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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 Antiversity. 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 Antiversity -- listed in the catalogue -- to discuss the direction and purpose of Antiversities in general and this one in particular.

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

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

   Ana Benveniste          Stuart Montgomery
   Joseph Berke            Aubrey Raymond
   David Cooper            Leon Redler
   Allen Krebs             Morty Schatzman
   Juliet Mitchell         Russell Stetler

   The secretary of this committee and co-ordinator of the Antiversity is Allen Krebs; the treasurer is Joseph Berke. The Secretary of the Antiversity, 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 Antiversity.
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 Berkoe
A selection from FUNY’s autumn syllabus

THEORY AND PRACTICE OF RADICAL SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Problems of strategy and tactics of contemporary mass movements in foreign and domestic radical organizations, with special attention to the analysis of their internal dynamics and the strategies they use to gain power. Students will be required to work on a project related to a specific social movement.

MARXIAN ECONOMICS

A study of the economic structure of our society; the nature of capitalism production and exploitation; the struggle between classes; the contraband of capitalist production; the economic crisis of contemporary capitalism; and the role of the state in this process. Students will be required to write a term paper on a topic of their choice.

MARXIST APPROACHES TO THE AVANT-GARDE ARTS

The diverse theoretical views of Marx, Lenin, Trotsky, Mao, and others will be examined, with special attention to the role of art in the class struggle. Students will be required to write an essay on a work of art that reflects these theories.

FILM WORKSHOP

The purpose of this course is to provide the student with an aesthetic and philosophical understanding of film as a medium and a form of expression. Students will be required to write a term paper on a film of their choice.

THE SEARCH FOR AUTHENTIC SEXUAL EXPERIENCE

This search will consist of exploring the idea of a universal sexual drive of examining religion, anthropology, and psychology for more insight. The course will also consider the meaning of considering the various dimensions of sexual behavior, with emphasis on the relationship of political power and society to sex. Students will be required to write a term paper on a topic of their choice.

LIFE IN MAINLAND CHINA TODAY

A critical analysis of the transformation of the country from a colonial and semi-colonial state to a modern society. Students will be required to write a term paper on a topic of their choice.

RACISM, CASTE, AND CLASS IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

A study of the development of racist caste in American society. An analysis of the current situation and the structure of racism in contemporary society. Students will be required to write a term paper on a topic of their choice.

POLITICS AND PERSONALITY

The role of personalization in a social revolution? What is the role of the individual, especially the “radical” personality (the anti-commercial, anti-authoritarian, anti-bureaucratic)? Students will be required to write a term paper on a topic of their choice.

IMPERIALISM AND ANTI-IMPERIALISM: THE IDEOLOGICAL QUESTION IN VIETNAM

This course will examine the ideological arguments of the two main ideological forces opposed to the Vietnam conflict (i.e., “Free World” imperialism, and anti-imperialism). Students will be required to write a term paper on a topic of their choice.

NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

An inquiry into the historic practice of non-violent resistance with special emphasis on the relationship of non-violence to the humanistic world view and the role of non-violent resistance by movements to achieve peace, freedom and social justice. Students will be required to write a term paper on a topic of their choice.

THE OLD LEFT AND THE NEW LEFT

A study of the Old Left and the new forces in the United States and the international communist movement. A review of current political and economic developments in the United States and the world. Students will be required to write a term paper on a topic of their choice.

ANTI-AUTHORITARIAN ANTHROPOLOGY

A study of the origins of society and culture. The course will consider the role of human understanding of culture and its role in shaping the human experience. Students will be required to write a term paper on a topic of their choice.

ANARCHIST AND SYNCRETIC POLITICS

The political ideologies of modern society, e.g. egophrenics, syncratics, congress theory, political parties, etc., will be examined. Students will be required to write a term paper on a topic of their choice.

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 the action of those who were denied the right to study and to teach in the society and student oriented universities.

The Free University is an experiment in education. The unique reason for its establishment is best explained by this statement which appears on page two of the Free University catalog:

"The Free University of New York has been forged in response to the intellectual bankruptcy and cultural emptiness of the American educational establishment. It seeks to develop the concept necessary to comprehend the events of this century and the meaning of one's life within it, to train for critical analysis. It seeks to open the scope of the usual academic and to promote the social integrity and commitment, from which scholars seriously stand aloof."

The Free University will consist of its present participants. Students and teachers will meet on common ground to take the direction of the school and to develop curricula, common courses, symposia, etc.

The Free University of New York is necessary because, in our perception, these universities have been reduced to institutions of intellectual triviality. Not only have they been systematically dehumanized, dehumanized in their total dehumanization..."

The Free University had been self-supporting. In order to accomplish this, the University was able to do what was necessary as working capital was obtained from students, from other universities, and from anti-war organizations. The Free University was not a profit making concern but it was able to make ends meet.

The Free University was opened on the night of our "Meet the Faculty" party. People were still removing trash from the main room. Yet, the work was done and eventually the first lecture room was opened. People crowded into the faculty and we were able to make ends meet.

The Free University students held a series of meetings with the University. The discussions were informal and open. They were held in order to discuss the future of the University. The discussions were held in the main room of the University. The discussions were held in the main room of the University.

Earlier experiments

Several notable experiments in the development of radical ca

the other with something to learn. These experiments have been carried on by members of the student community, isolated, yet maintaining the maintenance of educational quality, as a discussion between people — one with something to teach, the other with something to learn.
the first semester was an extraordinary success. Although we had only managed three weeks advance publicity on the opening of the school, the students gathered for courses, and, of course, more than one street. In addition, maybe one or two hundred people attended our single meetings of a particular course.

A large number of the people in the faculty of FUNY, such as radicals, were attracted to the radical political, and some of our “lecturers” became the leading publicists in New York. Here are a few of the people in the general lecture: Bob Newhart, Zev Scheneman, and S. F. S. (Free University) during the fall semester. Even a lawyer, Dylan, associated with the "enough cinema" of the Free University, Kamin, a student of the San Francisco - Moscow Peace Walk leader, member of the Committee for Revolutionary Action, Jack Mac Low of the "center" music group, David Meltzer (member of the War Resisters’ League), Alice Freeman (Black Nationalist leader), Dick Roberts (owner of Ineffable, member Socialistic Worker’s Party), M. B. Buss (Chairman of the American Socialist Labor Party), Louise Scheneman (artist and dancer, composer of "Spring," "Harlem," and "Yiddish" songs, author of books on psynthetic drugs). Spontaneous events

The Free University was an educational experience at its best level, an attempt to reestablish in a more manner to address the"

Political radicalism

Just as important, the free university has a role to play in the political sphere. The free university is a place where students can learn to analyze and understand political issues. The free university is a place where students can learn to think critically and to develop their own ideas.

In order to do this, the student must be able to think critically and independently. The free university is a place where students can learn to think critically and independently. The free university is a place where students can learn to think critically and independently. The free university is a place where students can learn to think critically and independently.

The free university is a place where students can learn to think critically and independently.
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 Lyttle

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
Rbt. Anton Wilson

REGISTRATION
SEPT. 27—OCT. 1

TEN WEEK SESSION BEGINS OCT. 4
($24/first course; $8/ each additional course; Welfare recipients free)
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Phone OR. 5-7424
Antiuniversity of London
An Introduction to Deinstitutionalisation

By Jakob Jakobsen

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 instituo 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 a 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 personal consciousness’ impact on the students, turning them into depolitisised and pacified subjects:

‘Modern capitalism and its spectacle all-lot 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 conserva-tive 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, poned be-tween 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 ini-tiation 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 main-ly occupied with its own survival as an in-stitution within the given society. The cri-tique 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 inter-ests and corporations that were underpinning nuclear armament and the ongoing war in Vietnam. Also to be considered was the general political atmosphere charac-terised 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 punish-able 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 mean-ing 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 commit-ment from which scholars now stand aloof.’

As stated on the promotional material from the Antiuniversity no formal quali-fi-cation 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 experiential 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 somehow 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 deinstitutional-ised ourselves’. This somehow underlines that the social relation inside the institu-tion was going to be key in the experimen-tal and demystifying process that was going to become the Antiuniversity of London.

Already at the opening of the Antiuniver-sity on February 12, 1968 discussions and antagonism between students, teachers and the Ad-Hoc Coordination Committee flared up, according to Harold Norse’s report in the International Times. The problem was that the coordination com-mittee had made arrangements with the BBC about coverage of the Antiuniversity. There were questions about whether a media organisation of the Establishment should be trusted as a way to promote the ideas around the project or whether this was a sell-out of the revolutionary aspira-tions to which the project was committed. The Ad-Hoc Coordination Committee was the group who had called for the first open meeting on setting up an antiuniv-ersity in London in November 1967. It consisted of David Cooper, Leon Redler, Julian Mitchell, Asa Benveniste, Stuart Montgomery, Russ Stetler, Morton Schatz-man, Allen Krebs and Joseph Berke. Most of this group were either psychiatrists or psychoanalysts.

Another flash point was the fee and pay-ment structure of the Antiuniversity, which was based on a membership struc-ture with a fee per quarter of £8 and 10 shillings (50 pence) for every course. The course leaders/teachers were offered pay-ment for their effort in running a course. This was based on the model of the Free University of New York after it opened on East 14th Street in the summer of 1965. Already on the first day of the life of the Antiuniversity, this structure caused vari-ous 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 di-ver-ent field of topics as well as teachers. A group of teachers involved with the New Left Review was running various courses in political theory and revolutionary move-ments. Avant-garde artists such as John Latham and Cornelius Cardew were run-ning courses consisting of collective and practical experimentation with making artistic work. A group of poets and writers such as John Keys and Lee Harwood off-ered (anti-)courses in poetry. The group of existential psychiatrists such as R.D. Laing, David Cooper, Leon Redler and Joseph Berke were running courses cover-ing aspects of psychiatry and psychology viewed from a critical social perspective. Also covered were Black Power, experi-mental drugs, prinking and under-ground media. Alexander Troches 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 contradic-tions 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 academic academy and to promote the social integrity and commitment from which scholars usually stand aloof.

Passionate involvement, intellectual confrontation and clash of ideas are particularly encouraged because we believe in a de-centralized style of learning.

The Free University of New York is necessary because, in our opinion, American universities have been reduced to institutions of intellectual servitude. Students have become so systematically dehumanized, deformed and deprived of the basic human faculties, sexuality, physicality and creativity. They are the victims of a system that is not only for the university but for all of American society. Students demand a new society that will provide for them.

The Free University has been established as an intellectual center explaining and exciting the new social order. It aims to create an environment in which intellectual creativity and political activism can flourish.

THE UNIVERSITY WORKSHOP

Tuesday, January 24, 10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

The University Workshop will be held at the Free University, 820 West 14th Street, New York, N.Y. 10014.

REGISTRATION

Registration is required at the Free University on the day of the event. The deadline for pre-registration is January 23, 1965. Registrants who register in advance will receive a brochure describing the workshop.

CALENDAR

Tuesday, January 24

The University Workshop is open to all students, faculty and staff of the Free University.

CINEMA DIRECTORS WORKSHOP

The purpose of the workshop is to provide an opportunity for cinema directors to share their experiences and ideas with other directors. The workshop will include a panel discussion, a screening of selected films, and a workshop on the technical aspects of filmmaking.

The workshop will be held at the Free University, 820 West 14th Street, New York, N.Y. 10014. The registration fee is $25 per person. For more information, please contact the Free University at 212-645-3960.
The Antiuniversity opened its doors at 49 Rivington Street in Shoreditch, East London, in January 1968, building on the success of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, Russ Stetter, one of the directors of the foundation, himself on the Ad-Hoc Coordination Committee and this paved the way for reasonable rent and conditions. The Antiuniversity was founded from 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 the university was born. Following the meeting the wider university of London had first emerged. In the minutes of a meeting of the Ad-Hoc Coordination Committee of 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 a lodge = small snack facilities to be installed. First floor = three small rooms to be converted to one small and one larger 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, 57 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 organisa-
tional papers that was to be excluded due to difficulties in covering the fees and a system of scholarships would be established.

The political scientist Allen Krebs and Joseph Berke were involved with setting up the Free University of New York in 1962. In 1963 Berke moved to London that same year to take part in the therapeutic community and antihospital Kingsley Hall established in Bow in East London. Kingsley Hall was becoming the nexus of the radical movement of psychiatrists who had set up the Free University of New York and Kingsley Hall with them into the Antiuniversity.

The first catalogue was beautifully block printed on high quality paper made by the poet, publisher and printmaker ASA Bayes. In the introduction it was stated that:

‘We must destroy the bastardised meaning of student, teacher and course in order to regain the original meaning of teacher = one who passes on the tradition; student = one who learns how to learn, not the course – the meeting where this takes place.’

Even though the traditional hierarchies were to be challenged in the Antiuniversity, many of the structures of the official university cast their shadow over the new anti-institution both in terms of economic relations and in terms of the Antiuniversity knowledge/power relations. This can be linked to one of the fathers of the Free University movement, Paul Goodman, who in his 1962 book The Community of Scholars had employed Allen Krebs and later Bob Cobbing as coordinator and Susan Stetler as secretary. There were voices challenging the authority and power of the administration. This was a part of the struggles around the development of the Antiuniversity, aiming at a move towards a more democratic structure. But there was also a movement 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 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 others, and he 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 development. It also echoed education projects where living as a community was an integral part of the educational perspective, for example Black Mountain College, the US and the New Experimental College in Denmark. According to Roberta Elemen 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 deinstitutionalise 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 repressive 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 this was not acceptable. One of this setup was and 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 decision 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 to the institution of the university was a thoughtful and forceful blow to the group of mainly psychologists who had set up the Antiuniversity. They could well accept the repressive and violent nature of the family as a coherent institution within society and the parallels to the structuring and functioning of the institution of the official university. In this process Allen Krebs stepped down as administrator and the position was taken over by the poet Bob Cobbing who hadn’t been a part of the coordination committee until then. This
also meant a more fundamental breaking down of the committee’s managing role at the Antiuniversity and the students began to ask: “Who owns the building?” Segal ends his text announcing these structural changes by stating that in the future ‘the Antuniiversity is YOURS’.

‘Instead of acting as satellites to the stars in our social universe, phase II of the Antiuniversity 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 but 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 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 Antiniversity 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 have done so far. Due to the ongoing structural struggles, formal and informal, within the Antiniversity many members had in fact stopped paying the fee after the first quarter which meant that the Antiniversity was already unable to pay teachers in the second quarter. So the subsequent democratisation of the Antiniversity 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 Antiniversity 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 was needed. It began to utilise private rent and running costs, already meant a more decentralised Antiuniversity secure economic outlook. It was calculated that £5 a year was the fee payment represented.

The £8 a term fee was abolished and a place. It was calculated that £5 a year was the fee payment represented. The anti-institutionalisation of the Antiniversity also led to a less viable economic structure. As the course structure as well as the quarter structure was abolished with ‘courses starting all the time’ according to the Antiuniversity Flyer, ‘allowing on when people met in self-organised ways and shared experiences, effects and knowledge. But the institution of the Antiniversity was then being erased.

The deinstitutionalising of the Antiniiversity 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 Antiniversity 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 when these questions 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 Antiniversity 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 Antiniversity 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 location: within the official universities and schools. Nevertheless, many people around the New Left Review who had taken part in the LSE protests did go on to offer courses at the Antiniversity, 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 protesting against the drastic changes that management wanted to implement. This occupation lasted more than a month and mobilised and politicised the students within in the institution that they wanted to defend. Yet the Antiniversity, as well as Kings Hall, was not resigned 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 Antiniversity was wary 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 Antiniversity:

“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 was pursued, for example, by many students for their prominent 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 women have long been condemned in the suffocation of the family and the isolation of the home—we now give a different meaning. That these female values were appropriated by male radicals initially gave women hope within these movements. But when they found out, 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 experiential way of consciousness raising that the deinstitutionalisation of the Antiniversity catalysed through the difficult process that was initiated on February 12, 1968, was not a failure. But it was not unambiguous either.

Images of the Antiniversity 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.  Thu 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.1. 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 Antiuuniversity.

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 specialty, 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. Goodman’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 1953. 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 revolutionise contemporary existence. Like Berke, Trocchi was a friend of Laing, enrolling him and David Cooper and numerous 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.

The Congress and Radical Education

‘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 corresponded 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 universities 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 educational 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 ‘passionate 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 in an article for Britain’s Peace News, during October 1965, ‘Preference was given to those courses or people who could not appear at an “establishment” university. Attention had to be paid to [FUNY’s] radical, educational and political position.’

When he moved to the UK during September 1965 to live at Kingsley Hall, Berke moved quickly to set up a London version, Free University of London (FUL), postponing it too as a ‘lever of change’ which, combined with FUNY and other free universities, would counteract the West’s ‘corrupt, decadent, immoral, unstable and insane’ civilisation. ‘On another level, one can see the formation of a brotherhood, in the sense of the Jesuits or of Castalia, Herman Hesse’s “Magister Ludi”, or Alex Trochici’s Project Sigma’, he added in the same Peace News article, thus continuing to draw on Trochici’s incantatory idea of a ‘spontaneous university’.

FUL did not succeed, however. In Jeff Nuttal’s words, it fell victim to the ‘waning gaps existing between the English Underground, the English left-wing liberals, and [Berke’s] “professionally defensive colleagues in the Philadelphia Foundation [sic].’ This was a hit at Cooper and Laing and the other members of the Philadelphia Association, who refused at that time to go along with Berke’s plan to use Kingsley Hall for his weekend lectures.

Nonetheless, a spark was lit, and when a year or so later, Berke came up with another, similar idea, Cooper and Laing jumped at the plan, seeing it as a further development of their anti-psychiatric interests. Berke began planning for the congress during the late spring or early summer of 1966, as 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, it was and would remain the public face of the congress. When, for instance, Berke’s American colleague Leon Redler wrote to Stokely Carmichael, the, increasingly radical, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), in a letter of October 1966, inviting him to attend the congress, he mentioned it as representing an ‘extension’ of the foursome’s work in ‘seeking to demystify communication in families of schizophrenics, and in so doing to seek to liberate those imprisoned in such nesexes’.

Berke carried forward FUNY’s educational imperatives into the congress by marshalling a similar mixture of ‘politicos’ and ‘culture wizards’, the former ‘SUPER-LEFT with a vengeance’. Many of the politicos were veterans of the May 2 Movement, which had been formed to spearhead students’ fight against United States involvement in Vietnam, and they brought to the congress a fundamentalist and extremely aggressive anti-Americanism.

This was particularly evident in the presentations given by the anthropologist Jesus Henry and the political scientist John Gerassi (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’.

Diasporic ‘education’ was banalised. Universities were drained of their ‘intellectual merit’, 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.

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 contemporariness.’

Radical education began as a revolt against bureaucracy and the conformity 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’.

Images of the Dialectics of Liberation from Peter Davis’ film material of the congress

Martin Levy is a writer and researcher currently writing a book about Joe Berke and the Dialectics of Liberation Congress. He is based in the north of England.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sat July 15</td>
<td>3 PM</td>
<td>R.D. Laing</td>
<td>&quot;Mediations between the individual and society&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon July 17</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Gregory Bateson</td>
<td>&quot;Patterns, Names, and Transformations&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues July 18</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Stokely Carmichael</td>
<td>&quot;Black Power&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed July 19</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Jules Henry</td>
<td>&quot;Psychological and Social Preparation for War&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs July 20</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>John Gereasi</td>
<td>&quot;Violence and Counterviolence: Dollars and Sense&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri July 21</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Paul Sweezy</td>
<td>&quot;The Future of Capitalism&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon July 24</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Ernest Mandel</td>
<td>topic to be announced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues July 25</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Paul Goodman</td>
<td>&quot;Objective Values&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed July 26</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Lucien Goldmann</td>
<td>&quot;Critique et décentralisme dans la création littéraire&quot; (in French)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs July 27</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Speaker and topic</td>
<td>&quot;Liberation from the Affluent Society&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri July 28</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Herbert Marcuse</td>
<td>&quot;Beyond Words&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat July 29</td>
<td>3 PM</td>
<td>David Cooper</td>
<td>&quot;Why have the organizers organized it?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that the schedule has been revised. Note also that, as usual, many of the topics are inadequately described by the titles above.
antiumversity of London
49 rivington street
shoreditch, e.c.2
739-8934

26 January,

The antiumversity 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
9 o'clock we shall have a general discus-
sion on the antiumversity.
Hope you can come.

Doris Meibach,
for the antiumversity.

The faculty, up to today, includes --
Steve Abrams, Bob Cribbing, Barry Flanagan,
Roy Battersby, David Cooper, Lee Harwood,
Asa Benveniste, John Cowley, Calvin Hernton,
Joe Berk, Edward Dorn, C.L.R. James,
Malcolm Caldwell, Steve Dworkin, John Keys,
Cornelius Cardew, Robin Blackburn, Nicholas Krasso,
Noel Cobb, Obi Egbuna, Allan Krebs,
A. Jensen, Ruth First, Bruce Rucklick,
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 Antiuiversity of London and post with this form to 49 Rivington Street, London EC2.
The following were agreed upon at the meeting on December 12th:

1. The school is to be called THE ANTI-UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.
2. Opening date: 12 February 1968.
3. With the permission of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, the school will use premises at 49 Evington St.
4. Allen Kerbs is organizing secretary.
5. A sec will be hired on a part-time basis from the beginning of January.
6. 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 2 1/2 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.
7. It shall be mentioned in the catalogue that the Antiversity 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 meetings, 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 groups of interested people to present and discuss their current thoughts, work, etc.

   Final item for publicity amended from £500 to £150.
   Institute agrees to outright loan to antiu. 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:
   a. 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.
   b. Fund raising campaign to be initiated.

Stuart Montgomery remarks on his conversation with representative of OLC education authority. Money could possibly be advanced in courses to be offered there (not offered elsewhere) and school is a charity. Feeling was that this is a poor source for funds.
Dear Paul Goodman,

Stemming 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 Antiversity of London.

The purpose of the Antiversity 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 Antiumiversity 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]

Joseph Berke, M.D.
Organising Secretary.

[Note: The text is not fully legible due to the image quality. The original text is in English.]
MEETING OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE OF THE ANTIUNIVERSITY OF LONDON

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

IN ATTENDENCE: AK, JHB, SM, 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. Lounge, snack bar, maintenance - Peter Upwood
6. Secretary - to be hired as soon as possible Hours 9 to 7PM at Rivington St. M-Fri
7. Publicity - TP - Stuart - small piece already in past issue full page next one
8. Outside News - JHB - to do feature article
9. New Left Review - insert to be added to NLR ready within 2 weeks - AK
10. Melody Maker - add to be placed - AR £12 for 4 x 1"
11. Norway - Bob Priddy to be contacted by Noel and Axel

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 EC2

The post course is 10/- without reference.
John Latham: There should never have been an Antiuniversity

Flat Time House,

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 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 about the Pub at lunch time, and wouldn’t see 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.
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 flask 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 criticizing knowledge.

JL: Yes definitely, it’s not knowledge you see. Knowledge is served as or it is 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 phantasmal in what they can do. They are being more powerful every day.

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

JL: I barely remember it at all. I remember— everybody I knew 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 antiuniversity 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 Antiuniversity.
The Antihistory of London has been
faceted in response to the murder of a
bystander and political activism of the
early-20th-century leads known in London
and the heart of the British Isles. It works to
develop this2 aspect and form of experience
accessibility to PARTICIPATION in the
evils of the century and the continuing of
the Antihistory of London, at the heart of the
world. It is an antihistory in the true sense of
the word and is intended to promote a
different kind of activity and a commitment
from which it should never be stolen.

The Antihistory of London will be a new
publication for discussion, discovery, and society
and re-creation, it is intended as an ongoing
experiment in the development of conversations
and will be related to other similar projects
in literary, history, contemporary, and abstract
areas.
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’s political revolt was to be a non-hierarchical one, bypassing Marx and Engels whose adherents designated themselves as the ‘elect’ giving 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 appropriate, dare to exercise it. History will not overthrow national governments; it will outflank them. The cultural revolt is the necessary underpinning, the passionate substructure of a new order of things.’


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 combinatorial endeavours are crucial. The cultural revolt that Sigma adjoins 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 in 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 ‘classical’ theory in favour of more realistic methods in tune with contemporary 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 a ubiquitous ‘outlinking’ 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/men and wo/men, 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 of the effective substructure 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, supereceding present alienation by encouraging wo/men to ‘become responsible for their own biographies’. Trocchi saw such a task as incompatible with the outmoded 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 es-
asys, ‘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 their similar inter-personal format and the basic attitude underlying the whole Sigma experiment.

Trocchi’s other contributions to the Portfo-

folio include S.P.5: ‘General Informations Service’, a further outlining of situation and tactics; S.P.4: ‘Potlatch’, an attempt to set up a non-elitist interpersonal 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 Troc-

chi was a member, issued an information bulletin of the same name from 1954–57. The Sigma ‘Potlatch’ can perhaps be taken together with S.P.1: ‘The Moving Times’, a broadsheet/poster featuring the writing of William Burroughs and issued in Tangers. ‘The Moving Times’ were displayed in underground stations but rejected as it was by London Transport, it was mainly flyposted 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’.

Sigma as part of the ‘vanguard’, at least by virtue of its theory, was uncompromising in its rejection of ‘alien society’ and as such 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 critiques and in this respect Sigma echoes the desire for a truly human activity to be made possible beyond the boundaries of a refined reality intent on maintaining a repressive status quo. For Sigma, history is a perpetual state of incompleteness.

‘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 mathematic symbol denoting ‘all’ or ‘the sum of’ emphasizes 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)
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The Sigma Centre was to be an instrumental component of the ‘cultural re- boot’. Unless the Centre could take root in other countries close to capital cities so as to exert 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 social-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 subjugated intellects oper- ates 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.33)

Contrary to many endeavours of this kind Trochi and Sigma did not underestimate the influence of social-relations upon would-be participants, viewing it as imperative that these relations be combated 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.54)

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 en‑emy 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 egoism in nucleus members surely generated by competitive impulses. R.D. Laing in his Sigma Portfolio contribution, ‘The Present Situation’, S.P.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 attempts to establish a Therapeutic University for schizophrenics was greeted with enthusiasm from Trocchi, who also professed 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 antiuniversity. Michael de Freitas (Michael N), 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 connection 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 period of the late 1950s, but draws wider conclusions than its subject suggests. Within his essay Creeley rallies against the insistence with which critics attack predominant importance to form, subjugating content to fixed patterns in a manner suggestive of a fear of possibil- ity. This mode of literary criticism corre- sponds to the denial of experience, which is institutionalised in all sectors of society. Ceeley 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 relation- ship 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 organisation’. We have already mentioned the Lettrist and Situation- ist 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 Joan Littlewood (see above) whose ‘Leisuredrome’, as Trocchi calls it, relates to Sigma’s attach‑ ing importance to ambience and environ- mental possibilities: ‘We can take care that the structural fea‑ tures of our Sigma Centre are geared toward and inspiring of the future as we imagine it.’ (‘Tactical Blueprint’, p.33)

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-psychiatriy 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, ‘HIM Government and the Psychiatric Situation’ 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- muller’s, Mute Books.

This diagram also includes John Wesker’s Centre 42 and John Calder’s Writers Nights as other possibilities for reciprocal- ity, despite the criticism meted out to them within the Sigma Portfolio: Centre 42 for its parochial qualities and the Writers Nights for, in the words of Marcus Field, their promotion of ‘meaningless word games in the name of culture’. The Sigma Centre, indeed the whole project, was to try and find a line of the between viability and a more uncompromising position. In his ‘Invisible Insurrection...’ Trocchi uses Centre 42 as a springboard into outlining a more fundamental approach than that shown by the ‘insularity’ of Wesker’s views. Trocchi: ‘Our university must become a commu‑ nity of mind whose vital function is to discover and articulate the functions of tomorrow, an association of free wo/men creating a fertile ambience for new knowledge and understanding... the university must become a living model for society at large.’ (‘Tactical Blueprint’, p.34)

The last phrase is important in relation to Sigma’s aims and tactics, themselves, showing greater oppositional insights than both Wesker’s and Calder’s groupings. Here we see an example of Trocchi’s subversive technique whereby Sigma would use society’s own mechanisms against itself: the system’s worship of ‘individual genius’ and ‘innovatory tal‑ ent’ would be deflected in such a way as to attract society’s attention to these individuals who would not be working for themselves, but autonomously as part of Sigma’s ‘community of mind’. The involvement of respected intellectuals would be one way of lending legitimacy to the work of Sigma and it was hoped that the Sigma Centre (re: Sigma) could attain a form of ‘cultural monop‑ oly’ arising from an increasing number of artists, writers and intellectuals defecting to Sigma. This itself would force society to respond to a Sigma of such concentrated intellectual power, eventually leading to a position where the platform advocated by Sigma would provide startling contrasts to conventional ‘autistic’ society. Sigma’s influence would be felt as a result of its at‑ tempt to ‘discover and articulate the func‑ tions of tomorrow’, for example, Trocchi’s insistence on the arrival of ‘leisure-society’ as an area that the Project would be most suited to deal with. [...]
The Mental Furniture
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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 last 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 radical and original 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 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 Morris relates 'The Role of Drama in Questioning and Destroying Moribund Social Values'. Robin Blackburn (with Nicholas Krasno) gives a course on the 'Sociology of Revolution'—in essence, dealing with the CUBAN experience.

Although most anything can and is discussed at the ANTHOUNIVERSITY, we give particular emphasis to material which would 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 attracted gangs of people, anything from psychoactive drugs to 'underground' communications media to demonstrations of solidarity with the heroic National Liberation Front of Vietnam.

At the ANTHOUNIVERSITY we pay a lot of attention to the social structure of the place. We try to keep from becoming a mirror image of the fossilized institutions which we are attempting to replace. This is no easy matter. Fortunately, as the ANTHOUNIVERSITY has developed, many of the students have begun to play an active part in running things, 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 ANTHOUNIVERSITY as well. Among such events have been poetry readings; a discussion of Black Power led by Oba Eghana, 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 ANTHOUNIVERSITY is that people from all parts of the world who happen to be in London are constantly coming by 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 ANTHOUNIVERSITY when they are in London are part of our visiting faculty and include Stokely Carmichael, American revolutionary leader; C.L.R. James, distinguished historian and philosopher; Hans Enzensberger, 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 'Yippie's'; and Paul Sweezy, economist and editor of the Monthly Review.
In London the ANTINUVERSITY is the only university which students can attend without having first gone through the reified, class oriented British exam system. (Relevant to this is the fact that in England England only 5% of the population ever attends university, while 7% is admitted to mental hospitals.)

The ANTINUVERSITY 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 ANTINUVERSITY has become an important meeting ground for members of the 'NEW LEFT' from all areas of the world.

In just four months the ANTINUVERSITY 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 reverberate in 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 ANTINUVERSITY 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 ANTINUVERSITY OF LONDON, 49 Evinston St., London E.C.2.) We promise to continue and expand what we have begun, and in the spirit of CUBA. VENCEREMOS.
Free University of Love

At its first faculty meeting on a bright, sunny day, the Anti-University got off to an auspicious start. With music, camaraderie, and a general mood of defiance, ideologues and anarchists from across the country gathered at the University of Love, a former college campus just outside the city limits.

The meeting was filled with the usual suspects: poets, artists, radicals, and revolutionaries of all stripes. The atmosphere was charged with excitement and hope for the future.

Harold Norse

Three Views on the Anti-University (others invited)

- "We must create a new world, not just attack the old one." - Alexander Trocchi

- "The Anti-University is a manifestation of the broader anti-establishment sentiment that is sweeping the country." - Robert Tashere

- "The Anti-University is a space for us to come together and share our ideas, our dreams, and our desires." - Alexander Trocchi

Traditionally, college students have been encouraged to challenge the status quo and question the authority of their professors. But the Anti-University takes this one step further, providing a platform for students to express themselves freely and without restriction.

"One aspect of this movement," Trocchi said, "is the creation of a new society based on equality, cooperation, and mutual respect. The Anti-University is a microcosm of this new world, where everyone is free to express themselves and their ideas without fear of judgment."
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.

JB: And I was angry about that, since I was a doctor-in-residence at 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 14th 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, Jon Mellem, James Weiss, Stoughton Lynd, Gerald Long, 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 militarism, 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 lasted – FUND 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 constraining. And here we were just trying to open things up, opening a place to have a discussion 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 somewhere, that more than 200 people signed up in the beginning. How was a day at the Free University? Could you describe the kind of dynamism, social dynamism, 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 generalised area that was taken over by discussions, 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 they wanted. Some were invited to read their poetry specifically, like Susan Sherman and Diane Markowski, Allen Ginsberg, Gregory Corso, Calvin Hern, all the people there. These were very important poets, and still are. Not just run-of-the-mill people speaking 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 other 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 outrageous a title to even have catalogued. So we were trying to be outrageous and different. This is the tail-end 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 described, and you went to Kingsley Hall. What did you know of Kingsley Hall, what had you heard about Kingsley Hall from when you were in the States?
BLACK POWER

A Letter from Prison to my Black Brothers and Sisters

Thursday, February 22, 1968.

Being a man is the opinióning battle 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's. And for every Orangeburg, there must be a Dien Bien Phu.

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 TUSINDA KILASHEAA!
WE SHALL CONQUER WITHOUT SUBJECTION
- Rap Brown.

Antiuniversity Forum on BLACK POWER Saturday, March 23, 7:30 p.m.
Speakers include David Cooper, Obi Egbuna, Allen Krebs, Leon Addle, Bro. Young.
Admission free to members of the Antiuniversity community.
were all buddies from medical school. We ing was there – and when Laing wasn’t The community around Laing when La-

Laing. There were several communities.

JB: Yeah, the community was around

Laing. There were several communities.
The community around Laing when La-
ing 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.

had had a good group in medical school. Discussing social issues also. So this was like a forerunner of the Free University, and the Antinuniversity, it was our dis-

cussion group. Kingsley Hall was like a university in itself, like an antinuniversity. Because we had all sorts of courses there going on. Courses were run every four-
night, every two weeks, by New Left Review magazine, you had all the people from New Left Review magazine there...

JJ: What kind of courses were they?

JB: Discussions about politics and eco-

donomies and so forth.

JJ: 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 meet-
ingings and discussions going on, especially about organizing the Dialectics of Libera-
tion conference.

JJ: | 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 microeducationalist. 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 Marcuse was talking about. That’s what I tried to do with my book The Tyranny of Mores; or, malice through the looking-glass. Bringing together personal and social forces. That’s how they become macro social forces.

JJ: Coming from Kingsley Hall, what was the reason you wanted to make the Dialectics of Liberation Conference, if you had already a dis-

cussion 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, destruct-

ism, 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.

JJ: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 supposed, love which is unrequited, love which is stilted, turns into violence. And also love, of course, is the antidote to many destructive forces. De-

structive forces – I’m talking about envy, greed, and jealousy. And I would add nar-
cissism. Envy, greed and jealousy is what that kind of expertise. Just 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 express-

ing hatred. We have greed balanced by generosity, or jealousy balanced by compassion. We have jealousy go up, or greed go down. 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.

JJ: 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 seminars and all the discussions...

JB: That’s right.

JJ: 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 Antuniversity of London essentially began with the Dialec-
tics conference. That was the first event of the Antinuniversity, and the Antinuniversity 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 Hill and around the area and 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.

Towards we broke into smaller groups, which were led by group lead-
ers 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 lead-
ers, 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 anoth-
er speaker and the whole thing continued again.

JJ: Who became the seminar leaders?

JB: People like myself, also Leon Redler and Morton Schatzman, other psycholo-
gists and psychiatrists and psychoanalysts. So people 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.

JJ: How did you break down the specialisa-
tion 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 bro-
down into political expertise, or this kind of expertise. Just a group of familiar-

ity with it. And the seminar groups were groups of about twenty.

JJ: The quality of these discussions, could you describe it a little bit? What was the dy-
namic 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 some-
thing, they would bring it up and then it would be brought around, ‘what did this 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?

JJ: In relation to Black Power, there was a lot of friction and difference.

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 we’re trying to be discussed then, such as we saw in the po-
lice forces in England at the time. There was beginning to be a discussion about it. Now there’s a bigger discussion about it.

JJ: You yourself were hosting what was called the Anti-Institution seminar.

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

JJ: Like the Antinuniversity...

JB: Yes, the Antinuniversity. The Ant-
inuniversity 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 brilliant intellectu-
als 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 discus-
sion that had started at the Dialectics. You have to go to the grandchild generation
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Nuttall</td>
<td>Honig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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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 Antiuiversity 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, Coates, Dine, Dorn, Ergunent (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.
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 R. Bleuler 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 Satten, Madans and the Family by R. D. Laing and A. Esterson, Tavistock Publications, 1959) and its conclusion, that schizophrenia is not a disease in one person but rather a sad way in which whole families function, then one realises the meaning social problem presented by this disease or perhaps pseudo-disease. For the emerging view is that acute schizophrenia is not a disease process or at least undetermined somatic or psychological causes, but rather that it is a microcosm of the human 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 psychiatric ward is that we must understand very clearly the nature of this sort of violence. We must understand how the patient becomes misapplied by others and then progressively invalidated as an autonomous person. The invalidation must not be continued in the ward and staff must begin to change this pattern into the traditional covert collusion with the patient's family. In the past this collusion has often meant that staff become implicated in a progressive violence that 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 schizophrenic problem, why not explore this contradiction by getting up in the heart of a mental hospital an experimental unit which theoretically could be in some sense an anti-hospital? It was agreed that we should do this at our hospital -- a large mental hospital of 3,000 patients just southwest of London. After a year during which staff were selected and emotionally prepared, we commenced the unit in January 1962 with 19 male patients in it, until that time, have been the inpatients was ward. About two thirds of the patients had been diagnosed as schizophrenics and they were adolescent or young adult men. In the second year the unit expanded into a bed ward. Both wards were close to the administrative center of the hospital.

We had one central conviction, founded on repeated unhappy experiences with conventional psychiatric admission wards that before we can have any chance of understanding what goes on in the patient's life the staff must have to be at least given some elementary awareness about what goes on in themselves. We therefore aimed to explore in our own day to day work the whole range of preconceptions, prejudices and fantasies that staff have about each other and about the patients.

This is 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 -- disturbances, disintegration, violence, contamination. The staff defences,ustered as they are erected against history rather than real dangers may be collectively termed institutional irrationality. What, then, is the reality of madness in the modern hospital and what is illness? What are the defining criteria 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 armed men and thrust into a straitjacket 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 straitjackets and padded rooms are on the way out, but it is no less true that the writer saw a patient, kicking and screaming in a straitjacket, carried by several policemen with the observation that only to dismiss the policemen and remove the straitjacket to end the patient's violent reactions.

Today psychiatrists resort to chemical restraints -- sedatives and tranquillizers -- and to electroconvulsive therapy. The effect of these heroic measures, however, is much the same if they are used, as they often are, without any responsible explanation. The speculation is that there is danger in it which must be controlled. Patients who are very sensitive to drug reactions often dislike 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 not have tranquillizers but simply that there should be clarity in the mind of the doctor and of the patient about the dosage. There rarely is. The meaning of this situation is one too often lost in the quasi-medical mystique of "illness" and "treatment." Why should 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 anxious about what you are going to do next?"

One of the commonest stuff fantasies in mental patients -- negative ones, if patients are not coerced verbally or physically into getting out of bed at a certain hour in the morning and being confined to bed again until they return is to be quieted. This is a staff anxiety over non-conformism with the time regulation is given their own lives.

The patient is the individual who frightened aspect of themselves that sometimes he does not want to get out of bed in the morning and come to work. It is obvious true that if they succeeded at the time regulation they would get to work.

In the past the patient has probably depended entirely on his father's ability to get him up. Shortly prior to his admission he has often been told against this enforced dependency by what for various reasons, he has only course available to him, namely staying in bed, despite his father's efforts to get him up. This withdrawal is often one of the "waiting symptoms" of schizophrenia.

In the hospital one can repeat the family patterns, that is to say the family's dependent needs by getting him up; this is really getting up FOR HIM. Or one can take him to the leaving the decision to him in the hope that he will one day GET UP HIMSELF. In fact, after many years of discussion of this issue in the unit and a great deal of practice difference between the two methods, it was found that if the ground was and our cautionary procedures were abandoned and patients left to get up themselves they invariably rise, even if the usual once they were given the chance they would spend most of the day in bed or sitting in a chair. No doctor saw an hour and a half after all and the gain in personal autonomy normal worldwide.

We had begun to question the ancient isolation. --
ANTI-HOSPITAL

This is the only thing that is really good about the sanatorium movement (destructionist, masturbation, promiscuity) for idle hands, but were not certain that we went from there. Work projects would at least form a group, make a happy ward family. But for patients and families who worked until we got away from the sanatorium.

The work was done without enthusiasm and the staff soon began to realize the irrelevance to the real problems of anger. People had real reasons to be angry with the hospital staff and to take issue with the hospital's approach. The staff began to feel that they were not making a contribution to the healing process.

There was a progressive blurring of roles between nurses, doctors, occupational therapists, and patients which obscured the focus on a number of disturbing and apparently paradoxical questions: for example, can patients "treat" other patients and can they even treat staff? The staff soon became quite frank and acknowledged that there were common areas of loss, anxiety, and illness, and that these needs were important. If they did what would happen next and who would control it?

It was at this point that the most radical departure from the conventional psychiatric work was initiated. If the staff rejected prescribed ideas about their function and if they did not quite know what to do next, why do anything? Why not withdraw from the whole field of hospital activity and become "private" in the sense of organizing patients into groups that they would involve themselves in relationships without the medication or medication? This shift in position of medical staff was extraordinarily difficult. After two years of work centered largely on this issue, we have barely shifted at all in the unit -- but we have shifted a little.

It was during the "experimental" phase of staff withdrawal that the staff group was able to make some advances. The advances made by the staff group were primarily in recognizing the inadequacy of their own behavior and, in the doctor's absence, to arrive at a group decision to replace some staff controls on what went on in the ward. The ward was divided into supervisory teams and work groups. Staff were allowed to continue with this work and continue to work on significant issues outside the group meetings and attend to the needs that had previously been addressed by a "battalium," a small group work team.

This leads us to the central problem of the psychiatric hospital: distinguishing between adequate and inadequate authority. The "official" practices of psychiatry in this country, whatever their progressive mantle, may not, alone or even without the authorization of the rigid, stereotyped (a)macrophages and needs of authority persons who repress the patient's individuality and alienates social expectations and hidden intentions as to who and what he may be. The authority of the authority person is granted by arbitrary social definition rather than on the basis of any real expertise he may possess. If staff have the courage to shift themselves from the false position in which they discover real sources of authority in themselves. They may also discover such sources of authority in the others who are defined as their patients.

This begins to get disturbing -- particularly when the patients sometimes happen to be those who are clinically the most parochial in the world. One of the most memorable group meetings in the unit was dominated by an extremely fragmented patient who was first bringing a lengthy project of reintegration that the ward staff and patients were put into a kind of a "sensory," a small group work team.

The ward became a sort of collective infant at the breast of the mother-caretaker. I made a formal comment to the ward staff that intervention was necessary. At a certain point indicated by the caretaker, everyone gathered themselves and into the fantasy awareness to find themselves on a more integrated level of group reality. And there was no doubt about who had led them there.

The need for a fully autonomous unit in which these things may happen is clear.
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 finding ourselves, and deinstitutionalising 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: You’re looking at something 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. Like the process of making an institution. While in a tribal gathering, maybe, or in a commune sometimes, individual actions and intentions are more clear. 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 better breeding ground for wisdom. I was thinking of the story of Mozart 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 at 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 also 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. ‘Anti’ meant anti-authority. There was a teacher, and there were students, and the students just had to take in what the teacher said without questioning them. In our seminars, everything was open to question. Initially, in the Antiuniversity, we had the question of how do you define a school and how do you define a teacher? Some courses were very popular, so most participants were teachers in other courses. The teachers became students, and the students became teachers.

How do you pass on wisdom? In a normal institution or university, one of the functions is to pass on knowledge. But what we were trying to do was find a way to pass on wisdom. And that’s much harder, that’s much more elusive. That depends on relationships, that depends on the style of a person, the experience of a person.

So, in technological courses, how do you make a radio? It’s knowledge, how to make a radio: you put this and this together, you’ve got a radio. So you have ten lectures on how to make a radio. But then how do you determine what should be broadcast? What should be broadcast and what shouldn’t be broadcast? That’s wisdom. So one of the discussions had to do with, really, wisdom. Also, a lot of the ideals of the Antiuniversity, had to do with making it easier for people to have access to knowledge. We have the Open University here, which is fine, most of the learning is done by yourself at home. Just like when we were talking about the Antiuniversity, well, there should have less of Antiuniversities all over the country. Antiuniversities in a truck, things like that.

JJ: So you saw an institution as a rigid structure, that you would do away with?

JB: Authority structure. But this also...

I had a conversation with the editor of the book Culture Against Man, who wrote the book Culture Against Man. Schools keep children stupid; Hospitals kill off people, make them sick, and so forth. So that’s why we talk about ‘anti’. Trying to get to a place where if you couldn’t do any good, you didn’t do any harm.

JJ: But also in the negativity of the ‘anti’, there is a certain openness. You don’t want to define a new structure, it’s more experimental, you could say. If you negate the existing power structures without setting up a new one...

JB: Yeah. And we found out that that’s impossible. As soon as you have group relations with people, you have a power structure. You have egos. You have people who are more dominant than others, and more outspoken than others. So as soon as you have that, then you have a power struggle. Or people do more, people who are willing to attend more meetings. And then you have people who attack this, and say ‘why should you be the secretary, why should you be in charge, making the decisions?’ So if you want to spread the decision-making process, you have to have more meetings, and things take time. Eventually people get tired of this.

JJ: But that was maybe also the conclusion of the anti-institutions, in a way, that new structures will somehow appear that might be better.

JB: That’s right, and people had to think about, well, how do you anti-university, and so forth. How do you negate the gap.

JJ: Just to return to the formation of the Antiuniversity, you established a committee to discuss...

JB: Whom we would invite, how we would finance it, where it would be, what we would talk about, who would be teaching, how do we publicise it – much easier now than then. I mean, nowadays, it’s easier through the internet and through Twitter, Facebook, things like that.

JJ: But what did you do, then, somehow to publicise it?

JB: Word of mouth, and then making posters and putting them around. So it takes time to do that. Nowadays, you can pretty much start an Antiuniversity in a week. Then, it took months.

JJ: The building at Rivington Street, that was rented to you from the Bertrand Russell Foundation.

JB: Yeah. It was just through the good graces of Randolph Steadman, I mean, that we got it.

JJ: Did you get a cheap rent?

JB: As I remember, yes. We very much hoped to reach out to working people, to working-class people. And black people, immigrant people. And, as I remember, working-class people weren’t interested in it at all. They just wanted to stay at the pub. Some black people came, if they were interested in Stokey... But people interested in discussions about racism and this and that, together. I don’t think took off.

JJ: What about Juliet Mitchell on the committee?

JB: She covered feminism. I think there were women who were interested in 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 had what we called ‘Tings’. A ‘ting’ was more a communal get-together, wasn’t it?

JJ: It was informal, unstructured.

JB: Yeah, and maybe that was missing, in the end, from the university in London, there wasn’t enough of this. When we’d established Kingsley Hall and then the Arbour Association, the Arbour’s Crisis Centre, we always tried to have bi-monthly meetings where someone spoke and a topic was discussed in depth and something like that.

JJ: I guess the Antiuniversity also became a social space where people were hanging out.

JB: That’s right, yeah. And there were a lot of crazies there. When I mean ‘crazies’, I mean affectionately, and hostilely. The hostile crazies were those who argued about everything, that would attend the meetings, talk just because they wanted to hear themselves, and so forth. They were disruptive. Affectionately, because some people they just talked a lot and 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 communies were there, in large apartments. They were stayed by amphetamine. Terrible. But grass is all right. Alcohol is difficult. Too much boozee 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 copy of the first Brochure, 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 the Antiuniversity, 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 and Freud.

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: We, in that year, 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.

JJ: So there was a more practical...

JB: Yeah, yeah. Mixture of the practical and the experimental 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’. We didn’t.

JJ: ‘I’m of course interested in this school where there were artists – like Cornelius Cardew, John Latham, Edward Dorn; a group of psychiatrists – you, Laing, Cooper, Redler and others; and then there were more political people. I’m less interested, 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 it that 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 most of us, life was love. But after a year or two, the labour of love wore thin. People wanted to get paid, people couldn’t live on that. So that’s how things begin to break down. You had to have a certain number of students to pay, to get money in, to pay the rent and that. And other people didn’t pay anything at all.
YOU AND THE ANTI-U

These past four months have proved that an anti-university can survive, it can even grow. The question is: in what direction?

We feel it is necessary to pass our birth and commit ourselves to a new community development. Any organization 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.

At this juncture we find ourselves feeling strongly the possibilities for new growth:—

- an increase in direct contact, founded on something more than the present teacher/student role relationships;
- an increase in the participation of all members in decision-making and planning;
- an increase in communication and cooperation between classes, with an eye towards a more critical appraisal of the various courses.

Perhaps these developments cannot come about without real qualitative changes: an end to the distinctions between ‘student’ ‘teacher’, ‘administration’, and all that implies socially and financially.

These are some suggestions as to how the Anti-university can develop. No doubt there are many more. For this reason,

A GENERAL MEETING

will be held on

SATURDAY MAY 11

AT 2:30

at the Anti-university

and the hall of Shoreditch Parish Church

ALL THOSE INTERESTED IN THE FUTURE OF THE ANTI-UNIVERSITY ARE INVITED TO ATTEND.

Pay the students

Choose the teachers

More teachers
antiuiversity of london
49 rivington street
shoreditch e c 2
739 6957

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 Beanier, Bill Mason or Leon Radier). The Antiuiversity has 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 and weekend of July 13th/14th : Eroticism - conducted by Aaa Benveniste and Stuart Montgomery, with Jeff Nuttall and Steve Dwoskin in attendance. Details of times etc will be available later.

*Counteruniiversity meetings will in future be held on Fridays at 8.30. The next one will be held on Friday July 5th. These are general meetings of anyone interested to come along, to consider the progress of the Antiuiversity 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 Counteruniiversity 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 Antiuiversity. 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 Antiuiversity is not in a position, financially, to pay members of the faculty automatically this session.)

Calculations seem to suggest that each member of the Antiuiversity 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 a ‘teacher’ and a ‘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 that notion of a commune, or, people moved in and started to live in the building at Rivington Street... I found some newsletters describing the Antiuniversity. At Rivington Street you met some people you really struggle with in their own way. Which is, of course, who gets paid for what is part of the Antiuniversity. A lot of the best teachers are actually mental patients, and some of the worst students are psychiatrists.

John: I have had the possibility to look into the papers of the Antiuniversity, and I could also see that after the first quarter, there was a call for a meeting where there was a critique of the fee structure and a critique of the payment to the teachers. Do you recall that, or discussions about the structure coming from inside the Antiuniversity? John: Well, there was a lot of talk about ‘should we pay teachers?’ We also had discussions about ‘should we pay students to learn?’ Now, in all these cases. In impoverished areas you pay students, you pay kids to learn. In New York they have that now. Wasn’t so common then. Of course, who gets paid for what is part of an authority or power structure. But fortunately, or unfortunately, we didn’t have to worry about that so much. We didn’t have enough money to pay for anything. John: I’m interested in the whole experimental nature of the Antiuniversity and the anti-institution in the way you were opening up a discussion of everything.

John: The whole experimental nature is based on a discussion about relationships. I mean, it has to do with the communicative nature of the experiment. And what we struggled with, it was not different from what various communnes are struggling with, and what other groups struggle with in their own way. Which is, people trying to look at relationships, and learn from them. And not try to create a social structure based on individual hierarchy. It’s quite difficult, as we discovered. We anti-anti’ed ourselves to death, you know. [laughs]

John: But what I was also thinking, in terms of the concrete. At Rivington Street you met every second week, with your ‘Anti-Institution’ seminar. How many people were there? Do you remember anything, like images, situations?

John: I think about fifteen. We had lively discussions about… That’s a generalisation. I don’t remember much the specific content of the discussions. I mean, after all, it only lasted for about 40 years ago. John: But what about your role as a teacher in this situation? John: My role as a teacher was to be there, and to inspire, to communicate, to inform. To hold things together. That was the essence of it, in my view. The anti-institution began in its sixties incarnation, pre-Dialectics of Liberation, at Kingsley Hall. And Kingsley Hall was like a commune. So I don’t remember if Rivington Street became a commune, but you could say the commune became the Antiuniversity. [laughs]

John: But I also understood it was not a problem, and I guess it’s not against the idea of the university that people are living there.

John: No, not at all.

John: But let me mean, also at Kingsley Hall, and what could it have meant at Antiuniversity, that you lived there, and stayed and slept, and had an everyday inside the institution?

John: I think the word ‘antiuniversity’ is a bit dated now. It’s not that we’re ‘antiuniversity’, it’s just what are we for? 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.

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

John: That’s right. Yeah. Coming out of antagonism, coming out of love, coming out of sharing.

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

John: 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 very hostile, 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.

John: And what decides in what direction a community like that will go?

John: Well, some people would say the grace of god. Other people would say it depends on good luck. Other people would say it depends on the balance of good people you have in the tent, so to speak, in the tribal tent. If you have too many disruptive and destructive people, nothing’s going to happen.

John: You talked about therapy as being ‘micro-social’, and society being ‘macro-social’. If you should compare therapy with education, teaching, how would you do that?

John: ‘Therapy’ is an over-used word. I think it refers to a different kind of engagement, where one’s trying to heal another person’s soul or relationships. I think therapy can take place educationally-wise too, but usually isn’t thought of that way. When I think healing does take place it’s when the teacher is enabled to convey wisdom.

John: How would you define wisdom?

John: Being able to gain a meta-perspective on events. A kind of teaching which allows you to see that your own lone indescribable suffering is not alone. Not the only thing happening. Know when to fight, know when to smile.

John: And something that can be learned?

John: I think so. Or it can be conveyed. You might not act on the knowledge, but it can be conveyed. I mean, I’m a good fighter as well. [laughs] But I have to know when to curb myself and when to smile. And when to shut up. So that wisdom... sometimes, as an experience, you learn it when you talk too much – one talks too much. It just muddles things. Silence is also very powerful.

John: I also wanted to ask you regarding community, and formal and informal power structures within 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?

John: It all depends on the people and the egos involved. Whether people want to subordinate their egos to a general good. It can be the case. John: And something that can be learned?

John: 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, like a bit of chaos, otherwise it becomes too solid, too entrenched. John: 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.

John: You can’t. The surroundings is our context, even if you live in a beautiful building in the country. You can keep it at bay and keep it on a distance for a while, but there are always interfaces going on. I think Langa 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 country. [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 ‘whack! whack! whack!’ And that’s really great for getting out aggression, and for exercise. I’d recommend making bread.

John: It might also be what you call the ‘micro-social’ relations, having practical things…

John: 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.

Joseph Berke is an individual and family psychotherapist who lives and works in North London. He is the author of many articles and books.

Image of Berke at the Dialectics of Liberation Congress by Peter Davis, 1967.
* Sensitivity Training Group - ours 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 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 8.30.

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

* Chamberlain 8.30 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 Antiumiversity 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 Antiumiversity 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 onslaught of science and technology on ecological systems, is prepared to meet with people at the Antiumiversity. 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 some direct connection between my eyes 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. Now 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 Antiumiversity on Sunday June 30th at 3 p.m. It is hoped that regular showings of underground films at the Antiumiversity may soon become a possibility.

* Items for the next news letter should be sent in soon.
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 meeting, that seemed doomed to be an administrative meeting of demoralizing the forces for major structural change, never turned from the atmosphere of complete sovereignty in the hands of the members present and not even when a key member of the upper administration entered. True, he took a seat in the outer circle was distant from the microphone while taping the meeting. But if the meeting had continuously evolved from the first one, his location, wherever that was, would have determined context. For the last dialogue was one between rebellious children and a stern, autocratic, though understandable 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 participation 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 showing the vele 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 "thems." 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 "thems" upon whom we blamed everything no longer existed. The question of the finances, the question of the this and the that of the past no longer held allure. The rebels had no longer to debunk the "thems" via the past screw-ups and 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 that power possibility has sprung into reality. We're interested in growing in all the wild dances this spinning earth confusedly throws off. We're not interested in prescribing a moral code of behaviour or a standard of excellence that would land us into a narcissistic bag of growing on 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. Only you can talk for yourself. We're going to have a 2-day weekend get-together in Regents Park July 6 or 7, so that in face-to-face contact we, as equal members, can personally commit ourselves to the creation of courses. Some of us will be interested in the standard teacher-student course groove and for them 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 be needed continuously. 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 it!
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
739 69 51 Old Street Tube

Martin Segal
236 PORTOBELLORO, W, 11. BAY
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
Richard Hamilton is to give his second talk on the work of Marcel Duchamp on Friday, June 26th, at 7:30 PM in the basement at 49 Wellington Street. The talk will focus on Duchamp's contribution to art education and the influence of his work on later artists. Hamilton's previous talk on Duchamp was well-received, and it is anticipated that this event will attract a large audience.

Richard Hamilton is a renowned art historian and curator, known for his expertise in modern and contemporary art. His forthcoming talk will be part of a series of lectures on various artists and movements, held in the university's art history department. This event is open to students and faculty, as well as the general public interested in the arts.

For more information or to RSVP, please contact the university's art history department at 511-123-4567. Tickets are available online at the university's website or at the door on the day of the event.
* John Chamberlain
American sculptor &
maker
doesn't know
hadn't any
couldn't, but
maybe might
have been
credited
with some
chaos transfer-
ed. I think.

* 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 "Meat 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 Antiumiversity itself INTENSIVE number of
meetings for 1 month, 24th June to July 24th

BRIEF NOTES: Portable typewriter missing from Office. Anyone
know it's whereabouts? Needed another bulletin board. Any offers?
Speakers on the Antiumiversity needed to go to far towns to
partake 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
Antiumiversity could well be incorporated in future issues of
this Newsletter. Longer views and Statements on What the Anti-
university 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
Antiumiversity
25 June, 1968

Bob Cobbing Esq,
The Antiuniversity,
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 Antiuniversity 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 £43.18.0. 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 university anno 2012

The Common Room, Senate House, University College London, May 3, 2012

Jakob Jakobsen: I hope this is just going to be an informal conversation. But of course it would be good if we could reflect on this kind of basic concept of the university under present conditions and also that 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 few years, particularly the last two, three years.

Danny Hayward: I'm Danny, I'm a PhD student at Birckbeck 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'm encouraged to. That is probably enough biography.

Jacob Bard-Rosenberg: I'm Jacob, I'm also a PhD at Birckbeck 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 Antouniversity of London. It was an experimental university in the late sixties. This institution was set up by different players. 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 Antouniversity. 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 elucidate, on how the university works today, or perhaps what it can be, 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 Birckbeck, 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 Birckbeck were paid to take a ten-week training course, which they needed to take if they were to become Associate Tutors, adjunct staff within the faculty. However, recently Birckbeck brought its pay scale into line with most other English institutions by reducing the payment to PhD students who take the course from £100 to nothing. Birckbeck is able to do this because it 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 students to undergo what they will in any event 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 horizon. I didn't have any hope 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, who very apologetically prefaced his discussion of the postgraduate structure extended well into the session — with an account of what has happened in UK higher education in the last three years, which was of course an advance to everyone there. But what needed to be explained to the students and aspirant teachers was that the restructuring of the system, the flattening, the demarcation, the transformation has changed, the structure has been reformed, this was out of their hands, it was out of anyone's hope to prevent it, given that it is inevitable that and since their careers are individual careers, and not collective careers after all, since who thinks about 'collective careers', their task was just to 'get on with it'. And so, having an exhausting and extended ethical debate about the positive and negative features of the reforms seemed to be redundant, superefficient, to be a waste of their time, in short, when what they ought to be speaking about is how they might best inculcate in themselves and actualize in attitudes which are required of them. There was a great pass for conformity in the room.

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 is 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. This is more concerning than just initial training programs, but there is a very serious demand that structured employment within institutions is not improved by systems of continuing professional development but, rather, monitored and controlled by them.

JJ: What does that mean, this professional development?

JB-R: It means that you as an academic will, or your institution will, continually pay for you to go on centrally-run courses. And it may have impacts on, for example, provisions of teaching, on national standards in teaching. Which ultimately won't be to do with standards, they'll be to do with controlling anyone who doesn't want to do what the government decides is in the customer interest of students.

MV: It's very much framed in terms of the student's demand, fraught to do with the career development, the emancipation of 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 administrators to restructure both department-wide and individual teaching loads, administrative duties for instructors. Also, it's used to designate... 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 REF — the Research Excellence Framework, which has replaced the Research Assessment Exercise. So the point I was just making, in this very dilatory way, 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 indicative 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 resituting a highly centralised, opaque, micro-managerial and intractable culture of governance onto the present 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 somewhat paid off. Which every 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 resituted not 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, very, more and more, the National Student Survey is related to the wider university funding is complicated as it stands anyway.

J: 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 is the interest that? Is that? Is that? Is that?

MV: So the point is that the student'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 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. The process of universities, or departments, becomes more 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 for universities 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 onto this course.’ Otherwise 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 transformed into wage workers, nothing we appear to be exempted from, even the beneficiaries of, the process of discipline applied to university teachers. But still, plainly, that’s not the case as far as 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 students. They become a channel for the discipline from government and financial institutions. So they experience discipline and they displace it.

DH: Sure. But the point is that students are controlled perfectly well by market demands, and it’s not necessary to create a third discipline in a situation where their behaviour in addition to the market.

MV: But it is. Those institutions will proliferate.

DH: Of course. But maybe they are more markedly present at the moment in the university sector in their function as means of disciplining the disciplines.

MV: Yeah, it’s an axiom of New Public Management that the more market discipline you introduce, the more oversight agencies you need to monitor quality.

DH: But the list of scheduled mediations will be something like market demand and determines student demand; student demand is monitored, analysed and measured, and then is converted into norms which regulate the behaviour of tutors, academics, course administrators. All of the people who have a pedagogical or information role in the reproduction of the university as a system in which people can learn. Market demand as a straightforward means of coercion is pretty well obliterated by means of that chain of apparently only bureaucratic measuring institutions.

JB-R: It’s also worth dwelling on the fact that ultimately there’s no way that a student can behave to withdraw themselves from becoming this space where market demand enters the university. As a student, regardless of what they do, when they are a student, basically through their bank accounts they’ve forced into this position. And they’re not in a position to say ‘well, I’m not paying my fees’. This is not an issue. For the majority of students, even the most antagonistic student, to be a student, is forced to introduce market demand.

JJ: ‘Market demand’ is like the labour market, like, future job possibilities, or...

JB-R: Or buying commodities, which is closed in a way, which hapless universities now.

JJ: But I guess it’s qualifying you to have a certain kind of profession.

MV: Well, education is the commodity that develops you as a commodity in the labour market. So it’s the commodity which enhances the value of you as a future worker for them. Even the most antagonistic student, to be a student, is forced to introduce labour commodity in most cases now, especially now.

JJ: So a student is not only a consumer but also a commodity within this system.

MV: Yes, especially when the funding comes from the students.

DH: There’s an ontology attached to this. The student becomes the bearer of his or her degree, which is what entitles him or her to compete for particular jobs. Of course, entitlement to compete is not an entitlement to get...

JB-R: [laughs]

DH: Even meaningful entry into competition requires significant initial outlay on the behalf of the student who wishes to enter that domain.

MV: US$ 50,000 at my old university.

DH: That vocabulary then mushrooms outwards so that students are bearers of degrees, but also, students with scholarships – as far as they still exist, and their numbers are dwindling and will continue to dwindle – are students attached to the structure of employment. They don’t need to ‘plug in’ degrees to students, they need to ‘plug in’ qualifications that allow for higher earnings into the student’s bank account. The student is written out of this equation very early on: at the point of application, aged seventeen.

JJ: What does it mean, that there’s two parts of university – there’s the teaching, bringing on a certain tradition of knowledge, a certain profession, but there’s also the research...

JB-R: Less and less.

JJ: …you are, I guess, as PhDs, also doing research...

JB-R: One of the things about the structures, to make it more concrete, we might talk about the structure of the seminar. It seems very clear that the marketisation of education has had a hugely pacifying effect on the possibility of a seminar taking place in university now. Where once there might have been heterogeneous discussion, students have become totally submissive and passive with regard to authority or teachers in that setting. A seminar is no longer a place for debate and discussion, but rather a place where you can be given a bit of knowledge. The seminar has degenerated into a lecture almost always. This is the concrete experience of people across the arts and humanities, I don’t know about elsewhere, over the last decade or so.

That doesn’t mean that demanding a seminar might be a site of struggle, unfortunately.

JJ: Is there a process of people setting up their own seminars?

JB-R: I guess the sites of struggle are most apparent are struggles over space, over seminar rooms. Common rooms have disappeared. Staff rooms have disappeared. Any communal space that might have existed for the type of productive academic work that exists outside the possibility of regulation have disappeared. Where they haven’t disappeared, they’ve become changed into something different. Information from what might have been the universal, interdisciplinary character of the university to the Customer Help Desk that can help with any of your problems but not really help academically. But it’s somewhere to go if you have a problem, at least. [laughs]
arrangements being made at Rivington 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 Rivington 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

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, M., 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 Battersby / Leon Redler / Roger Gottlieb
  Time and Timelessness
- Bob Cobbing / Anna Lockwood
  Composing with Sound
- David Cooper's Seminar
- Roberta Elsey Berke
  On Finnegans Wake
- Guerilla Poetry Workshop

(...over)
COMMUNITY SERVICES

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES, 32 Fyfield Crescent, NW1, PAR 58SS. Daily 5.30pm. Free legal advice for county & magistrates court proceedings, free advice for personal injury cases. Young addicts in need of help. Advice as well as crisis & acute distress, especially holidays.

LAW SOCIETY (Legal Aid), 118 Chancery Lane, WC2, 2462122.

LONDON WELFARE OFFICE FOR THE HOMELESS, 20 Northumberland Ave., WC2. INTERACTION TRUST, 72 Cheapside, EC2, 9229. Benefit performances; interaction offers performances by its players at Ambleside to active community groups.各種Who's Who, 1137 Old Compton Street, W1, 9229. Books & model boats available to groups doing community arts, crafts work with kids. Insurance requirements must be met. Other groups can ask about us as well.

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES, 18 High St., NW4, E5 7456. If you believe that the treatment you have received at the hands of the authorities is unjust, call them. Their fund is built from you, so why not join for £2 per year?

OXFORD: BIT Information service – 24 hour. Tel. 84536.

BIT IS your information/assistance service. Tel. 229 8215 (24 hour service).

RELEASE: C.4 602-8554. If you are doctored for drugs, information and advice is given about: arrests, drug dealing, diversion, immigration, civil rights and any other procedures. Research & reference library to unaided countries. No interest, no legal aid. Books, tapes, books wanted. C.4 at 59 Princeps St. Hours 9.30am-5.30pm weekdays, Sat. 11am-3pm. Monday & Thursday for TV, coffee and relief service.

DIGGERS medicine at Arts Lab: free & confidential service & advice for medical problems. 140 Shaftesbury Ave, WC2, 220455.

CITIZENS ADVICE BUREAU, 12 Great Portland St., WC1, 380-0768. Advice about housing, social security, etc. for people who are coming to work in London.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, Euston Rd, W1. 10-12pm for information about courses, seminars & meetings.

FREE NATIONAL character analysis/psychometry for the chronically poor, 874-0035 for details.

SEMINARS on drugs at Justice every Tues. at 5.30, Anna’s Cafe, 8a Great St. Martin’s Ln, WC2, 367-2406. for details.

DISCHARGED PRISONERS, The Catholic Benevolent Club provide accommodation at 92 Northumberland Ave, W1. for married people at 17 Roth well St., JR, 7203. for single.

LONDON PREGNANCY ADVISORY SERVICE 529-97579.

CONCILIATION & MILITARY SERVICE – The voluntary body for advice on the rights of conscientious objectors is the Committee of the E.C.L.Co., 55-65, Euston Rd., WC1.

DRAFT COUNSELLING SERVICE: Up with the draft – 09 support, 15 Canada St, London WC2, 262-6422. Open Thursdays only, 10am-6pm, E. screening service, 273-1976.

LONDON SCHOOL OF NON-VIOLENCE in the name of St. Helen & St. Mary’s, Fleet St., London. Non-violent politics with Richard Kinnon. Thursdays 10am-12pm. The Place. Thursdays 7pm with Jeffrey Ash. Thursdays 10am-12pm. 6.30pm.

LONDON ARTS LAB
182 Marylebone Rd, W1P

LONDON ARTS LAB
182 Marylebone Rd, W1P


FILMS
Mixture of underground (from 4.30pm onwards: double screen screenings; junk film; erotic;"


succeeds, we shall eventually count the antiuniversity. Psychology lesson.
Antiuniversity of London – Antihistory Tabloid
All material compiled and edited by Jakob Jakobsen, researcher and associate at MayDay Rooms. The Antihistory blog, where data-mining around the Anti-university and related initiatives is ongoing, can be found at antihistory.org. This tabloid is produced in collaboration with MayDay Rooms (maydayrooms.org) and the PETT Archive and Study Centre (pettarchive.org), which hosts papers from the Institute of Phenomenological Studies and the Antiuniversity of London. Additional material has been retrieved from various archives and personal collections. Thanks to Joseph Berke for allowing us to copy the London Anti-university papers. Thanks to Flat Time House for allowing use of images from the Sigma meeting organised by Alexander Trocchi in 1964. Thanks to Peter Davis for allowing use of images from the Dialectics of Liberation Congress of 1967. The Antihistory Tabloid will be available for free at MayDay Rooms, London, the PETT Archive and Study Centre, Gloucestershire, the And And And Platform/Documenta 13, Kasel, and other spaces interested in the histories of struggle. Copy-edited by Howard Slater, Marina Vishmidt, and María Berrios. Designed by Jakob Jakobsen, assisted by Åge Eg Jørgensen. Published by MayDay Rooms, London, 2012. Thanks to Ayreen Anastas, Jacob Bard-Rosenberg, María Berrios, Robin Blackburn, Gillian Boal, Iain Boal, John Cunningham, Anthony Davies, Peter Davis, Stephen Dwoskin, Craig Fees, Nour Fog, Leigh French, René Gabrie, John Haynes, Danny Hayward, Emma Heddit, Henriette Heise, Michael Horowitz, Jacki Immiry, Åge Eg Jørgensen, Mai Kjærsgaard, Martin Levy, Roy Lisker, Rob Lucas, Pauline van Mourik Broekman, Leon Redler, Morton Schatzman, Howard Slater, Fabian Tompsett, Clare Louise Staunton, Barbara Steveni, Marina Vishmidt.