to involve communities of black people was more prosper- ous as many of the courses touched on black experience and black politics. Some of the courses, especially David Cooper’s and R.D. Laing’s, were very popular and quickly became fully booked. Other courses turned into more or less practical experiments in relation to the topic. Joseph Berke’s course on the Antiuniversity ended up with Berke leaving the room due to illness and the group of students taking over the meeting. Together with John Latham the Antiuniversity turned the classroom into a big book sculpture and Cornelius Cardew refused to play for the students because he believed that they should produce their own music. This anticipated the work that he later did with the Scratch Orchestra. For these courses there were more traditional lectures on political science and revolutionary theory. And some of the courses presented in the catalogue never happened.

The year at the Antiuniversity was divided into four quarters lasting eight weeks each. In the second catalogue a new course was introduced called the Counter University that was to focus on the development and operation of the Antiuniversity itself. As a natural consequence of the experiential and experimental nature of the anti-institution the first meeting of this Counter University group was called for at the beginning of May 1968 as an assembly for everybody involved with the Antiuniversity. The flyer had the heading ‘You and the Anti-U’ and continued the debate around the organisational ques- tions already debated the first days at the Antiuniversity. It stated: ‘These past four months have proved that an antiuniversity can survive – it can even grow. The question is in what directions? We feel it is necessary to repudiate our birth and commit ourselves to a new community development. Any organisation which wishes to be meaningful, not only to the world outside but more importantly, to its self, must re-examine itself at each step. To do otherwise is a symptom of death.’

The three main questions on the agenda were the student/teacher relationship, decision making powers within the organisation, and the level of communication between courses. The flyer eventually calls for an end to the distinctions between ‘students’, ‘teachers’ and ‘administrators’. The Ad-Hoc Coordina- tion Committee was still functioning as the formal decision making body and it had employed Allen Krebs and Bob Cobbing as coordinator and Susan Stetter as secretary. There were voices challeng- ing the authority and power of the admin- istration. This was a part of the struggles around the development of the Antiuni- versity, aiming at a more towards a more democratic structure. But there was also a move from a formal to an increasingly informal structure. At the margin of the You and the Anti-U flyer small statements were written in by hand: ‘Is your teacher really necessary?’, ‘What about an anti- antiuniversity-antiuniversity?’. ‘Who’s going to do the dirty work?’ and ‘Pay the students charge the teachers’.

In April, Peter Upwood, the caretaker of the snack bar in the lounge, had moved into the Antiuniversity, joined by a group of friends who meant that the Antiuniversity was turning into a commune. This was not explicitly decided or approved by anybody but it was welcomed as a part of the develop- ment. It also echoed education projects where living as a community was an inte- gral part of the educational perspective, e.g. example Black Mountain College. The poet, publisher and printmaker Asa Elzey who wrote about the Antiuniversity in Berke’s Counter Culture book, this first commune improved the atmosphere and the care of the space. It helped to deinsti- tutionalise the university and establish new and closer connections with the material everyday life of the learning environment.

This new development catalysed a week- end workshop about the practicalities and ideals of organising a commune. Most of the communes around London came to the Antiuniversity at the end of April 1968 and shared experiences and political ideas around communal living and the possible structuring of the ‘antifamily’.

The second term started May 6 and a new catalogue was published. This time the pa- per and printing quality were less delicate. The first catalogue offered 37 courses, while in the second the courses offered increased to 60. New teachers joined the faculty, for example the exiled German visual artist Gustav Metzger and Afro- Caribbean historian and writer C.L.R. James. Parallel to this increased range of courses, the Counter University group started meeting more frequently and pushed forward the aim of getting beyond the organisational structure of student, teacher and administrator. In this process the Ad-Hoc Coordination Committee once more came under attack as a reac- tion to the force within the institutional framework of the Antiuniversity. In an article in the International Times Martin Segal describes the conflict in this way: ‘The rebels were told, in effect, to go out and start a family of their own if they wanted “participatory democracy” and that the structure of the Antiuniversity would be set up. But the group was not interested in the acting out of personalities put together by rubber bands and clips. It was not interested in boring meetings as the vehicle of deci- sion making. It was not interested and that was final.”

The committee was criticised for lack of transparency and for organising meetings in secret. Segal describes the committee as ‘them’, the founding fathers trying to get the rebellious children to behave. The comparison of the institution of the family- ily to the institution of the university was a thoughtful and forceful blow to the group of mainly psychiatrists who had set up the Antiuniversity. They could well accept the repressive and violent nature of the family, as a cohesive institution within the US and the New Experimental Col- lege in Denmark. According to Roberta Elenier who wrote about the Antiuniversity in Berke’s Counter Culture book, this first commune improved the atmosphere and the care of the space. It helped to deinsti-
also meant a more fundamental breaking down of the committee’s managing role at the Antiuniversity and the university. Segal ends his text announcing these structural changes by stating that in the future ‘the Antiuniversity is YOURS’. Instead of acting as satellites to the stars in our social universe, phase II of the Antiuniversity was an event space for everybody to act as stars.’

For a while the old and the new structure would run parallel, with a new catalogue being produced featuring a course arrangement as seen in the previous two catalogues. However, at the same time the old notion of the catalogue was ‘being exploded’. The course structure should not be based on the ‘names’ of the course leader and in the future attending a course was going to mean ‘considering oneself as one of the givers of the course’. One of the keys to break down the old structure was the process of shaping the range of courses that so far had been organised by the coordinator backed up by the coordinating committee.

This development led to the call for the Anti-U Course Creation Rally at Hyde Park Corner on 21 July, 1968. A ‘kip-in’ weekend for organising the Rally was planned for the previous weekend where faculty and Antiuniversity members were invited to meet and organise future courses. A provisional course catalogue was produced but the flyer for the Rally announced that ‘All decisions on the allocation of Anti-U space time will be made at this meeting.’

This ‘explosion’ of the course structure was accompanied by an ‘explosion’ of the fee and pay structure. Teachers and course leaders were no longer going to be paid for running a course and the faculty was called to contribute as the students had done so far. Due to the ongoing structural struggles, formal and informal, within the Antiuniversity many members had in fact stopped paying the fee after the first quarter which meant that the Antiuniversity was already unable to pay teachers in the second quarter. So the subsequent democratisation of the Antiuniversity also led to a less viable economic structure, but this should also be viewed in light of the resistance to the teacher-student structure that the contestation of the fee payment represented.

The £8 a term fee was abolished and a more voluntary pay structure was put in place. It was calculated that £5 a year was needed to cover rent and running costs, but it was also clear that ‘some people can pay, some people can’t’. But this less secure economic outlook already meant that a more decentralised Antiuniversity was needed. It began to utilise private flats for meeting places as an alternative to the cost-heavy setting in the building at 49 Rivington Street.

The first commune at the Antiuniversity came to an end in May and a new group of people moved in. A group that, according to Roberto Elzey, cared less about the Antiuniversity and this created some tension between the interests of commune and the university. This group was eventually replaced by a new group in July consisting mainly of people travelling through London just looking for a place to crash. This worsened the already tense atmosphere at the Rivington Street venue. As Sheila Rowbotham described it: ‘Modelled on the American Free School and echoing the Dialectics of Liberation conference, the Antiuniversity had been set up by a common affinity of anti-patriarchists and members of the New Left Review. It aimed to “[…] do away with artificial splits and divisions between disciplines and art forms and between theory and action”. Though these ideas, in a diluted form, were to percolate through the educational system over the next few years, in this radical enclave, in 1968, the dream was to be doomed. Life folded into learning too literally, turning the Antiuniversity into a dosshouse. The hope of a counter-institution was already sinking […] and the atmosphere was bleak and besieged.’

The breaking open of the institutional structure of the Antiuniversity and the advent of unrestricted experimentation with the organisational relations pushed out one of the last traces of the old structure as the sovereignty struggle at the Antiuniversity entered a new phase. The newly instated coordinator Bob Cobbing decided to step down from his post at the beginning of July 1968 due to organisational problems within the Antiuniversity. He wrote an open letter to Joe Berke with the physical space of the Antiuniversity and at the beginning of August the otherwise benevolent landlord of the building at 49 Rivington started to write formal letters asking the arrears for rent, electricity and telephone to be covered. Joe Berke negotiated an accord with the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation and paid most of the arrears. After this the building committee had to leave the building and continue as a dispersed anti-institution using people’s flats and pubs as settings for the educational activities. As the course structure as well as the quarter structure was abolished with ‘courses starting all the time’ according to Cobbing, the descriptions which were given of the Antiuniversity lost its own logic. A number of courses and meetings carried on around London with Bill Mason’s flat in Soho as the hub and postal address. Advertisements were placed in the International Times every week with a phone number stating that people can call for information on courses, seminars and meetings. The latest one I found was from the autumn of 1971. In light of the deinstitutionalised anti-institution, it can be said that the activities of the Antiuniversity were geared on when people met in self-organised ways and shared experiences, affects and knowledge. But the institution of the Antiuniversity was slowly being erased.

The deinstitutionalising of the Antiuniversity was a process characterised by struggle and antagonism and at times too many egos, as both Leon Redler and Joe Berke have told me. The Antiuniversity was revolutionary but its character of an experiment embedded in an alien environment of capitalism made it impossible to shield the anti-institution from the social relations of the surrounding society, a condition of which Krebs and Berke were aware from the outset. This was pointed out at a workshop at University College London in 1967 where the question raised by them was: ‘the scope or limitations of a “Free University”, with particular reference to a critique of the New York Free U, both in content and organisation, set within an unchanged capitalist/bourgeois society.’

The Antiuniversity of London was a part of a broader movement of student protests in the late 1960s, not only in the UK but all over the world. The May rebellion in Paris was unfolding parallel to the development of the Antiuniversity and in London there had already been student protests and occupations of campuses, most notably of the London School of Economics (LSE) in 1967. The students confronted the hegemonies and ideologies of the university, which they considered to reflect those of society as a whole. According to the more syndicalist parts of the student movement this was the main site of contest – and the self-organised Free Universities were at best not harmful, but were not engaging in the social struggle in its right direction: within the official universities at all levels. Nevertheless, many people around the New Left Review who had taken part in the LSE protests did go on to offer courses at the Antiuniversity, teaching political theory and revolutionary practice, courses that most probably couldn’t be found at official universities.

In May 1968 the students at the Hornsey Art School occupied their school protest ing against the renewal of the university’s management that wanted to implement. This occupation lasted more than a month and mobilised and politicised the students within the institution that they wanted to defend. Yet the Antiuniversity, as well as King’s Hall, was a lesson from which movements had to take note and set out to challenge the ideological nature of ‘the institution’. This issue was given less attention in the more pragmatic and at times reformist struggles within official educational establishments. But the struggles unfolding through the autonomous anti-institutions and the struggles located within official schools and universities, were probably feeding into each other more than diverting energies and disrupting each other. Through their specific situations they created different experiences and communities.

A wide array of experiences of deinstitutionalisation the Antiuniversity fed into other discourses of the counterculture and the New Left. For example, in terms of the Women’s Liberation Movement the Antiuniversity was a way of replicating the patriarchal structures of the surrounding society. Juliet Mitchell was part of the Ad-Hoc Coordination Committee until it was abolished and she ran courses ‘on the position of women’. She went on to publish Woman’s Estate in 1971 with a collection of essays on women’s liberation written in the late 1960s. Here she writes her reflections on the contradictory process of the Antiuniversity: ‘The new politics of all the youth movements entailed and rediscovered subjectivity, the relevance of emotionality and the need for personal freedom and respect for that of others. Subjectivity, emotionality, a “caring” for others had previously tended to be designated “feminine” qualities. Ironically the counter-culture movement, for wanting promi nence to values hitherto downgraded – “womanly” ones, “Make love not war” – the personal takes precedence – as it always had to do for women. “Togetherness” and “do your own thing” – fates to which they had been condemned in the suffocation of the family and the isolation of the home – were now given a different meaning. That these female values were appropriated by male radicals initially gave women hope within these movements. But when they found even here, where their oppressed characteristics seemed to be the order of the day, they played a secondary (to be generous) role, righteous resentment was rampant. (Mitchell, Woman’s Estate, 1971, p.175)

The experimental and experimental way of consciousness raising that the deinstitutionalisation of the Antiuniversity catalysed through the difficult process that was initiated on February 12, 1968, was not a failure. But it was not unambiguous either.

Jakob Jakobsen is a visual artist and organiser based in London and Copenhagen.

Images of the Antiuniversity of London from the BBC’s news spot about the place broadcasted in February, 1968 (Found on Youtube.com)
a unique gathering
to demystify human violence in all its forms
the social systems from which it emanates,
and to explore new forms of action

international
CONGRESS
DIALECTICS
OF LIBERATION

R.D.Laing Gregory Bateson S. Carmichael
Sat July 15th. 3pm. Mon July 17th. 10.30 am. Tues July 18th. 10.30 am.

Jules Henry Erving Goffman Paul Sweezy
Wed July 19th. 10.30 am. Thur July 20th. 10.30 am. Fri July 21st. 10.30 am.

Ernest Mandel
Mon July 24th. 10.30 am.

Lucien Goldmann
Wed July 26th. 10.30 am.

Herbert Marcuse
Fri July 28th. 10.30 am.

Paul Goodman
Tues July 25th. 10.30 am.

John Gerassi
Thur July 27th. 10.30 am.

David Cooper
Sat July 29th. 3pm.

at the Roundhouse, Chalk Farm Rd. London N.W.I. 10/- per lecture (£4.15.0. entire series)
(Buses—68, 31, 24. Tube Chalk Farm.) 7/6 lecture students (£3.10.0. entire series)
Advance Tickets, Institute of Phenomenological Studies, the Roundhouse London
8 p.m. Saturday, July 22nd, 1967 London

Allen Ginsberg, Stokely Carmichael, R.D. Laing and others
'The Dialectics Conference was an attempt to gain a meta-perspective about war and violence using, in particular, the tools and insights of psychoanalysis. The organizers hoped that their ideas would engage and interrelate with the views of the invited scholars, activists and participants at the Conference, and in an informal and non-academic format. To some extent this happened. But many of the discussions followed old patterns and cliches. Our goals were too high. We did not effect significant social change. But many micro social experiments, especially in psychiatry, have continued 50 years after the Dialectics took place.' – Joseph Berke

The congress on the Dialectics of Liberation begins and ends with two words: radical education. Most commentators assume that it was inspired solely by anti-psychiatry. But, in fact, without Joe Berke’s interest in radical education there probably wouldn’t have been a congress in the first place, and without the congress there would not have been a London Antiumniversity.

The purpose of this brief article is to look at what the phrase ‘radical education’ meant in the 1960s, and then to relate that concept to the congress.

The phrase ‘radical education’ was not often defined critically during the 1960s, though its meaning was pretty clear to those in favour of it. Briefly, it denoted a cluster of attitudes, positive as well as negative.

Radical educators were for anarchism or Marxism, for freedom of choice, for young people, for civil rights, for the Cuban Revolution, for avant-garde art, for the free expression of sexuality and for creativity and spontaneity. They were against capitalism, against bureaucracy, against authority, against an over-reliance on technology, against the Bomb, against the war in Vietnam, against grading, and against the established universities which they saw as lacking intellectual and social integrity.

Joe Berke’s involvement with radical education began at medical school in late 1962 or 1963, at the same time as he was writing poetry and hanging around with libertarian mad caps like Tuli Kupferberg and Allen Ginsberg. Like many students in those days, radicalised by injustice and poverty (not their own), he found his teachers (though not all of them) arrogant and authoritarian, and their teachings (though not all of them) either wrongheaded or just plain irrelevant.

His own speciality, psychiatry, was, he claims, taught as if it was a type of natural science, like chemistry or physics, with a labelling system, and with little attention paid to the ‘totality’ of patients’ experiences. Not surprisingly, therefore, he became particularly attracted to ideas coming from outside the higher educational mainstream, which seemed to offer meaningful alternatives.

Two major influences upon him at this time were the anarchist writers Paul Goodman and Alexander Trocchi, though there must have been many others besides, not least young people themselves who were becoming increasingly radical. In 1962, Goodman published a small book which was very influential indeed entitled The Community of Scholars. At the heart of Goodman’s book was the idea that the spread of an ‘administrative mentality’ amongst teachers and students was destroying American higher education, enforcing a ‘false harmony’ which fragmented and paralysed criticism.

This was Berke’s experience too. Good- man’s solution was for scholars and students to simply pack their bags and start their own universities. They had done this very successfully before, he noted, most particularly at Black Mountain College, in North Carolina, in 1933. And they could do it again. ‘[T]hat school lasted nearly twenty-five years and then, like a little magazine, folded. Its spirit survives.’ As for Trocchi, he influenced Berke via his Project Sigma, which consistent with his Situationist International past, was nothing less than an attempt to revolu- tionise contemporary existence. Like Berke, Trocchi was a friend of Laing, enrolling him and David Cooper and nu- merous other supporters in an ‘invisible insurrection of a million minds’, with the object of seizing the ‘grids of expression’, which is to say, the media and the other forms of mental production.

By Martin Levy

‘Invisible Insurrection of a Million Minds’ was the title of his Sigma Portfolio, No.2, of 1964. We know that Berke read that work for soon enough he set himself up as one of Trocchi’s New York representatives, and the two cor- responded and met together in Trocchi’s native Glasgow. At the heart of Trocchi’s manifesto was the call for a ‘spontaneous university’. ‘The cultural possibilities of this movement are immense and the time is ripe,’ he wrote. ‘The world is awfully near the brink of disaster. [...] We should have no difficulty in recognising the spontaneous university as the possible detonator of the invisible insurrection.’

One of the first post-1950s free universi- ties was the Free University of New York (FUNY), and Berke was involved with that too as an organiser and a teacher. There is a letter from him to Laing, written during the spring of 1965, in which he says ‘Am starting university in NY this summer’; as simple as that, with no supplementary explanation, but by which he undoubtedly refers to the founding of FUNY.

There is no questioning FUNY’s educa- tional radicalism. In a manifesto, also of 1965, the authors write of the ‘intellectual bankruptcy and spiritual emptiness of the American educational establishment’ and of its ‘dispassionate and studied dullness’.

‘The Free University of New York is necessary because in our conception, American universities have been reduced to institutions of intellectual servitude. Students have been systematically dehumanised, deemed incompetent to regulate their own lives, sexually, politically and academically. They are treated
like raw material to be processed for the university’s clients – business, government, and military bureaucracies. Teachers, underpaid and constantly subject to investigation and purge, have been relegated to the position of servant-intellectuals, required for regular promotion, to propagate points of view in harmony with the military and industrial leadership of our society.”

FUNY opened in a loft building close to the Lower East Side in early July, offering twenty-five courses, and enrolling two hundred and ten students. As Berke wrote of the congress during the late spring or early summer of 1966, at about the same time as he moved out of Kingsley Hall and into his own flat facing Primrose Hill, a part of London which would thereafter have radical educational and anti-psychiatric associations. One of the first times we hear of it, is in a letter to Allen Ginsberg, in which he mentions the recent foundation of the Institute of Phenomenological Studies (IPS).

This was a curious body. Laing’s son, Adrian, who knew Cooper very well, describes it in the life of his father as a ‘sort of trading name’ for the four founding ‘organisers’ of the congress (and when, on a recent occasion, I mentioned it to Berke, he laughed). It therefore seems not to have had much in the way of a tangible existence.

Nonetheless, Berke’s plan to use Kingsley Hall for his congress during the late spring or early summer of 1966, inviting him to attend the congress, usually unmasked, but sometimes this was particularly evident in the presentations given by the anthropologist Julius Henry and the political scientist John Gerasi (himself a teacher at FUNY), but in fact it pervaded almost all of the congress, usually unmasked, but sometimes in the occluded form of ‘anti-modernity’, of late 1950s and early 1960s universities. Students were treated with contempt by an ignorant and conservative technocratic ‘elite’, who viewed them as ‘raw material to be processed for the university’s clients – business, government, and military bureaucracies’. The very word ‘education’ was banalised. Universities were drained of their ‘intellectual vigour’; ‘exuberance and excitement’ were destroyed. What remained was a ‘dispassionate and studied dullness, a facade of scholarly activity concealing an internal emptiness and cynicism, a dusty-dry search for permissible truth’ which pleased ‘none but the administrator and the ambitious’.

Today, higher education is even more bureaucratised. Students are over-regulated and over-assessed. They are offered degrees, not the benefits of wisdom. Once again, they are to be fitted for an ever more inhospitable workplace. The question therefore arises: Does radical education have anything to say to students today? If it has, it would not be the first time that recent history has thrown up a radical and exciting possibility.

As the flyer for the congress, a joint effort by Berke, Cooper and Redler, puts it in a direct nod to Henry: ‘In total context, culture is against us, education enslaves us, technology kills us. We must confront this. We must destroy our vested illusions as to who, what, where we are. We must combat our pretended ignorance as to what goes on and our consequent non-reaction to what we refuse to know[...]

We shall meet in London on the basis of a wide range of expert knowledge. The dialectics of liberation begin with the clarification of our present condition.’

Violence and liberation from violence were the main topics at the congress, but these too were given a radical educational spin, as speaker after speaker, both from the platform and from the floor, drew their audiences around to the radical educationalists’ New Left agenda. The discussion around Black Power was particularly contentious.

On the more positive side, like FUNY the congress too spilled out into houses and pubs, privileging spontaneity over regimentation, making education relevant and fun, and breaking down costly and unnecessary barriers between teachers and students. As Berke wrote of the event, some months after its completion: ‘The [Roundhouse] was occupied 24+ hours a day for sixteen days by hordes of people meeting, talking, fucking, fighting, flipping, eating and doing nothing, but all trying to find some way to “make it” with each other and together seek ways out of what they saw to be a common predicament – the horrors of contemporary existence.’

Radical education began as a revolt against bureaucracy and the conformity...
DIALECTICS OF LIBERATION

Schedule of Lectures

Sat July 15  3 PM  E.D. Leary: "Mediations between the individual and society"
Mon July 17  10:30 AM  Gregory Bateson: "Patterns, Names, and Transformations"
Tues July 18  10:30 AM  Stokely Carmichael: "Black Power"
Wed July 19  10:30 AM  Jules Henry: "Psychological and Social Preparation for War"
Thurs July 20  10:30 AM  John Gerassi: "Violence and Counterviolence: Dollars and Sense"
Fri July 21  10:30 AM  Paul Sweezy: "The Future of Capitalism"
Mon July 24  10:30 AM  Ernest Mandel: topic to be announced
Tues July 25  10:30 AM  Paul Goodman: "Objective Values"
Wed July 26  10:30 AM  Lucien Goldmann: "Critique et dégénérisme dans la création littéraire" (in French)
Thurs July 27  10:30 AM  Speaker and topic to be announced
Fri July 28  10:30 AM  Herbert Marcuse: "Liberation from the Affluent Society"
Sat July 29  3 PM  David Cooper: "Beyond Words"

Please note that the schedule has been revised. Note also that, as usual, many of the topics are inadequately described by the titles above.

Why have the organizers organized it?
26 January

The antiuniversity of london invites you for an evening at Rivington Street with the whole faculty, on SATURDAY, 3rd FEB. from 7 PM onwards.

Food and drink will be provided, and at 8 o'clock we shall have a general discussion on the antiuniversity.

Hope you can come.

Doris Meibach,
for the antiuniversity.

The faculty, up to today, includes --

Steve Abrams, Bob Cobb, Barry Flanagan
Roy Battersby, David Cooper, Lee Harwood,
Asa Benveniste, John Cowley, Calvin Hernton,
Joe Berkeley, Edward Dorn, C.L.R. James,
Malcolm Caldwell, Steve Dworkin, John Keys,
Cornelius Cardew, Robin Blackburn, Nicholas Krasno,
Noel Cobb, Obi Egbuna, Allan Krebs,
A. Jensen, Ruth First, Bruce Kucklick,
REGISTRATION FORM

Name:

Address:

Telephone:

Courses (insert name of faculty member):

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.

Where required for registration, please supply additional information on a separate sheet.

Make cheques or postal orders payable to the Antiumiversity of London and post with this form to 49 Rivington Street, London EC2.
MEETING OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE OF THE ANTI-UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

4 ST GEORGE'S TERRACE NW1
12 DECEMBER 1967

IN ATTENDANCE: AL KRISH, JOR BERKES, DAVID COOPER, JULIUS MITCHELL,
                  STEPHEN MONTGOMERY, MORRY SCHATZMAN,
                  AUBREY RAYMOND

1. The following were agreed upon at the meeting on December:
   a. The school is to be called THE ANTI-UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
   b. Opening date 12 February 1968
   c. With the permission of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation,
      the school will use premises at 49 Rivington St.
   d. Allen Krebs is organizing secretary
   e. a sec will be hired on a part time basis from the beginning
      of January
   f. the school year will be divided into 4 quarters, each
      lasting about 8 weeks. "Courses", however, may be given biweekly or at
      the mutual convenience of the teacher and school. Courses will, otherwise,
      be weekly and each session last about 25 hours. Courses will be preferably
      given in the evening between Sunday and Friday inclusive. Two sessions
      per evening. Saturday night to be left open for special events. Courses
      may also be given during the day.
   g. It shall be mentioned in the catalogue that the AntiUniversity
      is sponsored by the Institute of Phenomenological Studies.

2. Suggestions for faculty were discussed. Each person to be invited to
   be personally approached. List of teachers divided up as to which
   person of those present will contact the prospective faculty member.
   (list enclosed) Contacts to be made by next meeting, or maximally by
   1 Jan. Prospective members to be asked to give a brief description of themselves
   and current work as well as points to which they will be addressing
   themselves at the school. Faculty to be asked not to give "courses" so much
   as to meet with group of interested people to present and discuss their
   current thoughts, work, etc.

   Final item for publicity amended from £200 to £150.
   Institute agrees to outright loan to au of £350. Institute guarantees
   remainder of budget, contingent upon fund raising drive to raise the rest of the
   money and more. Money to be paid back to the Institute as soon as possible,
   minimally in 4 quarterly amounts each quarter of the year, 4 quarters.

4. Finances - Proceeds from fees, loans gifts, etc to be used as follows.
   For each quarter, administrative expenses to be deducted from the gross amount
   of the remainder, hereby called the 'net' amount, 2/3 to be divided among the
   teachers, 1/3 to go into a contingency fund.
   Fund raising campaign to be initiated.
   Stuart Montgomery speaks on his conversation with representative
   of GEC education authority. Money could possibly be advanced in courses
   to be offered. Unique (not offered elsewhere) and school is a charity.
   Feeling was that this is a poor source for funds.

5. The following UK publications and magazines to be contacted

6. The following UK publications and magazines to be contacted

7. The following UK publications and magazines to be contacted

8. The following UK publications and magazines to be contacted

9. The following UK publications and magazines to be contacted
Dear Paul Goodman,

Stepping from the discussions that took place at the Dialectics of Liberation Congress last summer, members of the Institute, together with others at the Congress, have founded what we call the Antiuniversity of London.

The purpose of the Antiuniversity is to provide a context for the original and radical scholars, artists and activists residing in London, as well as Europe, and America to communicate their work to young people and others outside the usual Institutional channels.

We have a building for the School opening the week of February 12th, 1968. Many of the people who will be "teaching" there, you met at the Congress. We are preparing a catalogue at the moment and I will send you one as soon as it is printed.

The School has been planned so that people who will be "teaching" will not be giving formal courses as much, but will spend an evening (2 or 3 hours) once a week or fortnight discussing their work.

We would be very pleased if you would consider joining the faculty of the School. The distances are very great between you and us, so that, of course, it would be impossible for you to be with us on a regular basis much as we would like it, however, it would be very good if you would reconsider joining the "Visiting Faculty". As a member of which, we would ask you if you were in London or the London vicinity, if you would be willing to spend a few hours meeting with people either formally or informally at the School. Naturally, if you were to be in London for any extended period of time, we would be very glad if you would join us on a regular basis. (All members of the Visiting Faculty will be paid a commensurate fee for their work at the School).
Your expertise in understanding "what is going on in the World" would indeed be a great asset to the School.

The Antuniiversity sees itself as serving, not only the London area but all Western Europe and the United States will be associated with similar centres which are now being initiated in other countries.

All of us here, would be very pleased if you would consider joining the Visiting Faculty and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
MEETING OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE OF THE ANTI-UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

49 RIVINGTON STREET, E.C.2. 8 JANUARY 1968 MONDAY 6:30

IN ATTENDENCE: AK, JHB, SW, MS, JM, AR, & Ana Menveniste, Noel Cobb, Axel Jensen, Peter Upwood, Roberta, Liz, Joan (friend of Noel) and Vivian.

1. Minutes read and accepted.
2. Building - To use as soon as possible. Vietnam Solidarity Committee to be tactfully asked to vacate premises as of Jan 15. New lock to be put on door. Minimal work need be done to fix up building. Structure - basement - one large room to take up to 40 people. Ground floor - reception area for secretary and one large room to be used as lounge - small snack facilities to be installed first floor - 3 small rooms to be converted to one small and one large room by removing a partition. Remaining partition to be altered so as to soundproof the two rooms. Second floor - two moderately large rooms - take 20-25 people.

Furniture - building comes with 13 desks, 37 small chairs, 2 bench chairs, one sofa. A minimum of 25 folding chairs to be purchased. Also extra large chairs, etc. to make the lounge comfortable. Need electric heater - extra for reception and lounge. Other members of the Antiu. to be asked for donations in furniture, rugs etc.

3. Lounge, snack bar, maintenance - Peter Upwood

4. Secretary - to be hired as soon as possible. Hours - 3 to 7PM at Rivington St. M-Fri

5. Publicity - TR - Stuart - small piece already in past issue full page next one

6. Catalogue - Ana Menveniste to print catalogue at cost. To be made up by JHB & AK by next meeting at latest for approval and send to printer, Ana also to do poster

7. Faculty - additional acceptances discussed - Cornelius Cardew - composer, Cedric Price - architect Noel Cobb psychologist Axel Jensen - writer David Mercer - playwright Alan Median - political scientist John Keys - poet (includes some that came in after the meeting)

8. Next meeting - Tuesday, 16 January 9 PM @ 49 Rivington Street E02

Note: price is 10/- without reference.
John Latham: There should never have been an Antiuniversity

Flat Time House, Peckham, June 2, 2003.

Jakob Jakobsen: John, I would like to ask you about a very specific thing in your career as an artist. I saw your name in a prospectus from the Antiuniversity of London.

John Latham: The which?

JJ: The Anti. –

JL: Oh yes! The Antiuniversity. When was this?

JJ: The late sixties, 1968-69

JL: I just remember it. I went there once and I took a piece there which was quite an interesting piece. I left it there and didn’t go back, and I have lost it. But the piece itself was a school demonstration model of life forms under a glass, and I had taken it to them – as it was an antiuniversity – so they would understand, that if one of the life forms was a little trunk of a book, which was burnt, that could also be part of the biological domain. Well, people may have seen it and they may not have, but that’s how it came to be in the place where you found it. But it’s very marginal to me.

JJ: I read in the prospectus that you were meant to dissolve a book in sulphuric acid there?

JL: I didn’t do it there, but I was in St Martins as a part time teacher. I had got there by dint of having seen the Department and being refused. I found an opportunity to talk to the Head of the Painting Department at St Martins, and he was so pleased to be talked to I suppose, that when I said the real problem is that I need a job. ‘Oh, you can have a job’, he said. So that got over the problem of not being able to teach. And I went into St Martins and I taught for about a year, and then I said ‘Freddy, the key to all the new art is that the students should understand time, and I have an understanding of it and I would like to introduce it to St Martins’. And he said ‘Oh, it is too complicated, you would muddle the students’. So he was turning me down on that occasion. And I thought, well that’s very unprofessional of the Head of Department because time and timing is of the greatest importance to any artist, and if they don’t understand the subtleties and the way that time carries dynamics, they will be just like everybody else.

JJ: You had the event with the chewing of the book at St.

JL: Yes, at St Martins.

JJ: At St Martins and...

JL: Yes, it was when I was turned down twice with the time. I presented just a piece of paper, like this [waves a small piece of paper], and the Principal, who I gave it to, took one look at it and said ‘well um’ – and he opened a drawer near the ceiling of a very high room – and slipped it in there. I said ‘Freddy, you are not going to even read it.’ ‘No’, he said ‘it’s lunch time anyway’. And it made me so mad that they should be so uninterested in so vital an idea as I had in my mind, and I thought that this is the vital idea of time and it is very difficult to get across, but to be thrown out and told to be a carpenter... ‘If you were a carpenter we could use you, but no you confuse everybody’. So I had then to organise this – a little jeu d’esprit, it’s been called – this was to take a book out of the library... Barry Flanagan was a student there, and Barry was the one student who did understand what I was talking about. He would meet me in the Pub at lunch time and we would talk over a beer at lunch, and wouldn’t see each other in the School because I was employed in the painting department and he was a budding student in the sculpture department, and it wasn’t the thing for the two departments to have anything to say to each other. And I was trying to say look, the dimensional framework is simply misunderstood. Three dimensions of space is inert and it is purely for the business of measuring up the house, and the bits and pieces that go into the house and for going down the street, and getting round the world. Otherwise it is nothing. It doesn’t show us what is going on, and that was the meat of what I wanted to put into the School. But it also again happened when I invited, Barry and I invited, a number of the members of the College to my place to a party, and the party was called Still and Chew. I knew what was going to happen. And they were presented with a book out of the library by Clement Greenberg called Art and Culture, I had picked it as one of the relevant titles to have them chew up. And they were asked to tear a page off, and chew it and put the residue in a little retort, not a retort, a flask. And the party came to an end. It was a cheerful enough occasion. And I had signed for this book in the library’s register, and it took them six months to tell me that they wanted it back. And it was only then that I was able to get the distillation going, and took it back and presented it in a little phial – I had to even squirt the liquid in there. Anyway I said ‘this is the book’ and the librarian, of course, said ‘well, it if turns up’. And I said ‘it won’t turn up, this is the composition it has now in this phial’, and not being too baffled she just said, ‘Oh well, I don’t know why you students do such daft things, people want to read this book’. And I said, ‘Yes, I was aware that was what they wanted to do, but it won’t do them any good’, and left the room.

And she was left with the phial. And by the post in a couple of – the second post after I had done that, I got a little postcard saying ‘I am sorry, I can’t invite you to do any more teaching’, signed the Head of the School. Well, I lost the job! That was the outcome.

JJ: When did this take place?

JL: The party took place, I think, in 1966. And I took it back in 1967 and got the dismissal in 1967. When all communication between myself and the Head of the – the senior staff had broken down – it wasn’t that we weren’t friends, he just wouldn’t listen to what I had to say. And I had to do something that would be interesting, and not damaging anything. I’ve never damaged anything, but people say that I burn books and am liable to set fire to places, and I have set fire to little monumental towers of books. The arts authorities have taken a very dim view of what I was doing, and have not said honestly to me, ‘look, you should not do this thing’; they have conspired to make sure that I don’t get anywhere where I would need to go. So I have no employment.

JJ: But there must be...

JL: I have gone through all kinds of ways of getting work made, by getting into new situations which are stimulating enough to be able to make something.

JJ: But this whole discussion about knowledge you are engaging in now... you are using books in a very physical way, you are burning books, by pouring sulphuric acid on them and burning them and chewing them. In what perspective is that to be understood? Do you think of this as a way of criticizing the use of books and the use of knowledge?

JL: I was really only concerned with the process. I had checked out how paper reduces to alcohol and sulphuric acid was the way that the lignin in the paper would reduce to sugar, and the sugar would then convert to alcohol. The only reason the acid came into it was that I should be able to get the alcohol from the sugar which resulted from it. It stimulated the students – the story – and I hadn’t contrived the story. It happened, as stories do happen, by chance. Things happen that are unexpected, and they are a lot of fun if they are not very annoying...

But there were certain people who were outraged by the attitude of a person who didn’t treat a book with the greatest respect. And when I first had the idea to do it, I had the same sensation. I was looking for a flat, manageable, surface; the painting period that I had been through had come to an end and was exhausted. I had a piece of wavy material and I wanted to make that flat, as the first thing to do formally. And the book, sitting on the table, was a mysterious apparition to me. It was the right size and it had black marks in lines, and that was the key thing that made me say ‘it’s got to be done’, because the other kind of black marks were done by constellation means from the spray painter, and here is a white sheet which has become a volume and has time in count time. Count time is not the same as musical, rhythmic and sound time, and the idea of time as event was gaining a lot of excitement in my nervous system, if only because it was sensible in art.

JJ: In the way you were using books, the time in a book, in a text... Is that the time you are erasing when you are burning or chewing?

JL: Well, I never... I won’t say never, but there were occasions when I nearly used a new book. But very, very rarely. Mostly, they are junk books thrown away for people just to pick out and put what would be a few pence towards. They’d throw them in the bin and they would be – the ones they thought were better – like 20p, and the others were only 5p. That was a source of my material. What I was looking at was one book fitting into another, indicating a world in which information of great complexity hits another, and the intersection between two worlds. Was as simple as that, it was the relationship in space. The metaphysical space between a book which has been simply put face down and put into plaster, so nobody would ever find it, but it had...
the form of an organic development which had taken many thousand of millions of years to arrive at perhaps. And the thought of the atemporal aspect of a book, not there to read, as an object, was very interesting compared to the act of reading it, and compared to the appearance of a constellation black mark, in relation to a linear black mark which had hieroglyphics going across it. Wonderful. It was simply a fascinating – like Duchamp's objet trouvé. It was just like – there for me to do, without having bothered to have any skill about it at all, it fell together. All these things rolled into there, one thing after another, after another. And this is where we are at the moment, with that piece of construction going through the window, or apparently going through the window.

JJ: I have been interested in this Antiniversity, where you didn’t do much obviously, but I see it linking to the kind of relationship you had with St Martins, and the way you existed there. And at the same time your engagement with books. This group of psychiatrists or anti-psychiatrists...

JL: There was a writer called Alex Trocchi. Alex Trocchi came to my place, invited by a friend, and it wasn’t a very fruitful meeting at all. I wasn’t interested in what he was interested in but he had written a kind of paper called ‘The Insurrection of a Million Minds’, and that he wanted me to join.

JJ: But you worked with Alexander Trocchi on the Sigma project.

JL: Sigma and Jeff Nuttall and myself did join up with the Philadelphia Trust and Ronnie Laing – the far out writer Ronnie Laing, with his Philadelphia Organisation, was it psychotherapy activity?... Alex Trocchi wanted to try and get us together and he had us all turn up in a house that you could hire in the Oxford region – you could hire it for the weekend, so that overnight you could have talks, and be relaxed enough to understand where the one type of activity would overlap with another. But it never happened. And what I did there, if I may tell you, what I did do there... you see it had to be a gesture, of the kind which would be arresting. I had a spray gun there, I had a book, and I had plaster. And in the early morning I made, on the wall of their room, a very large two sided canvas, because pressing paint through the warp and weft of the texture of the canvas made a very interesting comparison, and I went on with it and the piece was preserved and it has been in an exhibition in Stuttgart, and in the Tate I think.

JJ: There is only this one?

JL: Just the one. This is a development from it. Now, I hope I can get this to go... [turns on the Flat Time Roller] And you see if we look at what is going on... in the roller you will see things start to change... and on the sides there are things going on... and the letters at the top are about the same as the letters here [points at Basic TDiagram], and I find that each one is standing for a range of time frequencies. Well, the boundary between one and the next was something like 14 to 15 times what it had been before, and so that with 56 bands I had a very very big expanse of time, which would do for that range, which has got to the minus 23 seconds as the time base of a quantum of action, as I thought of it at the time. Well, it is really the time it takes light to cross the diameter of a classical electron, and an electron doesn’t have that kind of a diameter. Nevertheless they knew that it occupied the space, and you couldn’t tell where its components were. It’s an amazing discovery. Electricity. I don’t understand it myself, but I can say that it establishes a position relative to light, and that was the important starting point of having that kind of spectrum

What are the stars? Of course they know there are planets moving. And that was where the mystery was for the ancients. My black marks are very interesting to the astronomer. Because it’s not about his stellar universe, it’s about a universe that goes on inside his head. Or it goes on independently of the head. We don’t know. Memory may be nowhere near the head. It is picked up by the head and processed, but the information is everywhere. Our business as artists is to roll this thing through a very very badly diseased organism with enormous power to deal with – I am talking about the Bush-type power. George W. Bush knew that he could drop a bomb on that flank if necessary. If the thing is programmed he could come as close as that to obliterate it. And technology is doing that now. The satellites that we have are giving us too much power. And if we get too bumptious and too arrogant altogether outside of... beyond the pale, that’s what will happen. And people are like that anyway.

JJ: So in a way you are criticising knowledge.

JL: Yes definitely, it’s not knowledge you see. Knowledge is served as knowledge; it is not adequately presented. It needs to be converted into Event Structure and what I am calling Flat Time. That is flat – that is a flat thing. [points at Basic TDiagram] And flat time is all there, everything that you need to talk about is mappable, not flat. Know the computer would be able to do it. When it gets into computing one will be able to decide what time boundaries we are going to be able to – we want to look at, and perhaps pick up one from way out and bring that in. Computers are so phenomenal in what they can do. They are being more powerful every day.

JJ: Just to finish and return to the Antiniversity. Do you remember the place 49 Rivington Street?

JL: I barely remember it at all. I remember nobody I did know who went to it and came to my – my lecture, there was only one. I am sure I didn’t give more than one, and I produced this demonstration piece for schools and it was... because it had a book in it, that would introduce them to something which was teaching in the orthodox way that here was the non-orthodox, which was a book which had been burnt. I was trying to get people to understand. What had happened was that we were talking and reflecting, and being intuitive and how we didn’t understand intuition. All those things were developing in my mind and I wanted to – I thought that if people want to go to an antiniversity I don’t mind going in there and seeing whether they are listening, whether there is any use. But I came to the conclusion that I was wasting time as well. Like I kind of got my own act together sufficiently to be able to convey to them what had to be conveyed. And that was perhaps as much my fault as anybody else’s. But it was too difficult a project. They should never had had an Antiniversity.
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It runs contrary to Alexander Trocchi’s notions to connect Project Sigma to him alone, as if it were his personal creation. This contagious attitude is prevalent in our society which grants the ‘cultural worker’ the mantle of ‘privileged producer’ who provides a cynical societal system with some form of conscience, whilst re-inforcing an ‘acquisitive nature’ by being in ‘possession’ of his/her own output. Trocchi and Sigma were not so naive as to overlook this parasitic process; the Sigmatic revolt was to adhere to principles of anonymity and hence subversion. Sigma itself was to avoid ‘clear definition’. This problem of definition has given rise to a misrepresentation of the Sigma stance, at the expense of a clear understanding of the opening sentences of Trocchi’s initial essay.

As soon as it [revolt] is defined it has provoked the measures forits confine ment. (‘A Revolutionary Proposal’, City Lights Journal, No. 2, 1964, p.14)

Trocchi illustrates here an issue that has engrossed revolutionary groups: the question of organization and the difficulty in popularising core theses. Aising from this, the Sigma writings also highlight problems pertaining to the role of intellectuals and artists in any movement for concrete change: the abstract proscription of intellectuals and the danger of elitism in an artistic affirmation of individuality. Nevertheless it is clearly important to associate Trocchi with ideas and tactics fundamentally more far-reaching than the British literary ‘underground’ scene of the 1960s was capable of coping with. In an unpublished essay on the ‘history’ of Sigma, reluctantly written, Trocchi says: ‘various individuals... have judged it to their advantage to break with Sigma and to exploit Sigmatic techniques for immediate personal gain... Almost inevitably, they felt bound to justify their lack of integrity, their obvious tactics were to identify Sigma with myself personally, plug the desperate dope-friend with his head full of bats with vampire proclivities and Bob’s yr uncle.’ (Sigma History, undated manuscript, p.5)

Elsewhere in this manuscript Trocchi, almost writing to himself, says that it would lack integrity to respond to such smears with ‘pitless public exposure’. More saddening that this wrangling is the misfortune of having to talk of Project Sigma in terms of Trocchi the individual rather than as the invisible ‘metacategorical’ revolt of history that Trocchi related it to.

To date the only documentation on Project Sigma comes in the form of Jeff Nuttall’s Bomb Culture; a book that deals largely in terms of personalities whilst avoiding coming to terms with more applicable tactics that would lead to a thorough negation of society. Nuttall reports Trocchi as saying, “What this [Sigma] is all about is a complete rejection of everything outside that door” (Jeff Nuttall, Bomb Culture, Paladin, 1970, p.210)

Throughout his book Project Sigma is distinctly linked to Trocchi the personal. In essence is the fault of Trocchi the junkie. This mood is sketched by Nuttall when he chronicles the meeting at Braziers Park (25 July, 1964), where an expectant panel of sympathisers awaited Trocchi’s inaugural address only to be kept waiting by Trocchi who had miscalculated the quantity of heroin he had taken the previous night. This to Nuttall signifies the beginning of the end. Despite Tom McGrath’s attempts to ‘fill-in’ there seems to be little understanding of the phrase ‘invisible inscription’, and no identification with it as a non-hierarchical statement. In its place was substituted, once more, the philosophy of ‘leaders’. In a lucid passage from his essay, an apt epitaph to this meeting, Trocchi identifies himself as an egotist, extending this identification to all wo/men:

‘What is to be feared is not wo/man’s egotism but the common failure to recognize and accept it. For it must be accepted before it can, at least, in its more vulgar manifestations, be transcended.’ (Sigma History, p.9)

This lack of awareness leads not only to a misunderstanding of Project Sigma but can be applied to revolutionary groups and those who identify with revolution- ary theory: hypocrisy can flourish where unresolved egotism and competitiveness lie. Trocchi: ‘The readiness with which competitive impulses shatter solidarity and render action fragmentary and ineffective is most discouraging.’ (Sigma History, p.10)

It would be counterproductive to attempt to sum up in few words the activity and plans of Project Sigma as piloted by Trocchi. Difficulties arise in actually ascertaining the extent to which some of the minor projects were developed; such knowledge lies in the hands of those who participated and they would be quick to point out that Sigma remained a blueprint. Unfulfilled as it was, Sigma can be seen as the ‘underground’ movement that showed greater potential than most that were operative in Britain in the 1960s. This potential can be partially located in the fact that Trocchi was acquainted with a variety of countercultural movements as well as with individuals working in a similar direction. Sigma’s more populist, non-selective attitude served to increase this potential by means of encouraging a wider breadth of engagement.

This scope shown by Project Sigma is related to its identification of definition as limiting and can be contrasted with some politically motivated groupings who, designating themselves as the ‘elect’ give rise to a disciple-like membership. From the outset Project Sigma was to recognise itself as an exponent of ‘cultural revolt’, an area where self-criticism and ‘free’ thought are given greater room.

‘So the cultural revolt must seize the grids of expression and the powerhouses of the mind. Intelligence must become more self-conscious, realise its own power, and, on a global scale, transcending functions that are no longer appropri- ate, dare to exercise it. History will not overthrow national governments; it will outflank them. The cultural revolt is the necessary underpinning, the passionate substrata of a new order of things.’ (‘A Revolutionary Proposal’, City Lights Journal, No. 2, 1964, p.15)

I am in danger here of separating cultural from political revolt, when for our times the development of a global and psychologically repressive capital has meant that combinatory endeavours are crucial. The cultural revolt that Sigma adapts itself to can be identified as being based in a broader criticism of society, one that takes into account subjective tendencies and conditions of living, finding primary orientation in a ‘critique of everyday life’ and the drive towards autonomy and self-responsibility.

For Trocchi and Project Sigma the danger of a purely political revolt lies in the restrictive coming to grips ‘with the prevailing level of the political process’, an occurrence that hinders the pursuit of Sigma’s intended ‘coup de monde’ becoming caught up as it would in a more traditional ‘coup d’état’. Political revolt also suggests a number of anachronisms. Not least the view, in many ‘Marxist’ circles, that revolt must seize certain key positions under the illusion that ‘power’ is located centrally therein. Trocchi...

‘We are sure of our own power as something which is to be realised, not seized... in ourselves... now...’ (‘General Informations Service’, Sigma Portfolio, No. 5, 1964, p.8)

Trocchi rejects the confrontational tactics of ‘clasical’ theory in favour of more realistic methods in tune with contemporaneous developments that see a relocation of the ‘terrain of struggle’ away from the dominant ‘workerist’ base into society as a whole. The Sigmatic revolt was to be an ubiquitous ‘outflanking’ that would make wo/men themselves conscious of their conditions, eventually undermining the effectiveness of the institutions that have ossified around them. ‘Men make their history themselves’, quotes Trocchi, but he bypasses Marx and Engels whose adherents have since shown their intention to preserve ‘inherited’ structures. Trocchi: ‘If you want to change things, to alter radically the relationship between wo/man and wo/man, between wo/men and society, you go a very strange way about it if you proceed in such a way that, directly or indirectly, you reaffirm the validity for now of institutions which are the effective substrata of the status quo.’ (‘General Informations Service’, Sigma Portfolio, No. 5, p.2)

An attitude such as this is not concerned with preparing for power, instead Trocchi’s invisible insurrection aimed towards activating a collective involvement that would dissolve the circuitry of power, superceding present alienation by encouraging wo/men to ‘become responsible for their own biographies’. Trocchi saw such a task as incompatible with the outlawed practices of the ‘left’ political parties and splinter groups whose awareness of differ-
In order to generate enthusiasm and outline basic themes an ongoing series of works was issued under the title Sigma Portfolio (S.P.). Trocchi’s initial essays, ‘The Invisible Insurrection...’ and ‘Tactical Blueprint’, appeared as S.P.2 and S.P.3 respectively and have often been printed together, identifiable as they are by the South Bank Winter Garden typographical bravura of the basic attitude underlying the whole Sigma experiment.

Trocchi’s other contributions to the Portfolio include S.P.5: ‘General Information Service’, a further outlining of situation and tactics; S.P.4: ‘Potlatch’, an attempt to set up a non-elitist inter-personal log that would collect ‘an international underground body of opinion beyond conventional limits.’ (Potlatch, S.P.4, 1964, p.1)

The Lettrist International, of which Trocchi was a member, issued an information bulletin of the same name from 1954-57. The Sigma ‘Potlatch’ perhaps can be taken together with S.P.1: ‘The Moving Times’, a broadsheet/poster featuring the writing of William Burroughs and issued in Tangiers. ‘The Moving Times’ were displayed in underground stations but rejected as it was by London Transport, it was mainly hypostated in galleries and cafes. Both ‘Potlatch’ and ‘The Moving Times’ can be seen as lending practical weight to Trocchi’s polemic against publishing, which he sees as soliciting only conditioned responses as opposed to the ‘vital flow of informations’ predicted for both ‘The Moving Times’ and ‘Potlatch’ whose ingredients would encourage greater engagement with their content as well as being free of the censorship of publishers. Sigma was to acquire its own printing-press to increase the issuing of Portfolio and the ‘poster-perversions’ of ‘The Moving Times’ and, linked to this, Trocchi stressed the need for a ‘supply of important informations previously withheld from the public’.

Trocchi’s other contribution to the Portfolio is ‘Manifsto Situationiste’, S.P.18, has own development of a tract issued by the Situationist International (1957-72). Trocchi was a member of this group until he withdrew in the early 1960s. In 1958 they issued the following statement on the Construction of Situations:

‘The situation is thus made to be lived by its constructors. The role played by a passive or bit-part playing “public” must constantly diminish, while that played by those who cannot be called actors, but rather, in a new sense of the term “livers” must constantly increase.’ (Preliminary Problems in Constructing a Situation, Situationist International Anthology, Bureau of Public Secrets, 1981, p.43)

Trocchi makes this tactic malleable by connecting it to a foreseen rise in automation. This technological ‘innovation’ if correctly harnessed could, Trocchi believed, emancipate people from the necessity of production, heralding a re-definition of work and the release of what he calls ‘Play Value’.

‘Thus freed of all economic responsibilities, wo/man will have at his/her disposal a new plus value, incalculable in monetary terms, a plus value not computable according to the amount of salaried work... PLAY VALUE. What is becoming is “Homo Lutum” a life liberally constructed.’ (Manifesto Situationiste, Sigma Portfolio, No. 18, 1964, p.2)

For Trocchi the construction of situations is tantamount to a ‘serious game’ that would ‘raise the whole tenor of daily living beyond the level of stock responses’ (Manifesto Situationiste), p.3, with situation-making as a context from which to gain an awareness of our social and psychic conditions. This ties in with Project Sigma being a promoter of ‘play’, urging others to be alive to the dangers of a ‘leisure-time’ that is coerced as ‘work-time’. It is the idea of play being able to create a tension between what is and what is possible that attracts Trocchi and Sigma, play and experimentation being a viable means from which to work on ‘solutions’ to manifold oppression independent of the ‘conventional economic framework’. A society that knew how to play would give rise to an idea of life as a journey of discovery, with individuals being able to take control over their own lives.

The Situationists, one of a number of post-war ‘experimental’ groupings, carried out their activities from a similar footing believing that life should be lived and ‘frozen thought’ suppressed. Their relevance to Trocchi and Sigma lies in normal recognition of desired ‘ends’ with many instances of overlapping ‘means’, not least of which being the “meta-categorical” approach. (We cannot discuss the theories of the Situationist International here as this would entail the introduction of a variety of individuals who, like Trocchi, were at one time connected to it. Simply ‘defined’ the SI could be seen as the convergence of ‘avant-garde’ practice with the post-war-reanalysis of Marxist theory). In Trocchi’s Manifesto Situationiste he recognises the need for a revolutionary solution to ‘our infinitely complex age of crises’, taking up the ‘avant-garde’s’ citing of the need for a collective concrete creativity involving the realisation of poetry in a poetry of arts. Dutch painter Constant, involved with the Cobra group and the SI, states in the magazine Be-rc...

...’artistic creation finds itself at war with the existing culture, while simultaneously announcing a future culture. With this dual aspect, art has a revolutionary role in society.’

Trocchi’s ‘cultural revolt’ does not correspond to a creativity that is stultified by a ‘civilisation’ caught between life and art’, but to a revitalised, direct and collective art that informs life. Thus Trocchi adds:

‘Alongside the art of the individual, sigmatic culture would inspire the art of dialogue, the art of interaction.’ (Manifesto Situationiste, S.P.18, p.4)

This revitalisation of art implies a move into realms previously foreshadowed by ‘Marxist’ reliance on the ‘political’ and the pursuit of ‘power’; now the urban, the environmental, the biological, the sexual spheres all react to broaden the goals and illustrate the depth of understanding needed to effect any successful change. The American poet Michael McClure contributed an essay entitled ‘Revolt’ to the Portfolio S.P.21, arguing here that revolt is a biological necessity:

‘Revolt happens when the mind and body and almost voiceless tiny cries of the tissues rebel against the overlay of unnaturals frozen into the nervous system.’ (McClure, ‘Revolt’, Sigma Portfolio, No. 21, 1964, p.3)

Here revolt is not primarily linked to economic conditions and this divergence makes it clear that the predominance of any single issue over others must militate the attempts to alter the structures of society. In turn Trocchi draws our attention to urbanism, criticised as a purely functional ‘art-form’ geared towards reinforcing conventional attitudes and behaviour. The SI, the Lettrist International, COBRA and the International Movement for an Imaginist Bauhaus all worked at one time or another with architectural ideas; the SI calling for the building of a city that would attract dissidents of all countries. Trocchi’s links with the continent would correspond to the inspiration for Sigma’s plans to work in a similar direction; the Portfolio contains an outline of a collaboration between Joan Littlewood and Cedric Price for a ‘consciously constructed environment’. S.P.11, as well as details of Cedric Price’s Fun City Project, featuring as S.P.31. Elsewhere Trocchi sees his Sigma Centre as providing space for spontaneous architecture.

As can perhaps be gathered it was Trocchi and Project Sigma’s intention to realise a whole range of projects that could have made a dramatic effect upon the political and cultural life of western nations. This grandiose claim can be substantiated if we consider the prevailing mood of 1960s agitation as one of ‘positive utopia’. The character of the May events in Paris testifies to this. Here the movement towards collective learning, ‘self-management’ and overt participation demonstrate again Sigma’s position within a far more combative current. It shares with the Paris insurrection a pressing need for change; Trocchi repeatedly refers to ‘getting Sigma as part of the ‘vanguard’, at least by virtue of its theory, was uncompromising in its rejection of ‘alien society’ and astute in its recognition of official opposition as subsumed. For Sigma there can be no limits to the processes of change and development as long as there remains outlets for a variety of criticisms and in this respect Sigma echoes the desire for a truly human activity to be made possible beyond the boundaries of a reified reality truly human activity to be made possible beyond the boundaries of a reified reality placed people in direct conflict to the prevailing mode of organisation links up with the revolutionary drive towards concerted action as represented by ‘wage-workers.’ The ‘avant-garde’ concern over the division between ‘art’ and ‘life’, culture and ‘politics’ leads it to adopt the same aims of the overcoming of social separation.

‘Sigma is a word referring to something which is quite independent of myself or of any other individual, and if we are correct in our historical analysis, we must regard it as having begun a long time ago.’ (General Informations Service, Sigma Portfolio, No. 5, 1964, p.1)

The choice of the word ‘sigma,’ a mathematical symbol denoting ‘all’ or ‘the sum of’ emphasises the Sigma attitude: the word’s ambivalence and intriguing qualities make it unidentifiable with staid responses, complimentarily binding it to an anonymous movement that was to hopefully ‘snowball’ and progress through participation.

The most immediate tactic employed by Project Sigma was the creation of an ‘International Index’—later referred to as ‘pool cosmonaut’, a phrase resulting from Trocchi’s description of himself as a ‘cosmonaut of inner space.’ The International Index was to serve as a tool to ‘unite mind with mind’, a means of channeling the dispersed energy of individuals into a reservoir of ‘talent’ and cognitive power that would fuel the insurrection that Sigma was attempting to instigate and nurture.

‘It is the fact of the existence of this international pool of talent and its evident availability here and now that is the ground of our cautious optimism.’ (Sigma History, undated manuscript, p.3)
started before it’s tragically too late’, and his own urgency is communicated by his marque for radical social change plans that appear to develop from one another in rapid succession. One such plan, that unfortunately did not reach fruition in a Sigma guise, was the formation of a Sigma Centre or Spontaneous University, ‘a non-specialised experimental and creative workshop’. The Sigma Centre was to be characteristically multi-focal:

‘A place, then, in London, to be found in the immediate future. From the beginning we shall regard it as our living-gallery-auditorium-haunt of a situation where conferences and encounters can be undertaken, contact with the city made, and where some of our techniques, found objects, futurics and publications can be exhibited, it will be our window on the metropolis, a kind of general operations base for the whole project.’ (General Informations Service, Sigma Portfolio, No. 5, 1964, p.4)

The Sigma Centre was to be an instrument of the ‘cultural revolt’. Other forms of taking root in other countries close to capital cities so as to exact a stronger influence by becoming focal-points of contestation. In his ‘Invisible Insurrection...’ Trocchi sees the Sigma Centre as developing more in relation to medieval universities where intellectual elusiveness and innovation were encouraged, rather than to the universities of the day where a narrow view of learning is in operation. Trocchi:

‘The universities have become factories for the production of degree technicians.’ (Tactical Blueprint, City Lights Journal, No. 2, 1964, p.31)

It is worthwhile to note one or two of Trocchi’s criticisms here: today’s universities are inextricably linked to the socio-political system that finances them. This system’s view of itself as complete removes any trace of critical process from learning. This lack of critical process reinforces the dominant social relations. One such characteristic invested in by these social-relations is the ‘competitive impulse’ and Trocchi sees this as encouraging students to be ‘clever tacticians’ and hence perpetuating the domination of appearances.

In retaliation the Sigma Centres were to initiate a ‘community-as-art-of-living’ rejecting any academic encumbrances such as increases in staff and buildings in favour of the revitalisation of learning as a continual process of interaction between individuals. A fixed curriculum would be replaced by a loose ‘form’ arising out of the ‘spontaneous generation of the group situation’, where the sense of community that arises is as much a part of any intended educative aim. It was hoped that the dissolution of hierarchy by communalism would encourage a critical intelligence rather than sublimation and operation with ‘ulterior motives’ in mind. This implies that the university established by Sigma would take on a ‘laboratory’ function where:

‘conventional assumptions about reality and the constraints which they imply are no longer in operation.’ (Tactical Blueprint, p.35)

Contrary to many endeavours of this kind Trocchi and Sigma did not underestimate the influence of social-relations upon would-be participants, viewing it as imperative that these relations be combat before any future developments could take place:

‘Within our hypothetical context many traditional historical problems will be recognised as artificial and contingent; simultaneously we shall realise our ability to outflank them by a new approach.’ (Tactical Blueprint, p.34)

Following on from this Sigma was to encourage people to ‘discover what they themselves are about’, an acknowledgement of widespread ignorance existing beneath a sheen of technical sophistication. Trocchi:

‘We must do anything to attack the enemy at his base, within ourselves.’ (Pot-latch, Sigma Portfolio, No. 4, 1964, p.4)

It is individuals, conditioned to respond and think in certain unquestioning ways that Sigma must reach. This is not to suggest that those working for Sigma were paragons radiating true consciousness; the meeting in Braziers Park illustrates an egotism in nucleus members surely generated by competitive impulses. R.D. Laing in his Sigma Portfolio contribution, ‘The Present Situation’, S.6, draws attention to his domination of social relations over the activities of wo/man citing Heidegger’s phrase ‘the worst has already happened’ to illustrate the alienation and separation within society and the psychoanalytic tendency to exacerbate this condition through objectification of the ‘human subject’. Laing’s work with the Philadelphia Association and his attempt to establish a Therapeutic University for schizophrenics was greeted with enthusiasm from Trocchi, who also profers the notion of individuals as being prevented from an understanding of themselves by the very networks they are dependent upon.

The Sigma Centre, then, was to have been as much an experiment in community and personal interaction as an anti-university. Michael de Freitas (Michael X) himself involved in Sigma, mentions in his autobiography the intention for Sigma ‘members’ to live in the Sigma Centre with their families. The Black Mountain College experiment (1933-52), acknowledged by Trocchi as an antecedent, was founded upon similar lines. A valuable comparison between the two was provided by the poet Robert Creeley, himself a teacher/practitioner at Black Mountain, whose essay ‘An American Sense’ was number 26 in the Portfolio. This piece is largely concerned with the American peculiarities of the late 1950s, but draws wider conclusions than its subject suggests. Within his essay Creeley rallies against the insinuation with which critics attack predominant importance to form, subjugating content to fixed patterns in a manner suggestive of a fear of possibilites. This mode of literary criticism corresponds to the denial of experience, which is institutionalised in all sectors of society. Creeley includes the following from fellow poet Charles Olson:

‘We are still in the business of finding out how all action and thought have to be refounded.’

The fossilisation of meaning and relationship reacted against here find similar expression throughout the Portfolio. A further reason for Trocchi’s ‘tentative optimism’ stems from just this incidence of cultural groupings having an ‘instant social value’. We have already mentioned the Lettrist and Situationist Internationals, others mentioned by Trocchi include Bertolt Brecht’s theatre experiments and the Semantic City at Canisy in France. Still following the same theme it is interesting to note that Sigma Portfolio number 28, was a printed circular from the Castalia Foundation, a group involving Timothy Leary. In an unpublished diagram that outlines possible outlets for Project Sigma, Trocchi makes reference to several British-based groupings that could feed into ‘Pool Centre’. One of these was instigated by Jon Littlewood (see above) whose ‘Leisuredome’, as Trocchi calls it, relates to Sigma’s attaching importance to ambiance and environmental possibilities:

‘We can take care that the structural features of our Sigma Centre are geared toward and inspiring of the future as we imagine it.’ (Tactical Blueprint, p.35)

The aforementioned Therapeutic University was another such scheme that would provide ‘talent and goodwill’ to the Sigma Project. Trocchi was particularly keen to give an outlet to the views of anti-psychiatry within the project, partly for reasons of their approach to society: an angle with roots firmly latched onto beliefs in the ‘interiorisation’ of capitalist social relations.

Trocchi’s further intention to campaign for a liberalisation of the drug-laws and to take steps towards redressing the hysteria that surrounds their use found support in anti-psychiatric circles with qualified doctors prepared to lend their discoveries to such a campaign. A letter, ‘HM Government and the Psychiatric’ was to be sent to Jennie Lee MP, and a book, Drugs and the Creative Process, involving William Burroughs, R.D. Laing and Trocchi was to have been published by Heine-Moulder. This does not, of course, mean that Sigma Centres are geared to political and social impact. However, a group with such a list of achievements and a range of shared aims could feed into ‘Pool Cosmonaut’. One such plan, that started before it’s tragically too late’,...
The Mental Furniture

antihistory.
piece left on university
The schools and universities are dead. They must be destroyed and rebuilt in our own terms. These sentiments reflect the growing belief of students and teachers all over Europe and the United States as they strip aside the academic pretensions from their 'institutions of higher learning' and see them for what they are — rigid, training schools for the operation and expansion of reactionary government, business, and military bureaucracies.

To action. Students and teachers have begun to found their own schools and universities. These known as FREE UNIVERSITIES, ANTI-UNIVERSITIES, CRITICAL UNIVERSITIES. All have begun within the past three years and have taken root in the United States (over 12), Canada, New Zealand, Germany, Italy (over 4), Holland, Yugoslavia, England, Spain, and Denmark. They criticise all existing social practices and institutions in their home countries, as well as the West, and for that matter, the entire world. They are a home for an ever increasing 'underground' of radicals and originals thinkers, activists, and artists.

These FREE UNIVERSITIES express the militant refusal of young people throughout the West to accept the destructive values and dogmas that are passed off as education. The FREE UNIVERSITIES are the vanguard of a large scale political resistance which in the West takes the form of CULTURAL GUERRILLA WARFARE.

Most recently the ANTI-UNIVERSITY OF LONDON has been founded. In operation for four months, it has over 300 members, including 50 faculty. Meetings take place in a rented four storey building in a working class district of London.

The faculty includes many of those who attended the Cultural Congress of Havana in January; David Cooper speaks on 'Psychology and Politics' — how to study events in both individual and social terms. David Hurter relates 'The Role of Drama in Questioning and Destroying Moribund Social Values'. Robin Blackburn (with Nicholas Krasno) give a course on the 'Sociology of Revolution' — in essence, dealing with the Cuban experience.
Others include Allen Freb on 'World Revolution', Russ Stetler on
'Socialism in Asia', Leon Redler on the 'Psychology of the Family',
Juliet Mitchell on 'The Role of Women in Capitalist Society',
Cornelius Cardew on 'Experimental Music', Francis Bacon on 'Dragons',
and myself on the 'Theory and Practice of Anti-Institutions' —
including Free Universities, communes, anti-hospitals, and 'under-
ground' communications media.

Although most anything can and is discussed at the ANTHUNIVERSITY,
we give particular emphasis to material which could not otherwise
have a public forum for either political or academic reasons.
Moreover, we seek to demonstrate to young people the nature of class
struggle and social conflict in their own terms. For example, in
London, at present, this involves discussions about how and why the
authorities suppress many of the activities which antagonize
souls of people, anything from psychoactive drugs to
'underground' communications media to demonstrations of solidarity
with the heroic National Liberation Front of Vietnam.

At the ANTHUNIVERSITY we pay a lot of attention to the social structure
of the place. We try to be a mirror image of the fossilized institutions which we are attempting to replace. This is no easy
matter. Fortunately, as the ANTHUNIVERSITY has developed, many of the
students have begun to play an active part in keeping things running,
often they give seminars or lead discussions and arrange for special
events. These take place on Saturday evenings and are open to non-
members of the ANTHUNIVERSITY as well. Among such events have been
poetry readings; a discussion of Black Power led by Obi Egbuna, leader
of the United Coloured Peoples' Association, and himself a member of the
faculty; a lecture by William Burroughs; and a meeting with students from
the Critical University of Berlin, Germany.

A very exciting aspect of what happens at the ANTHUNIVERSITY is that
people from all parts of the world who happen to be in London are con-
stantly coming in to hold discussions, meetings which may last for an
hour or extend over several days. Some of those who have agreed to meet with
members of the ANTHUNIVERSITY when they are in London are part of our
visiting faculty and include Stakely Carmichael, American revolutionary
leader; C.L.R. James, distinguished historian and philosopher;
Hans Eversberger, German poet and writer; Allen Ginsberg, who is
currently helping to organize a new political party of the youth
in the United States called the 'Tippie's'; and Paul Sweezy, economist and
editor of the Monthly Review.
In London the ANTIUNIVERSITY is the only university which students can attend without having first gone through the reified, class-orientated British exam system. (Relevant to this is the fact that in England only 5% of the population ever attends university, while 7% is admitted to mental hospitals.)

The ANTIUNIVERSITY is the only place in the world where people can learn about the new work in ANTI-Psychiatry based on humanitarian and Marxist principles, including the non-treatment of schizophrenia.

The ANTIUNIVERSITY has become an important meeting ground for members of the 'New Left' from all areas of the world.

In just four months the ANTIUNIVERSITY OF LONDON has become a centre of revolutionary activity for all of Western Europe. What is discussed, planned, or put into practice, whether of political, cultural, or academic nature, has begun to resound from many quarters.

We do not relax. We have seen the need to link arms with kindred groups not only in the West, but particularly in and of the 'third world', and especially CUBA. We have begun to do so.

In this spirit the ANTIUNIVERSITY welcomes visitors from CUBA to come around and meet with us. We welcome you to send us your magazines and books. We welcome news of all revolutionary activities, in CUBA and everywhere. We, in turn, would be glad to send you news of our work. (WRITE, THE ANTIUNIVERSITY OF LONDON, 49 Evington St., London E.C.2.) We promise to continue and expand what we have begun, and in the spirit of CUBA. Venceremos.
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Free University of Love

At its first faculty meeting on River Street, the Anti-University got on its feet. William, who, with father, painters, sculptors, publishers, novelists, psychoanalysts, teachers, and local people, was charged with the design and construction of the building, was the leader in this undertaking. The whole atmosphere was highly charged with the excitement of the occasion. A discussion of procedural methods was begun, and it was decided what the anti-university would be.

The faculty met, and the discussion opened. The first item on the agenda was the question of the anti-university's name. After some discussion, it was decided that theAnti-University should be called the Free University of Love. The meeting adjourned, and the faculty went home to plan the next meeting.

The Free University of Love was founded on the principle of freedom and love. Its purpose was to provide a place for people to come together and share their knowledge and ideas. The Free University of Love was a community of scholars, artists, and thinkers who were committed to the ideals of freedom and love. The Free University of Love was open to all, regardless of race, religion, or social status. The Free University of Love was a place where people could come together to learn, grow, and create. The Free University of Love was a place where people could be themselves and express their ideas. The Free University of Love was a place where people could find beauty and meaning in the world around them. The Free University of Love was a place where people could find hope and inspiration for the future.
Joseph Berke: Thinking Without Practice Is Useless – It’s Destructive

Highgate, North London
February 27 – May 5, 2012

Jakob Jakobsen: I would like to ask a little bit about your life in New York in the early sixties. I read somewhere that you were a psychiatrist and a poet in New York in 1964. Maybe you could introduce who Joseph Berke was in 1964?

Joseph Berke: I was trying to find out who Joseph Berke was. I’m still trying to find out who he is. I’m coming closer. But then, I was trained as a doctor, and I lived on the Lower East Side of New York, Manhattan. It was a very exciting time to be there, with a lot of writers and artists and people, on the Lower East Side of New York. So, for example, I was the neighbour of Allen Ginsberg, and we’d read poetry together in the Metro Cafe on 10th Street and 2nd Avenue. I was also for a while a doctor-in-residence at the Metro Cafe. So when anybody was sick, or had an infection, or was worried about something, they’d consult me in the back room of the cafe. And I remember helping one person who had some illness, or giving them some penicillin. I got paid for this with two bags of grass, marijuana. So the time of smoking dope, taking acid, was going on, and so forth, like that.

JJ: Where were you educated as a doctor?
JB: I was educated at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in the Bronx in New York. So I eventually moved down from the Bronx, which is upper New York, into Lower Manhattan. First I had a small apartment on 27th Street. It was horrible. I had to walk up five flights of stairs, and there were cockroaches everywhere, you know? I would come in, and it was three rooms: a bedroom, a living room and a kitchen, and the bathtub was in the kitchen, and cockroaches were all over the kitchen.

JJ: But how come you, as a doctor, got in touch with the more cultural scene, the Beatniks and so forth? I guess you as a doctor were meant to work within science.
JB: I was always interested in social issues. So I organised a General Strike for Peace in New York in 1963. Marched from the upper Bronx to Lincoln Center, which is the centre in Manhattan. I think it’s about 10 miles. I walked all the way, in my white robe, my stethoscope, everything like that. I was interested in social issues, and that’s how you get to meet people who are also interested in social issues. This was organised with Julian Beck, from the Living Theater. So I got to meet people, like Carolee Schneeman, who’s a great artist, who’s still a great performing artist. And lots of poets and writers. My buddy in New York was also Calvin Herndon. Calvin was a sociologist and a poet, a great poet. He wrote a book called Sex and Racism in America. He originally came from southern America, Nashville, TN, I think. We would hang out in the Metro Cafe or bars around Avenue A, Avenue B. Tompkins Square Park is where there was a lot happening.

JJ: And could you tell a little about what made you interested in education, and eventually made you involved in setting up the Free University of New York?
JB: Well, I’m very well-educated. [laughs] I went to university, I went to Columbia College, from Columbia College I went to medical school. And I found that, technically, the education was brilliant, but they really bypassed social issues, and things which I wanted to learn about the world. So it was because of that that I teamed up with other people, or other people teamed up with me, and we first started the Free University of New York. I think it was in a loft on 4th Street. So, various issues about sexuality, racism, politics, economics, philosophy, seemed relevant. Also, the context of this was the Vietnam War. I was a conscientious objector in the Vietnam War. And by the time I came here I had to do alternative service. I was drafted. So I did alternative service at Kingsley Hall in London, which is the community which Laing established. That was accepted. I was at Kingsley Hall for two years. Well, more than that, but after two years, I finished my conscientious objector’s service, and I applied for veterans’ benefits, and they told me to piss off.

JJ: [laughs]
JB: And I was angry about that, since Kingsley Hall was like a battleground anyway, at least as hard as being in Vietnam.

JJ: Just to return to the Free University of New York – Allen and Sharon Krebs, Jim Mellem, James Weinstein, Staughton Lynd, Gerald Lang, and you were in the committee. Can you describe this founding committee, or the people, if you remember them?
JB: I remember Allen and Sharon very well, and they were deeply committed people politically. Very left-wing, very angry over the Establishment. Sharon had a moment of fame during the 1968 Presidential convention in Chicago, when she entered into the convention hall naked, carrying the head of a pig on a plate. That stirred up things no end. She was very pretty too. Eventually Allen came to Kingsley Hall and lived in Kingsley Hall for quite a while.

JJ: Where did you meet, or, this group, how was it brought together? Was it people from the political scene, or the cultural scene, or...?
JB: It was a mixture. I mean, the political and the cultural scene mixed together. As I said, at that time, we were all Marxists, and wanted to change the system, and we were also scared about nuclear war. So that added an element to the whole thing.

JJ: But how did the University work?
JB: Well, we advertised locally. We put around leaflets everywhere, and we had courses in black culture, in racism, in sex in America, in America as a kind of capitalist bastion, on American militari-ism, and so forth. And then we would advertise, put posters everywhere, and people would come. And we had a loft, and then we had rooms, so it lasted for a while. The main inspiration was Allen and Sharon Krebs. And they were passionately against the war in Vietnam, and passionately against the capitalist system. And passionately against oppression and racism. That was part of the founding ethos of it.

JJ: I’m also thinking of the implications of setting up an institution like a university in New York at that time. Was it quite a significant step, in a way, to make a counter-institution like that? I’m just thinking, was it in terms of Black Mountain College, or Paul Goodman? What kind of inspirations fed into your taking part in forming this institution?
JB: I wasn’t too aware of Black Mountain College at the time. There was a place called Bard College, and other places which were more... more well-organised, really, than we were. I think we launched – FUNKY lasted – several years. And then it probably collapsed once Allen and Sharon came to Europe. They were the people who held it together. Some of the leading poets were there, and artists. It was also a place where people could meet, and exchange ideas, and hang out. The universities, the regular universities, were kind of very constricted and constrict- ing. And here we were just trying to open things up, opening a place to have a dis- cussion about what was relevant to us.

JJ: What kind of values were embedded in the Free University?
JB: Open enquiry, radical thinking, being able to experiment with ideas – stuff like that.

JJ: The kind of community... I read some- where, that more than 200 people signed up in the beginning. How was a day at the Free University? Could you describe the kind of dy- namic, social dynamics, as far as you remember, of course.

JB: You know, all those things are... you know, you have a place, you meet, you have coffee, you go out afterwards, then you go to a poetry reading, or go to a bar. The whole place, you know, it wasn’t just one place, it was like the whole scene around there. So it was a whole general- ised area that was taken over by discus- sions, and a lot of creative people. You could consider the Metro Cafe as an extension of the Free University. The Metro Cafe had two readings every week. One on Monday, I think, and one on Thursday, or Wednesday, I forgot. Anyone who wanted to read poetry could read any poem that he wanted. Some were invited to read their poetry specifically, like Susan Sherman and Diane Markowski, Allen Ginsberg, Gregory Corso, Calvin Herndon, the whole people there. These were very important poets, and still are. Not just run-of-the-mill people spouting out their words, these were very well-known people too. So that was great. And my great wish was to be able to be invited to read poetry there, though I never quite made it. There were several journals published. One was called The Metro Cafe and the oth- er was called Fuck You: a journal of the Arts.

That was a very important magazine for several years. Published by Tuli Kupferberg who lived across the street from me. A storefront. I always wanted to get published in Fuck You. A lot of libraries wouldn’t carry it because at the time it was considered too scurrilous, or too outra- geous a title to even have catalogued. So we were trying to be outrageous and dif- ferent. This is the tailend of the sixties, but you know, what came before it was an extremely oppressive atmosphere in America. That is what we were trying to confront, and overcome.

JJ: After you left, do you know how long the Free University kept running?
JB: I think it sort of broke apart when Allen and Sharon came to England. That happened after the Chicago Convention, 1968. Beatniks were early sixties, hippies were late sixties. And that was when Jerry Rubin and Abby Hoffman and others were doing their thing at the Chicago Convention. And there was also the Berkeley Free U. So all these things coalesced around the same time, and then split apart.

JJ: Then you went on to London, as you de- scribed, and you went to Kingsley Hall. What did you know about Kingsley Hall from when you were in the States?
BLACK POWER

A Letter from Prison to my Black Brothers and Sisters

UPON ARRIVAL. February 22, 1968.

Being a man is the quintessence of one's life; one loses a bit of manhood with every stale compromise to the authority of any power in which one does not believe. No slave should die a natural death. There is a point where caution ends and cowardice begins. Every day I am in prison I will refuse both food and water.

My hunger is for the liberation of my people; my thirst is for the ending of oppression. I am a political prisoner, jailed for my belief that black people must be free. The government has taken a position true to its fascist nature. Those who they cannot convert, they must silence. This government has become the enemy of mankind.

Death can no longer alter our path to freedom. For our people, death has been the only known exit from slavery and oppression. We must open others. Our will to live must no longer supersede our will to fight, for our fighting will determine if our race shall live.

To desire freedom is not enough. We must move from resistance to aggression, from revolt to revolution. For every black death, there must be ten dead racist cops. For every Max Stanford and Huey Newton, there must be ten Detroit. And for every Orangeburg, there must be a Danbilephu.

Brothers and Sisters, and all oppressed people, we must prepare ourselves both mentally and physically, for the major confrontation is yet to come. We must fight! It is the people who, in the final analysis, make and determine history, not leaders or systems. The laws to govern us must be made by us.

May the deaths of '68 signal the beginning of the end of this country. I do what I must out of love for my people. My will is to fight; resistance is not enough. Aggression is the order of the day.

Note to America:

America: If it takes my death to organize my people to revolt against you and to organize your jails to revolt against you, and to organize your troops to revolt against you, and to organize your children, your god, your poor, your country, and to organize mankind to rejoice in your destruction and ruin, then here is my life.

BUT MY SOUL BELONGS TO MY PEOPLE!

LASHLE TUSHINDE KALASHAKA!
WE SHALL CONQUER WITHOUT BEAUTY

- Rap Brown.

Antiuniversity Forum on BLACK POWER Saturday, March 23, 7:30 p.m.
Speakers include David Cooper, Obi Egbuna, Allen Krebs, Leon Kedler, Bro. Young.
Admission free to members of the Antiuniversity community.
JB: Oh, Kingsley Hall had just started. Kingsley Hall had started as a community in June, July 1965. So I arrived, I was there with Calvin. We came over on a boat called The Happy Castle. Eleven days coming from New York to Southampton. It was Calvin Hernton, his girlfriend Cathy, and John Keys. John Keys was also a very great poet who was part of the scene. And John Keys’ girlfriend came over before him. Calvin wrote a novel about the trip called Scarecrow. In the novel, I was ‘Dr. Yaz’ giving acid to everybody. He probably poet who was part of the scene. And John came from New York to Southampton. It was. Eleven days coming everything. Horrible smells.

And then we got to Kingsley Hall, and there was a crisis, a near-crisis, about Mary Barnes. Mary Barnes was a 45-year old woman nurse, who decided the only way that she could un-twist herself was to go back and become a fetus, then grow up again. There was a big crisis, ‘What would happen with Mary?’ She had moved in right from the beginning. At first she lived in a box in the basement. A box by an English artist named John Latham. And she wouldn’t go out of the box. She was peeing and shitting in the box and everything. Horrible smells.

So people had to decide what to do with her. And Laing thought that maybe she should be fed with a tube in there. And Aaron Esterson who was also a psychiatrist there said ‘no, you can’t do that, it’s too dangerous’. So there was a lot of conflict about Mary. Eventually Laing asked Mary if it would be okay if she was fed with a baby bottle. And Mary reluctantly acquiesced to this. And then he said, ‘Well, who’s going to feed her?’ And I said, ‘I’ll do it’. And that’s how I got started.

JB: You were living together in Kingsley Hall. There was a community.

JB: Yeah, the community was around Laing. There were several communities. The community around Laing when Laing was there – and when Laing wasn’t there. Several of my friends from medical school joined me there, eventually came over. Leon, and Morty, and Jerome, they were all buddies from medical school. We had had a good group in medical school. Discussing social issues also. So this was like a forerunner of the Free University, and the Antunius, it was our discussion group. Kingsley Hall was like a university in itself, like an antunius. Because we had all sorts of courses there going on. Courses were run every fortnight, every two weeks, by New Left Review magazine, you had all the people from New Left Review there...

JF: What kind of courses were they?

JB: Discussions about politics and economics and so forth.

JF: I found a letter when I guess you were inviting to a meeting in 1965 about setting up the Free University of London at Kingsley Hall. But I read, I think, somewhere, that your British colleagues didn’t want a Free University within this kind of psychiatric environment. Do you recall that?

JB: I think that Kingsley Hall was a free university. And there’s all sorts of meetings and discussions going on, especially about organizing the Dialectics of Liberation conference.

JF: Education has been a thread through your whole life and career. How would you explain your concept of education?

JB: Basically, wanting to know what’s real. What’s real? What makes the world tick? What makes the world go? What makes us go in the world? There’s a world out there, and a world inside of me. So... I’m a micro-educationalist. Psychotherapy is a micro education. There’s a macro education about what goes on out there. How to bring them together. That’s like what Marrace was talking about. That’s what I tried to do with my book The Tyranny of Mere, or, malice through the looking-glass. Bringing together personal and social forces. That’s how they become macro social forces.

JF: Coming from Kingsley Hall, what was the reason you wanted to make the Dialectics of Liberation Congress, if you had already a discussion going at Kingsley Hall?

JB: Well, we had a discussion going at Kingsley Hall but it was a mini-discussion. We wanted a macro-discussion. We wanted a kind of World Congress. With all the great intellectuals from all over the world coming to discuss violence, destructivism, what we can do to change things. We thought that we were very – how would you say – we were chuffed with ourselves, full of ourselves. We thought, we knew through psychological means why a lot of these destructive forces were taking place. We wanted to share with people, all these opinions.

JF: But also 1967 was the Summer of Love, and I think it’s quite significant that you made a congress on the nature of violence.

JB: Because eventually love, love which was requisite, love which is unrequited, love which is unpressed, love which is stilled, turns into violence. And also, love, of course, is the antitode to many destructive forces. Destructive forces – I’m talking about envy, greed, and jealousy. And I would add narcissism. Envy, greed and jealousy is what the mania cats and the seven deadly sins. Now certainly the seven deadly sins are also balanced by seven benevolent graces. The seven graces. But when the balance gets out of whack, not only do we get out of whack personally, but the whole culture gets out of whack. So you have too much envy, but not enough love. We have envy balanced by gratitude. So someone who’s ungrateful, that’s another way of expressing hatred. We have greed balanced by generosity, or jealousy balanced by compassion. We have jealousy go up, or compassion go down. Or greed go up, or generosity go down. Like that. So this is what I’m trying to work out. Beginning at that time at Kingsley Hall, then through Dialectics, and afterwards.

JF: At the Dialectics of Liberation, the kind of discussion there – of course it was primarily well-known people making presentations, people like Stokely Carmichael, and Marcuse, a whole series of cultural and political personalities. But I’ve always thought about it as a Congress where the most important things going on were the discussions and all the discussions...

JB: That’s right.

JF: Could you maybe tell a little bit about the nature of the event in terms of the socialising, the micro-relations?

JB: Yes, I mean the Antiuuniiversity of London essentially began with the Dialectics of Liberation conference. It was the first event of the Antiuuniiversity, and the Antiuuniiversity was the second event of the Dialectics. So in the morning there were lectures by the main speakers, then there was lunch and discussions continued over in Primrose Hall and around the area and then the talks, the cafes. I think I mentioned last time that, amazingly, in London for two weeks it didn’t rain. It was sunny for two weeks. That helped a lot.

Aftewards we broke into smaller groups, which were led by group leaders who were familiar with the topics. Maybe eight, ten groups. All over the Roundhouse, different parts, discussing what was going on. We were divided into Alphas, Betas and Gammas. Alphas were the main speakers, Betas the group leaders, and Gammas were the participants. And then the evenings, again, there were more informal discussions, where people were hanging around. People lived in the Roundhouse. A good friend of mine – I remember this very well – she lived in the Roundhouse for two weeks. Stayed there all the time.

And then the next day, there was another speaker and the whole thing continued again.

JF: Who became the seminar leaders?

JB: People like myself, also Leon Redler and Morton Schatzman, other psychologists and psychiatrists and psychoanalysts. Some who were into Laing, and other people who were more familiar with Bateson’s work and others’ work. And then we had political people like Stokely Carmichael. One of the people was Allen Krebs, who founded the Free University of New York. He was there. So it continued in that vein. People who had some expertise.

JF: How did you break down the specialisation between you or did you break it down?

JB: We didn’t break it down that much. It was mostly people who had some expertise in the main topic, and it wasn’t broken down into political expertise, or this kind of expertise. Just the different familiarisity with it. And the seminar groups were groups of about twenty.

JF: The quality of these discussions, could you describe it a little bit? What was the dynamic of the groups, or what ideals did you have for this kind of group work?

JB: I think it was mostly to help people to digest. What was said in the main meeting, go over it again and again. So if someone didn’t understand something, they would bring it up and then it would be battered around, ‘what did that mean’. When Bateson talked about issues like the ‘double bind’, what is a double bind? How can we illustrate it? How can we apply it in terms of family dynamics, for example. So eventually the hope was that people would have some better idea of what was involved. When Carmichael talked about Black Power, well, what is Black Power? Did you have to be Black to have Black Power? Can you have White Power, or Yellow Power?

JF: But in relation to Black Power, there was a lot of friction and differences.

JB: That’s right, yeah. And a lot of people who contested the idea of Black Power. Is it true, or should they have Black Power, or are they just racists in reverse, stuff like that. The whole issue of racism and institutionalised racism. Such as we see, and it was interesting to be discussed then, such as we saw in the police forces in England at the time. There was beginning to be a discussion about it. Now there’s a big discussion about it.

JF: You yourself were hosting what was called the Antiuuniiversity. The Antiuuniiversity...

JB: That’s right. I was talking about the creation of the Free Universities, different kinds of... I don’t know, I don’t like the word ‘anti’ so much, but... alternative television, alternative radio stations, alternative places where people could be helped if they had a breakdown instead of mental health facilities. Alternative publishing within the so-called underground press. All these things I was trying to bring together.

JF: Like the Antiuuniiversity...

JB: Yes, the Antiuuniiversity. The Antiuuniiversity theoretically came from the Dialectics of Liberation. It was really an attempt to continue discussions that got started there. Discussions on all levels. Psychologically, sociologically, and every which way. And that lasted for about three years. We had a lot of these intellectuals in London speaking there. So people came out of curiosity, out of fame. By then Laing was very famous, and became more famous. But it was, for a while, it was a good opportunity to broaden the discussion that had started at the Dialectics. You have to go to the grandchild generation
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<td></td>
<td>6:30 classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cobbing/Hernton</td>
<td>*Caldwell Cardew</td>
<td>Metzger</td>
<td>Huxley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cowley/Cooper</td>
<td>Raymond/ Stetler</td>
<td>Watkins</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(at the Mind Lab)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7pm</td>
<td>(7pm)</td>
<td>Watkins</td>
<td>(7:30pm)</td>
<td>(only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rustin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13 May)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mabin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:30 classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoo-</td>
<td>Cobb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kumar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gottfried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(21 &amp; 22 only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(May only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*BattersbyFirst</td>
<td>*Dwoskin</td>
<td>Berke</td>
<td>Krasso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>(23 May only)</td>
<td>(17 June only)</td>
<td>(1 June only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15 May)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10 May only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Krebs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(at her home)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C.LISM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All classes begin the week of May 6-12 unless a different starting date is indicated.

(F) means that a course meets fortnightly.

(?) means that the starting date is uncertain; students should contact the Antioch University secretary to confirm.

* means that the scheduling is not as indicated in the catalogue.

The following courses are yet to be scheduled. Dates will be announced in the future: Beck/Malina, Benveniste/Montgomery, Cotter, Dine, Dorn, Eguna (probably Friday evenings), Gibson.

Norman Frueh's class has been postponed.

Alex Cockburn is unable to teach this quarter.

This schedule is accurate as of 3 May.

Further changes are not expected.
The Anti-Hospital

By David Cooper

Schizophrenics occupy about two thirds of the beds in most mental hospitals and mental hospitals are nearly half the total hospital beds in the country. In most European countries about 1 per cent of the population go to hospitals at least once in their lifetime with the diagnosis schizophrenia and the Swiss psychiatrist P. Huber estimated that for every one schizophrenic in a hospital there are about ten "at large" in the community. If one takes note of recent research into the familial origin of schizophrenia (see p. 1) and the study by D. D. Laing and A. Esterson (Tavistock Publications, 1950) and its conclusion, that schizophrenia is not a disease in one person but rather a crack in which whole families function, then one realizes the massive social problem presented by this disease or perhaps pseudo-disease. For the emerging view is that acute schizophrenia is not a disease process as we yet understand or psychological causes, but rather that it is a microcosm of a whole situation in which one member of a group, usually a family group, is affected by a process which is often violent and arbitrary to become the patient.

The implication for the psychiatrist ward is that we must understand very clearly the nature of this sort of violence. We must understand how the patient is not only becoming mystified by others and then progressively invalidated as an autonomous person. The invalidation must not be continued in the ward and staff must begin to relate to the patient on a traditional covert collusion with the patient's family. In the past this collusion has often meant that staff becomes implicated in a progressive violence which is perpetuated, in the name of treatment, against the labelled patient.

If the conventional psychiatric ward and hospital are in many ways opposite to those indicated by the nature of the schizophrenia problem, why not explore this contradiction by getting up in the heart of a mental hospital an experimental unit which is essentially a hospital for the sick? It was agreed that we should do this at our hospital -- a large mental hospital of 3,000 patients just northwest of London.

A year after the ward was selected and emotionally prepared, we commenced the ward in January 1963 with 19 male patients in what, until that time, had been the incontinent ward. About two thirds of the patients had been diagnosed as schizophrenic and they were adolescent or young adult men. In the second year the unit expanded into a 60-bed ward. Both wards were close to the geographical center of the hospital.

We had one central conviction, founded on repeated unhappy experiences in conventional psychiatric admissions wards that before we have any chance of understanding what goes on in the patients the staff have to have at least some elementary awareness of what goes on in themselves. We therefore aimed to explore in our day to day work the whole range of preoccupations, prejudices and fantasies that staff have about each other and about the patients.

This was undoubtedly a major task. The psychiatric institution throughout its history has found it necessary to defend itself against the madness which it is supposed to contain -- disturbance, de-integration, violence, contamination. The staff defense, midder as they are encouraged against (history rather than real dangers), may be collectively termed institutional irrationality. What is the reality of madness in the mental hospital and what is illness? What are the defining limits of institutional irrationality?

It has long been recognized that a great deal of violent behavior in mental patients is a direct reaction to physical restraint. If any member of the public were to be seized by several burly men and thrust into a straightjacket for reasons which were obscure to him, and if his attempts to find an explanation were without avail, his natural reaction would be to struggle. We are no longer in the era of the straightjacket and padded rooms are on the way out, but it is not so long ago that the writer saw a patient kicking as he was being thrown in a straightjacket, carried by several policemen into the observation room, and one who had to disorder the policemen and remove the straightjacket to end the patient's violent reactions.

Today psychiatrists resort to "chemical restraints" -- sedatives and tranquilizers -- and to electroconvulsions and lobotomy. The effect of these less drastic measures, however, is much the same as they are used, as they often are, without any responsible explanation. The implication that the delay in giving antipsychotic is that there is danger in him which must be controlled. Patients who are very sensitive to these operations often obey by providing the violence -- at least until they are subdued by a larger dose of the same "treatment." This is not to say that disturbed patients should receive more tranquilizers but simply that there should be better control and of the patient's violent reactions.

There is the meaning of this situation is only too often lost in the quasi-medical mystique of "illness" and "treatment." Why should one not, for instance, tell the patient: "I'm giving you this stuff called Largactil to quieten you down a bit so that we can get on with the rest of our job without feeling too worried about what you are going to do next?" One of the commonest staff fantasies in mental hospitals is that if patients are merely reviewed verbally or physically into getting out of bed at a certain hour in the morning the ward staff will be taken away. Behind this is a staff anxiety over non-conformism and the time regulation is given control over the daily lives of patients and over their own lives. The patient is the one who frightens aspects of themselves that sometimes they do not want to get out of bed in the morning and come to work. It is obviously true that if they succeed they will not come to work if they inflict violence. It is also true that young schizophrenic patients will often report back and take jobs which will have to attend punctually. But all this ignores the life history experiences of these patients and their own histories of "staying in bed problem." In the past the patient has probably depended entirely on his mother to get him up in the morning. Shortly prior to his admission he has often relied on this against this enforced dependence by what, for various reasons, is the only course available to him, namely staying in bed despite his mother's efforts to get him up. This "withdrawal" is often one of the "presumptive symptoms" of schizophrenia.

In the hospital one can repeat the family patterns, that is to say gratify the patient's dependent needs by getting him up; this is really getting up FOR HIM. Or one can take the opposite decision and leave the patient in the hope that he will one day GET UP HIMSELF. In fact, after many years of discussion of this issue with the staff and a great deal of policy difference between the nursing staff it was found that if the usual routine procedures were abandoned and patients left to get up themselves they invariably did so, even if the previous days they had not. On several occasions they would spend most of the day in bed for reasons not known, and then get up and attend punctually after all and the gain in personal autonomy normal worldwide.

We had begun to question the ancient
ANTI-HOSPITAL

That is the title of a new book, "The Hospital," by Dr. W. H. Shadbolt, who has written a brilliant book on the subject of hospitals and their administration. The book is not only a valuable contribution to the medical profession, but it is also a valuable guide to those who are interested in the social and moral aspects of hospital life.

The book is divided into three parts: The first part deals with the history of hospitals, and is a detailed account of the development of the hospital system in England. The second part is devoted to the management of hospitals, and includes chapters on the staff, the finances, and the administration of hospitals. The third part is a series of case studies, which illustrate the practical application of the principles set out in the first two parts.

The book is written in a clear and concise style, and is illustrated with numerous charts and diagrams. It is a must-read for anyone interested in the history and management of hospitals.

The book is available in hardcover and e-book formats, and is published by Oxford University Press. It is priced at $35.00, and is available from all good bookstores.
Now, I’m a grandparent now, and I’m looking at all my grandchildren. They’re going to open up the whole discussion again.

JJ: How come you wanted to make an institution like that, in a context where you were critical of institutions?

JB: We were all anarchists, and we... in the process of making an institution, we deinstitutionalised ourselves. I think that maybe we shouldn’t have had a building, we should have had talks, going around all of London. Anyway, buildings are expensive.

JJ: If you define what an institution is, would you do that?

JB: Again, we’re looking at words like ‘institution’. One of the reasons that I don’t like the word is because I think individual intentions get muddled and confused and hidden in an institution. Laing called this ‘praxis’. So any social structure where there’s more praxis rather than process, when people know who’s doing what to whom, is a breeding ground for wisdom. I was thinking of the story of Moi and Salieri. Salieri (who is also a fine composer, but not quite up to Mozart’s standards) slowly poisoned Mozart to death. It was done in such a way that Mozart never knew who was getting him. If you really want to hurt someone, you do it through a social system where you start over here, and the knife is put in by someone over there, and you never knew where it came from.

JJ: I’m of course interested in the term ‘anti-institution’ – we could call it ‘alternative’ but ‘anti’ is quite a powerful term.

JB: Yeah, what is the ‘anti’ against? ‘Anti’ meant anti-dehumanisation of the people who were involved in the activity. By dehumanisation I mean people who were in the power structure, the authority structure. Like Allen Krebs was talking about in New York. Where do you have a discussion, talk about, teach Marxism? Maoism? The work of various Black Power leaders? And so forth. Eventually this changed. Americans universities changed. But around the time I think there were no courses in Marxism-Leninism. Most of the people involved in the Free University were very left-wing. Same thing in London, but less so.

One other aspect of it is extended discussions. Extended discussions, like, in the Antiuniversity we would kind of teach each other and... We had 10 lectures on how to make a radio. But then we were looking back at it. Certainly weren’t enough women involved. We were all kind of male chauvinist pigs, you know. [laughs]

JJ: So, could you describe, what is an Antiuniversity, as a matter of principle?

JB: The Antiuniversity has several elements. One element is that it’s concerned with wisdom, not just knowledge. The second element is what kind of knowledge it does involve. And the third element is that we were more like a community. So I got new experimental colleges, I got community. The Free University of New York was like a community. Much of the difference between institutions and anti-institutions was the communal aspect of it. Institutions are run by a power/authority structure – hierarchy of power. An attempt to negate this through more communal activities, greater communal decision-making. This creates its own problems. Nonetheless, that’s another aspect of it. The communitarian aspect of it. And also, the fourth aspect was, the ability to discuss subjects which are not open to intensive discussion elsewhere. Like Allen Krebs was talking about in New York. Where do you have a discussion, talk about, teach Marxism? Maoism? The work of various Black Power leaders? And so forth. Eventually this changed. Americans universities changed. But at the time, I think there were no courses in Marxism-Leninism. Most of the people involved in the Free University were very left-wing. Same thing in London, but less so.

One other aspect of it is extended discussions. Extended discussions, like, in the Antiuniversity we would kind of teach each other and... We had 10 lectures on how to make a radio. But then we were looking back at it. Certainly weren’t enough women involved. We were all kind of male chauvinist pigs, you know. [laughs]

JJ: So there was a more practical...

JB: Yeah, yeah. Mixture of the practical and the experiential together. I mean, you could have practical courses like ‘How to Make an Atomic Bomb’. We didn’t do that. [laughs] ‘How to Make a Hand Grenade’, ‘How to Write a Propaganda Leaflet’.

JJ: I’m of course interested in this school where there were artists – like Cornelius Cardew, John Latham, Edward Dow, a group of psychiatrists – you, Laing, Cooper, Redler and others; and then there were more political people. I’m curious about the interaction, because you’re bringing different languages, different perspectives, into the same anti-institution.

JB: That’s right, and the hope was that we would kind of teach each other and meet. Sometimes we did, most of the time we didn’t. Many of us knew each other. I think that it also brought out big egos in this place. So Laing was a big ego. John Latham was a big ego.

JJ: Also, you made a rather traditional structure, with courses every week or every second week in the afternoon, late afternoon, or in the evening of the first catalogue.

JB: Yeah, most people worked, that’s why. And most people didn’t get paid. So some people who needed money more got paid more, got paid something. But there wasn’t a lot of money around. And for people who talked a lot and lived a lot, they were weird, but seemed to contribute to the general atmosphere of the place.

JJ: How much drug-taking was taking place at the Antiuniversity?

JB: A lot. Well, those were the sixties. What kind of drug-taking?

JJ: A lot of grass. And acid. I know in New York – we left New York when the communes were there, in large apartments. There was a lot of drugs used by amphetamine. Terrible. But grass is all right. Alcohol is difficult. Too much boozing is no good either. Soft, mellow drugs. Ecstasy.

JJ: Could you talk a little about the group of teachers – I got the first catalogue, or a photograph of the Antiuniversity. What kind of teachers, I guess, or what were they called, ‘course leaders’, or...?

JB: Well, the teachers and course leaders... I mean, a lot of the teachers were people who either spoke at the Dialectics or had seminars at the Dialectics. Or friends of Laing. And of course, for example, Laing and Cooper gave several classes. That was very well-attended because also, you know, it’s not just what they said, but their personalities came through. A lot of the people attending saw it as a chance to meet those people.

Otherwise, the people at the Antiuniversity were like Juliet Mitchell, or like Calvin Hernton or others, who were course leaders at the Dialectics. Calvin was very intellectual and a poet himself. He wrote the best poem about Kingsley Hall and Laing, I thought.

JJ: For example, Cornelius Cardew, the composer-musician, he made a course. What did, for example, music mean in the Antiuniversity? Do you remember it?

JB: Well, it was an attempt to do something original and unique and different. There was also a course in printmaking, by Asa Benveniste. He was great. Trigram Press, I think he had. He was a brilliant typographer and poet. He had some sense of beautiful print on paper, and how you do it.
NEWSLETTER

*The Action Research Project on Racialism in Britain meets every Monday night at 8.30 p.m. The participants have been tape-recording interviews with black and white children and adults in London, focussing on attitudes bearing on racialism.*

People are needed, with portable tape-recorders if possible, for conducting further interviews; and, even more urgently, for transcribing the tapes (see Terry Bealier, Bill Mason or Leon Radier). The Antiuniversity has been granted the project a loan of £60 for equipment, tapes and travelling expenses. Publications and audio-visual material based on the project are planned. An initial report will appear in about a month.

*Weekend courses: weekend of June 29th/30th: Arts and Fakes of Living - conducted by William McLellan weekend of July 13th/14th: Eroticism - conducted by Aaa Benveniste and Stuart Montgomery, with Jeff Nuttall and Steve Dwoskin in attendance*

(discussion of times etc will be available later)

*Counteruniversity meetings will in future be held on Fridays at 8.30. The next one will be held on Friday July 5th. Those are general meetings of anyone interested to come along, to consider the progress of the Antiuniversity of London, to relate its development to other experiences in Free and Counter Universities, and to make recommendations for future projects and operation.*

At the last Counteruniversity meeting on Friday, June 14th, it was recommended that, in order to break down the division between students and faculty, members of the faculty should no longer be automatically paid expenses in connection with their attendance or a fee for conducting a course. Rather should they be invited to contribute, in the same way as students, to the running costs of the Antiuniversity. This does not mean that anyone desperately needing expenses or even a fee should not be paid, but that these would be exceptions to the general rule. (Incidentally, our Treasurer reports that the Antiuniversity is not in a position, financially, to pay members of the faculty automatically this session.)

Calculations seem to suggest that each member of the Antiuniversity needs to contribute about £5 every three months (£20 a year) in order for the finances to be viable.

It was agreed also, that besides groups forming round a particular person and/or subject, as at present catalogued, that groups be encouraged to form at any time for study or action. If such groups need a specialist or leader, endeavour will be made to find one.
In the Antiuniversity course catalogue introduction, it is written “We must destroy the bastardized meaning of student and teacher and course in order to regain the original meaning of a ‘teacher’: one who passes on a tradition; the ‘student’: one who learns how to learn; and ‘course’: the meeting where all this is taking place.” In a way you went into the project still with some of these early ideas.

There was a lot of discussion about that, and afterwards people thought that they couldn’t really eliminate the word ‘student’, because students are there to learn, and teachers are there to teach. But trying to deconstruct the terms, by the fact that some things are happening in other courses, and some students became teachers of other courses. And also what bothered us was the method of teaching. Sometimes this didn’t work due to the personality of the people involved. Some people are just ego freaks. [laughs] Or they’re basically dominating personalities. But at the best of times, when people were open and willing to listen and discuss, well, that was fine. And how do you know when people are ego freaks? You don’t.

I think about fifteen. Why? It has to do with the community. Of course, who gets paid for what is part of the discussions. I mean, after that, there was a lot of talk about therapy. Did you read that? [laughs] It would have been better if we’d actually cooked something. I still have to open up the book to see what I just said about praxis and process. How would you describe the power inside a small group? It depends on the people involved. Whether people want to subdivide their egos to a general good. It can also be a clash of egos. Sometimes you talk too much – one talks too much. It just muddles things. Silence is also very powerful.

I also wanted to ask you regarding community, and formal and informal power structures inside a community. How does this relate to what you just said about praxis and process? How would you describe the power inside a small group?

It all depends on the people and the egos involved. Whether people want to subdivide their egos to a general good. It can also be a clash of egos. Sometimes you talk too much – one talks too much. It just muddles things. Silence is also very powerful.

I think the word ‘antiuniversity’ is a bit dated now. It’s not that we’re ‘antiuniversity’. What is what we are? I think we’re for wisdom. And how do you gain wisdom? One way is to live in a commune – and to understand the difficulty of relationships with people. Because it is difficult to be in a space which you’re sharing with other people, especially with people like myself, who’s an only child.

So, in a way you understand that what you can learn, the wisdom, is also coming out of antagonism.

Right that’s yeah. Coming out of antagonism, coming out of love, coming out of sharing.

If you bring your whole existence within a framework like this, what does it do to your personality and psychology, living inside an institution?

Again, I don’t like the word ‘institution’. I prefer the words ‘social gathering place’ or ‘tribal gathering place’ or ‘tent’? ‘Institution’ reminds me of IBM. Or a kind of bureaucracy in government. I think two things can happen. It can make you more mellow, and more laid-back, more tolerant. Or the other way, you can get stuck, or smile, or angry, and poisonous. Both things happen. Depends on who’s there, and your mood, and... it depends really on the degree of envy and jealousy and narcissism you carry with you.

And what decides in what direction a process of self-organisation would evolve within the Antiuniversity?

I did have a hope. The hope was not realised. More happened in the group than I expected. And what could it have meant at Antiuniversity?

The problem is when a formal structure becomes an institution, and gets over-solidified, over-reified.

I always like to live with a certain amount of chaos in my life. I’m comfortable with chaos. Other people fight chaos tooth and nail, and they don’t like it. It’s like a bit of chaos, otherwise it becomes too solid, too entrenched.

So, I guess that of course egos are also conditioned by a society that is alienating people. So it’s hard to make an institution like that, embodied in a society that is destructive. You can’t just get rid of the surrounding society.

The surroundings is our context, even if you live in a beautiful building in the country. You can kind of keep it at bay and keep it on a distance for a while, but there are always interfaces going on. I think Laing at one point tried to establish a commune in the countryside. He had a benefactor, a man who was wealthy, and bought a house in the countryside. [laughs] But eventually the intrigues and the conflicts and the difficulties came there too. Even though the house was nice, the man imported a chef, from a Tiki Tonga restaurant. [laughs] It would have been better if we’d actually cooked together. Actually one of the most important things you can do in a commune is to make bread. You have to take the dough and you go ‘shack! shack! shack!’ And that’s really great for getting out aggressiveness, and for exercise. I’d recommend making bread.

It might also be what you call the ‘micro-social’ relations, having practical things... The practical things are very important. In the Antiuniversity, one thing that went wrong: too many intellectuals, too much thinking. Thinking without practice is not useful. It’s destructive.
Sensitivity Training Group - Since is a time of social and personal alienation. The most grim paradox of urban culture is that as the population increases, individuals grow further apart. The object of SENSITIVITY TRAINING is to create an awareness which will assist in establishing closer and more frequent personal relationships.

Roland A Krausen's Sensitivity Training Group has its first meeting on Monday July 1st at 8.30.

David Sladen's course on the later philosophy of Wittgenstein begins on Thursday 27th June at 5.30.

Satish Kumar will again be at the Antiuniversity this week. His subject is Revolution in Education and the time is Friday, 6.30.

Chamberlain £5.30 Tuesday 2nd July.

Catalogues for the period beginning July 15th (due out on June 15th) have not yet appeared. There is a chance that the Antiuniversity will be changing its address, so catalogues have been held up until a decision on this is known. All being well, catalogues will now be ready on July 1st.

Up to now catalogues have been issued free. They will continue to be issued free to members, as also will the news letters and supplementary sheets of information. Non-members of the Antiuniversity who wish to receive catalogues will in future be asked to contribute five shillings a year, and for the news letters and supplementary sheets another ten shillings.

Professor Barry Commoner, the scientist from Washington University in St Louis, who has made major contributions towards elucidating the overall of science and technology on ecological systems, is prepared to meet with people at the Antiuniversity. Date and time not yet known, but please enquire if you are interested.

Ian Sutherland's practical painting course is due to begin at any time now. We would be glad to hear of anyone else interested in joining.

Sutherland says: My first experience of enlightenment in relation to painting was the feeling that my eyes had been cleared. There was one direct connection between my eye and my conscious mind, and there was too much to draw and paint. Everything was visually beautiful. I pursued this state of consciousness until there was a connection between my unconscious mind and my conscious mind through painting. How my painting takes me to states of awareness that I do not understand but that could be called joy.

London Film-Makers Co-operative holds a general meeting at the Antiuniversity on Sunday June 30th at 3 p.m. It is hoped that regular screenings of underground films at the Antiuniversity may soon become a possibility.

Items for the next newsletter should be sent in soon.
Weekend 12-14 July  
Friday night to Monday morning

EVERYBODY COME - Spend the weekend at the Anti-G - meet people -
get together - groove - discuss what to do with the Anti-G plan

There will be a HYDE PARK rally! (See below.)

EVERYBODY on Saturday night (bring drink, music, Jonas-
plans - sticks etc.). The session on erotica: will take place as sched-

uled. Bring sleeping-bag and food. Coffee and some food will

be available.

ANTI-U COURSE CREATION RALLY

EVERYBODY who wants to run a course or attend a course from 22 July

outwards should come along to:

SUNDAY (SPEAKING CORNER)

from 22 July onwards

There will be no priority given to courses you are interested in and to
courses that are involved in the provisional

catalogue. Come all the more to courses listed in the provisional
catalogue as well. ALL DECISIONS ON ALLOCATION OF ANTI-G TIME-SPACE WILL BE

COME ALL THE MORE!
TWO terms of the fox trot and people were getting bugged. But only some actively tried to make changes. The administrative opposition 'understandingly' countered, 'Why bother me? Dance what you want! I'm just the band leader,' and went on playing the fox trot, fox trot, fox trot.

And then it happened. Completely unexpectedly the administrative opposition was not. The regular, three-weekly meetings, that seemed doomed to be an administrative means of demoralizing the forces for major structural change, never turned from the atmosphere of complete sovereignty in the hands of the members present; nor even when a key member of the upper administration entered. True, he took a seat in the outer circle, was distant from the microphone tape the meeting. But if the meeting had continued to evolve from the first one, his location, wherever that was, would have determined center. For the last dialogue was one between rebellious children and stern, authoritarian, though father supported by some remaining good sons.

That was the way it was for that was the way it was forced to be by the founding father. The rebels were told, in effect, to go out and start a family of their own if they wanted participatory democracy and the like. The family had its setup and was not interested in the acting out of personalities put together by rubber bands and clips. It was not interested in hoarding meetings as the vehicle of decision making. It was not interested and that was final.

But this time, there was a new representative of the administration; one who told us that the previous one had been sacked in a recent meeting of the 'them'. We lost our father but we did not gain a strong brother. He participated as weekly as any other single voice, as any other wanderer in this experimental forest. The 'them' upon whom we blamed everything no longer existed. The question of the finance, the question of the this and the that of the past no longer held allure. The rebels had no longer to debunk the 'them' via the past screwups and the past inconsistencies. It became all 'WE' and that meant all interest in the future.

So here we are writing to tell you that the anti-university is YOURS. Those of us who played inside of it the opposition role are not interested in leadership now that the power possibility has sprung into reality. We're interested in grooving in all the wild dances this spinning earth confusedly throws off. We're not interested in prescribing a moral code of behavior or any standard of excellence, that would land us into a narcissistic bag of grooving only what our present selves deem worthy. So here we are asking you to come and crack our skulls open and warp our bodies till we can't recognize ourselves from one day to the next.

The old notion of catalogue of course is being exploded. Attending a course because of a 'name' is no longer the scene. Attending a course because of the course title, we would like to say, is no longer the scene. Attending a course and not considering oneself as one of the givers of the course is no longer the scene, we would like to say.

But we can't. Only you can talk for yourself. We're going to have a 2-day weekend get-together in Regents (or some other) Park July 6 or 7, so that in face-to-face contact we, as equal members, can personally commit ourselves to the creating of courses. Some of us will be interested in the standard teacher-student course groove and for them and us a big bulletin board will be there for people to sign up. (A provisional catalogue of such courses is also being prepared and will be available.) And all the scene grooves that spring existence there shall be accepted. Let a thousand flowers bloom.

And where is the money question in all this? The £8 fee per term is out. We know that. We have to finance the physical plant's rent, electricity and secretarial material wants. But this isn't going to be decided by fiat. This is one of the things that must be a wild flower meeting product. Some people can't pay. Some people can. Some people need. This has to be settled. Private houses and rooms throughout London are needed. An internal newsletter to quicken the pace of change, to get ourselves off our newfound cushiony arses and onto more sensitive ones, is needed and that is the beginning of an appeal to those who interest themselves in such provocations. Action ideas are needed and will need to be set up. We only want the anti-U to be a medium through which anybody with any thing can experience doing.

Instead of acting as satellites to the stars in our social universe, phase II of the anti-U is donating event space for everybody to act as stars.

Call and stop in!
Though the old term continues
in the old style
the new continuous anti-term is
growing roots in the present.
FEED THEM!
Anti-University of London
49 Rivington St., Shoreditch
730 69 51
Old Street Tube.

Martin Segal
230 PORTOBE
RD, W11. BA
Dear Joe,

I am resigning as Co-ordinator of the Antiumversity as from Wednesday 10th July.

(1) by my calculations, the Antiumversity no longer has money to pay a Co-ordinator

(2) the task of Co-ordinating takes and will take far more time than I can give to it

(3) the new arrangement by which courses will be formed at a rally in Hyde Park on July 21st seems to me to be largely unworkable; OK as an additional means of organising activities, but not as the sole means. I could not be responsible for Co-ordinating such a project

(4) I feel some sort of responsibility towards those who have at my instigation provided details for the catalogue of courses which they are prepared to give. If the catalogue is now largely to be ignored, I must resign in protest

(5) it seems to me that the present attitude to financing of the Antiumversity, decrying the initial arrangements of fees for membership and courses without putting forward any adequate alternative, gives the Antiumversity a very short expectation of life

(6) if some adequate alternative emerges and the project can continue, it seems to me desirable to place responsibility for the day to day working of the Antiumversity - Co-ordinating, responsibility for repair, regulation and appearance of premises, even secretarial matters, in the hands of those who accept the hospitality of the Antiumversity. I think one of these 'inhabitants' should be appointed Co-ordinator, and all should understand and accept their responsibilities to offset their privileges as guests of the building.

(7) I am perfectly ready to be proven wrong over matters (3) and (5) above. Indeed I hope I shall be. But if other people share my doubts, they should be prepared to act over the weekend of 12th to 14th July and ensure that their views are taken note of in the arrangements of the new session

Bob Cobbing

Joe Berke, copy to Stuart Montgomery etc etc

7th July 1968
NEWSLETTER

*Richard Hamilton is to give his second talk on the work of Marcel Duchamp (with slides) in the basement at 7.30 on Thursday June 7th.

*Satish Kumar - on world tour for the Gandhi Centenary will meet with members on Fridays June 21st and 28th at 6.30 to talk about Gandhi and Movement.

*Ken Costes will give two lectures on Workers’ Control on Tuesdays June 18th and July 3rd in room 3.

THIS QUARTER WILL FINISH ON JULY 14TH. In future, no division into quarters will be made. The courses and meetings listed in the next catalogue, due out on June 15th, will reflect what is taking place or about to take place at the Antiuniversity at the time the catalogue is put together.

PROJECTS BEGIN ALL THE TIME. People come around the Antiuniversity all the time without giving advance notice. News of new things will be given in supplementary sheets as they happen. This will be sent to all members and should be considered as an extension to the catalogue.

AT THE LATEST OF THE THREE-WEEKLY COUNTER UNIVERSITY SESSIONS held on June 3rd, two major proposals were made for changes in the organisation of the Antiuniversity.

1. The formal distinction between student and teacher embodied in the present money relationships be dissolved by abolishing set student fees relying instead on a yearly membership fee plus voluntary contributions, and abolishing payment to faculty.

2. That a weekend get-together be held on July 6th/7th for the purpose of finding out through personal encounter who is interested in what projects, courses, activities and thus forming groups with or without teachers or leaders to meet at the Antiuniversity or wherever else suits the people concerned.

In order to further debate these proposals and to make arrangements for the weekend get-together, a meeting of all interested students and faculty is called for Friday June 14th at 8.30 here at Rivington Street. Other subjects to be discussed include the finding of new larger more central premises, and the raising of funds to cover running costs.

RECENTLY the Treasurer of the Antiuniversity has been transferred to Stuart Montgomery. Joe Berke presented accounts to the meeting of June 3rd. A copy is available with Stuart Montgomery for anyone interested to see.

Bob Cogling has temporarily taken over the job of co-ordinator from Allen Krebs. Susan Steetler remains Secretary.
* John Chamberlain
American sculptor &
film-maker
doesn't know
hasn't any
couldn't, but
maybe might
have been
credited
with some
chaos transfer-
ed. I think.
Tuesday June 18th at
8.30 and thence
fortnightly

*Malcolm Caldwell, because of a matter which is sub judice will be unable to continue to teach this term, but hopes to resume as soon as possible

*Carolee Schneemann A HAPPENING (previous works include the happenings "Ment Joy", "Snows", and "Water Light/Water Needle"
also referred to as action theatre, kinetic theatre or event theatre
WILL MEET with people with a view to creating something that could be performed at the Antiuniversity itself INTENSIVE number of meetings for 1 month, 24th June to July 24th.

BRIEF NOTES: Portable typewriter missing from Office. Anyone know its whereabouts? Needed another bulletin board. Any offers?
Speakers on the Antiuniversity needed to go to far towns to take part in conferences etc., for expenses or even for a fee. Any volunteers, please?

THE ANTIUNIVERSITY has been run up to now with as little organisation as possible. Some people feel we still have too much organisation; some that we have too little. It is good that such matters are being debated. An exchange of views is desirable. Short views on any matter relating to the functioning of the Antiuniversity could well be incorporated in future issues of this Newsletter. Longer views and Statements on What the Antiuniversity is or should be or could be are invited and could be incorporated in the second issue of the magazine due out soon.

Newsletters are planned to appear at fairly frequent intervals, about every fortnight. Items for the next newsletter should therefore be sent to us fairly soon after the current one is received

Newsletter
Antiuniversity
The
Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation
Ltd

directors: C. Coates, C. Farley, R. Schoenman, R. Steiner
3 & 4 Shavers Place, Haymarket, London SW1, England

telephone: 01-930 4209, 4061
cable: Rustfound London SW1

25 June, 1968

Bob Cobbing Esq.
The Antituniversity
49 Rivington Street
London, E.C.2

Dear Bob Cobbing,

Thank you for coming to see me last week and for your cheque for the arrears of rent on 49 Rivington Street, for which we gave you a receipt.

I shall try now to outline the outstanding difficulties as we see them.

In the first place there are certain arrears outstanding. To the best of my knowledge, these concern only the new coin box telephone; the original telephone; and the electricity. We have not yet received any bills for the coin box telephone, but I understand that they will be in the range of £4 for connection and £2.10.0 per quarter rental. I shall write to you further about this when I have further information. As to the telephone, the situation is that we are paying the entire rental for the old telephone equipment, but there is a sum of £10.5.0 outstanding for dialled units to February 14, 1968. There were no trunk calls or other extras through the operator in this period. We have not received a further bill yet. As to the electricity, the situation is that when we first arranged the rent, we calculated that the Antituniversity would use electricity at the rate of £5.12.0 per week (approximately £60 per quarter). The outstanding electricity bill to June 4 is £195.18.0, and according to our previous calculation the Foundation should pay of this £152, leaving you to pay £63.18.0. I hope that you will agree that this is a fair procedure. I am summarising these amounts outstanding on an enclosed sheet, and shall be grateful if you could send a cheque for them as soon as possible. The usual letters concerning the rent for the remainder of June will be sent to you separately this week.

As you know, I suggest that the new telephone
The Common Room, Senate House, University College London, May 5, 2012

Johak Jakobsen: I hope this is just going to be an informal conversation. But of course it would be good if we could re-act on this kind of basic concept of the university under present conditions and also the role of the student, the role of the teacher or the scholar within the university structure. Maybe you could start with introducing yourselves and your place in the system, in the machinery.

Marina Vishmidt: I’m Marina. I’m a PhD student at the School of Business and Management at Queen Mary, University of London. I don’t teach. I’m finishing my PhD this autumn. My contact with the university has been somewhat minimal in these four years, particularly the last two, three years.

Danny Hayward: I’m Danny. I am a PhD student at Birkbeck College, in my second year. I too do not teach. I could perhaps offer a narrative why that is the case, since in principle I could; in fact, I am encouraged to. That is probably enough biography.

Jacob Bard-Rosenberg: I’m Jacob. I’m also a PhD at Birkbeck College, the department of English and Humanities, in my first year. I also don’t teach.

JJ: The reason I’m sitting here is because I am doing research into an alternative university called the Antuniversity of London. It was an experimental university in the late sixties. This institution was set up by different people. But mainly people coming out of the anti-psychiatry movement, coming out from Kingsley Hall, and this whole movement that was critical of the function of institutions in society, especially in relation to mental illness. Then they moved on to set up the Antuniversity. Of course they looked at the institution, the institution of the university, and tried to re-negotiate that in relation to seeing the institution as a shaping machinery, in a way. So I think it would be interesting if you would like to, or could speculate, on how the university works today, or pretend what it could, is what kind of structure is built into this present university that you work within.

DH: It might serve to begin, then, by expanding on why I’m not teaching. Currently, at Birkbeck, PhD students are encouraged to teach. In the sector as a whole, PhD students, in fact, are required to teach if they wish to secure paid employment once they graduate. Until quite recently, students at Birkbeck were paid to take a ten-week training course, which they needed to take if they were to be employed as associate tutors. They were paid £1000 for that, and then a small amount to complete the training. But this has finally come to acknowledge what was manifest all along, or certainly for the last ten or fifteen years, which is that anyone who wishes to gain paid employment in the sector once they’ve graduated, must teach. Given that is the case, there’s not much incentive for the institution to pay in students to undergo what they will in any case have to undergo — if they don’t want to become merely waste product after they graduate.

I did enrol for the ten-week training course three months ago. Students, in order to pass it, needed only to demonstrate their attendance over the ten-week period. Hence I have, in any case, hoped to avoid having to admit that, having signed up for the course, I managed to attend only one of the sessions and then only three-quarters of it. But the session itself, or the content of it, gives some kind of aperture on the current status of ‘training’, that is to say, the inculcation of the skills that are required of people who wish to teach in British higher education.

The class was led, on the one occasion I did attend, by the head of the PhD Studies Department. You are, very apologetically prefixed his title, saying it’s an extension, per se, of the structure of the PhD studies. This is all about the PhD students as people or about the discipline who would not submit to this egregious process, to continue it, they would previously have needed to sign the Student Satisfaction Survey, which is now centralised, opaque, micro-managerial and intractable culture of governance, to the point where the imaginary student who is looking to get the best quality product for a justifiably increased fee. So just like the E9K fees are about displacing education subsidy from a direct to an indirect structure — hugely more expensive for the student in the short and long run, unless the loans are understood to be an element of choice — but what kind of chance they will be — student demand is an imaginary displacement of responsibility from management or the state, ultimately (or its funding bodies and quangos) to the student as the consumer of last (and first) resort. Which is, of course, reinforced by management and the state of course in the best interests if the student. The student herself will be too busy negotiating her escalating levels of indebtedness to find her place at the system’s heart.

JB-R: It’s probably worth reflecting briefly on the White Paper that came out. Sorry, not the White Paper, the Browne Report. That was a large report on British higher education, and one of the demands made within this document was for a sort of highly-structured national system of continuing professional development for people working as teachers within the sector. This is now a year and a half, two years later, being echoed by a demand by the National Union of Students. An article that went round in The Guardian three weeks ago, in which the National Union of Students are now demanding of all teachers within universities that they become part of a continuing professional development structure. The union of lecturers is very much against this. But as the union of lecturers and the National Union of Students are both ultimately controlled by the Labour Party, this is not an argument which will get anywhere, as everyone is concerned with the sort of target of reducing the quality of education, of research and teaching, and not collective careers after all, if they might best inculcate in themselves and their peers.

MV: It’s very much framed in terms of the student demand, how to do it, problems of motivating the student to fulfill their potential as a student by being a consumer. But it’s also very much a disciplining tool, a central disciplining tool, the National Student Survey. Obviously, well, maybe not ‘obviously’, but it’s used by management to restructure both department-wide and individual teaching loads, administrative duties for instructors. Also, it’s used to intimidate. For example, at Queen Mary, there’s a complaints procedure which is being used to restructure the part of the Business school which is obviously inimical to the larger goals that the current administration has for the Business school.

So the various kinds of administrative devices and procedures which are associated with this consumer revolution as it’s been implemented in the British university system in the last year or two are being fully wielded by management as disciplining tools, over students, over administrative staff. As part, I guess, of the intensification of the auditing culture which is now located on the side of student satisfaction rather than, for example, the REP – the Research Excellence Framework, which has replaced the Research Assessment Exercise. So the point I was just making, in this very duality, was how these kinds of surveys of student satisfaction are disciplinary instruments both for students and, maybe more clearly, for teaching staff. Because it’s also used to allocate funding, the Student Survey, isn’t it?

Overall, these developments seem inductive of the dictum putting students at the heart of the system, which is the main talking point incessantly quoted from the Browne Report by government officials involved with the restructuring of the universities and people in university governance. The dictum is about re-sitting a highly centralised, opaque, micro-managerial and intractable culture of governance onto the people of the imaginary student who is looking to get the best quality product for a justifiably increased fee. So just like the £9K fees are about displacing education subsidy from a direct to an indirect structure — hugely more expensive for the state in the short and long run, unless the loans are understood to be an element of choice — but what kind of chance they will be — student demand is an imaginary displacement of responsibility from management or the state, ultimately (or its funding bodies and quangos) to the student as the consumer of last (and first) resort. Which is, of course, reinforced by management and the state of course in the best interests if the student. The student herself will be too busy negotiating her escalating levels of indebtedness to find her place at the system’s heart.

JB-R: And there’s a whole business of league tables, which is not straightforward because these league tables are not published by the government. They’re published by privately-owned third parties, The Guardian, The Times... But yes, more and more, the National Student Survey is related to something that university funding is complicated as it stands anyway.

JB: But what kind of interest, if you should characterise it, what kind of interest is governing the university? You could say, on a general level, these kinds of changes that you are presenting here. What interest is that? That is...

JB-R: So here is something that’s changed significantly in the last two years, and it differs between institutions. So you take, for example, Oxford and Cambridge, they don’t really care. They’ve got lots of money, they don’t have any problem attracting students. With the undergraduate education, the main change
which has happened is not in terms of how the institution’s run. From the standpoint of the students, how much the fees are, it’s to do with the fact that core budget has been cut, core funding from the government, so the only way they can guarantee the continuance of their departments is by attracting students. Which is something universities now find very difficult. Their concern is ‘can we get bums on seats this year, and how many jobs will it cost if we don’t?’

This is a slightly older problem. I remember, I’ve worked as an administrator. Interviews for job interviews. I was told ‘if you’re the administrator on this course, your job is not to administrate the course but rather to guarantee the conversion rate of first-contact applicants acceptance into this course.’ Therefore this course disappears, and you won’t have a job any more.’

DH: That statistical figure is a condition of access to further funding. But the question about wider interests can be answered in connection to the issue of discipline. So students, who have now been transferred into a marketing consum- ers, might appear to be exempted from, even the beneficiaries of, the process of discipline applied to university teachers. But still, plainly, that isn’t the case insofar as the transfer of the fee burden to them means that they have to become endlessly more sensitive to their employment prospects after graduation. That sensitivity to employment prospects means what that gets presented as.

MV: Discipline gets mediated through the market. That market is going for job interviews. I was told ‘if you’re the administrator on this course, your job is not to administrate the course but rather to guarantee the conversion rate of first-contact applicants acceptance into this course.’ Therefore this course disappears, and you won’t have a job any more.’
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MV: Discipline gets mediated through the market. That market is going for job interviews. I was told ‘if you’re the administrator on this course, your job is not to administrate the course but rather to guarantee the conversion rate of first-contact applicants acceptance into this course.’ Therefore this course disappears, and you won’t have a job any more.’
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arrangements being made at Hivington Street be transferred directly to the name of the Antiuniversity, and likewise the electricity charges and the coin telephone box. The arrangements for this could go ahead as soon as we have your agreement. These alterations would require readjustments in the payments that you are making, but there should be no difficulty about these. We should like to arrange a new rental which would be exclusive, leaving you to pay directly for the electricity and telephone. At our original calculation, this would mean reducing the rent by £5.12.0. per week with respect to electricity. At the same time, however, we must make some arrangement which covers the fact that not only is the Foundation at present making a loss which it cannot afford on the rental of Hivington Street, but also we have not taken into account the depreciation of the premises. You advised me that the Antiuniversity is looking for alternative premises. In these circumstances we should agree upon a new lease under which you either agree to increase the rent to enable the Foundation to redecorate the premises when you leave them, or alternatively you agree to restore the premises to their original condition before the termination of the contract. Perhaps at the same time we should make it a condition that the lease can be terminated by three months notice on either side.

I hope to hear from you about all this at your earliest opportunity. With many thanks,

Yours sincerely,

Chris Farley
Antiumiversity of London

It has been necessary to give up the premises at Rivington Street because of lack of funds, and until we have more money, courses and seminars are being held in members' homes and other places. Information about all meetings can be had by writing to 1, Sherwood Street, M1, or by telephoning Bill Mason at 01-289-0998.

The registration fee is now £5 a year starting in September and will admit members to all courses, but unless cards are shown a visitor's fee of 5/- will be charged. Notification of all public lectures sponsored by the Antiumiversity will be first sent to members who will be able to attend at half price. We hope to arrange that membership cards may be used to obtain the usual student discounts. Any member who has already paid for the summer session will be sent a year's membership.

A room will be rented in a pub for a general meeting and get together on the second Friday in September when future courses could be discussed. The time and place will be known by the last week in August - ring Bill Mason after that for details.

Courses now meeting are:
- Action Research Project on Racialism
- Roy Batterby / Leon Redler / Roger Gottlieb
  Time and Timelessness
- Bob Cobbing / Anna Lockwood
  Composing with Sound
- David Cooper's Seminar
- Roberta Elsley Berke
  On Finnegans Wake
- Guerilla Poetry Workshop

(...over)