# Contents


Chapter 1: THE PEOPLE'S UNIVERSITY, MYTH AND PERCEPTION. ..... 1
Principles. ..... 1
The Charter and its Interpretation. ..... 2
Myth and Perception. ..... 3
The Concept of University Tenure. ..... 4
Abuse of Tenure. ..... 4
CHAPTER 2 : AN APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE. ..... 7
Constitutional Basis of the Appeal. ..... 7
The Practical Reality. ..... 7
The U.G.C. Grading Exercise (1986). ..... 8
Department of Chemistry at Aberystwyth. ..... 8
Physics at Bangor. ..... 10
Departments of Mathematics, Bangor ..... 12
Everyday Administration at Bangor. ..... 13
Department of Physics, Swansea ..... 14
CHAPTER 3.TENURED AND UNTENURED. ..... 15
An Incident with the British Council. ..... 15
Reprimand and Dismissal. ..... 16
Mr. J. Henry Jones, Tutor in Adult Education. ..... 17
Legal Points. ..... 18
The Rights of Non-Tenured University Staff. ..... 18
Accommodation in the Universities of Wales and ..... 19
I.B.M., Data Systems Division, Kingston, New York. ..... 22
CHAPTER 4. SELECTION FOR TENURE. ..... 23
Power of the Head of Department. ..... 23
Chemistry, Aberystwyth, 1968-1983. ..... 24
A Remedy. ..... 25
Chemistry, Swansea, 1977-1978. ..... 26
Advanced Fellow, Aberystwyth 1978 to 1983. ..... 27
Bangor, 1983 to 1985. ..... 29
Swansea, 1985 to 1986. ..... 31
Conclusions. ..... 31
Suggestions for Reform. ..... 32
CHAPTER 5.MY APPEALS FOR ..... 33

# Chapter 1: THE PEOPLE'S UNIVERSITY, MYTH AND PERCEPTION.

This little book summarises my attempts at gaining tenure in the University of Wales. In my opinion my applications and representations covering the period 1974 to present have not been assessed properly by the various committees and officers of the University, especially in the three colleges at Aberystwyth, Bangor, and Swansea. I have appealed for tenure on numerous occasions to various bodies such as the University Court, the Committee of Principals, and the Privy Council. The book is appended by copies of the most important correspondence between the the various University authorities and myself; a copy of my Petition to the Privy Council; the College's reply and my comments on this reply. The appendices also contain tables of relevant statistics comparing my qualifications with those of tenured contemporaries, and other relevant data.

## Principles.

The aim of the book is not to cause further dissent and bitterness among the antagonists, but to provide a clear basis for an appeal direct to the People of Wales for tenure in its only University - "The People's University". I wish simply for an opportunity to serve the People of Wales, an opportunity to use my training and talents to pursue and disseminate knowledge in the University. Some of the most important principles at stake are as follows.

1) Recognition by the University of Wales of scholarly excellence and qualifications, recognition in the form of tenure, or its reformed equivalent.

2) The principle of academic freedom, which embraces the most severe difference of political opinion, or such factors as ethnic or social origin.

3) The principle of free speech, and expression of opinion.

4) The principle that all qualified persons that apply for tenure in the University of Wales must be assessed on ability, experience, and recognised contributions to knowledge.

5) The principle of equal status for the two languages of Wales, active Welsh language education, and the right of qualified native speakers of the Welsh language to tenure in the University.

6) Above all, the principle of fair assessment, recognition for lengthy service, experience and scholarly excellence in the form of tenure or its contemporary equivalent.

## The Charter and its Interpretation.

The Charter of the University of Wales is the basis for its existence, and is a document which defines its rights and duties. It bears the sign manual, or signature, of the present Head of State, Elizabeth II, and its Articles and Statutes are available to the General Public from the Registrar of the University in Cardiff or in the annual University Calendar. It is reproduced for convenience in Appendix 1. The purpose of the original Victorian Charter was to found a University "in and for Wales". Subsequent amendments have not altered this original purpose.

The rest of the Charter elaborates and defines the way in which the University's Constituent Institutions, or Colleges, shall be in and for Wales. Unfortunately, the document as it stands at present is pedantic, assertive and detailed, but open to very loose interpretation. For example, it is the opinion of the College at Aberystwyth, the University College of Wales, expressed in its reply (Appendix 2) to my Petition of 1986 to the Privy Council, that the College is not obliged by Charter to teach in the Welsh language. The absurdity of this assertion is easily revealed by the argument that if this were the case, then neither is the College obliged to teach or research in English. The Charter does not specifically instruct the College to teach or research in English or in Welsh, but only to teach and research. A simple remedy to the quaint point of view taken by the College is not specifically available, because of looseness in the wording of the Charter. The latter begins with the confident assertion that "there shall be and is hereby constituted a University in and for Wales." Let there follow a sentence such as this, " The University shall actively and diligently teach and research all subjects whatsoever in the Welsh and English languages, and opportunity shall be given for well qualified Welsh speakers from Wales and elsewhere to teach and research in the University using the medium of the Welsh language".

Such an amendment to the Charter has to be proposed and approved by its supreme legislative authority, the University Court, and then submitted to the Privy Council. Unfortunately the Court is an apathetic and ineffective Body which would be frightened by a revolutionary idea like making the University teach more effectively in the Welsh language. Pressure for reform must come from the People of Wales itself, if it wishes to see the Welsh language treated with a modicum of dignity and if it wishes to see the language survive.

# Myth and Perception.

Let us assume that the People of Wales (about two and three quarter millions within its geographical boundaries and thousands more exiled) wishes to see the survival of the Welsh language in its vigour and brilliance, strong and uncorrupted. By inference the University of Wales, being in and for Wales by its own Charter, should be aware of this wish and should ensure that it teaches in the language far more effectively than it does today. It would surely seek to appoint to tenure fully qualified native Welsh speakers who have gained recognition as international scholars in any speciality whatsoever. I am such a scholar and am more than willing to serve the educational needs of the People in its University.

Indeed this would be expected of the "People's University" as it is still known with increasingly misplaced affection in contemporary Wales.

Let us assume that a University "in and for Wales" be concerned with the award of tenure to an internationally recognised scholar, a native of Wales, with ability to teach and to write, deliver lectures and to compose scientific research papers and monographs in both the official languages of Wales. This assumption is made on the basis that a University "in and for Wales" is "for Wales" and therefore for the People of Wales. A native of Wales such as myself is one of the People of Wales whose only University is "for" Wales. I may reason that the University concern itself with my ability to produce knowledge, a concern that ultimately must manifest itself in the award of tenure. Otherwise, it will not be possible for me to continue to teach or research in the University. Indeed I have already earned and been awarded three of its degrees, its highest degree of Doctor of Science (D. Sc.) more than ten years ago when I was 27 years old. Apparently I am the youngest scholar in the University to have received this degree, and probably the youngest in any British University to have been so honoured. This degree was awarded to me for a thesis composed of forty two published scientific articles. I have now published two hundred and sixty two at the time of writing. Ten years later therefore, with a matured and established international reputation, the award of tenure by the University of Wales is a logical sequitur. Why have I been rejected for tenure by the University on over fifty occasions in these ten years, and by five of its Constituent Institutions? Why has this occurred despite numerous awards and honours in Britain and several other countries around the world? These include the Harrison Memorial Prize and the Meldola Medal of the Royal Society of Chemistry; numerous Fellowships awarded in open British competition among fifty or so Universities; and Visiting Professorships in Cornell University and I.B.M. in the United States, and in the Scuola Normale Superiore and University of Pisa in Tuscany. Appendix 3 contains full details of my Curriculum Vitae, well known to the University of Wales from numerous requests for tenure.

Why should I have to strive so hard for a routine appointment to tenure, why has the mechanism and authority of the People's University been so blindly unable to grant a single scholar, out of so many appointed, his basic necessity, right and reward?

Can a "People's University" which does not feel obliged to teach in the original language of that People or even to recognise with tenure an internationally accepted scholar born and educated in Wales be anything

but a parody of virtue and a myth of its own devising? Let us see if our perceptions mature when we have the facts of this book at our disposal. What can the People of Wales, the readers of this book, do to cure a contemporary affliction that debilitates, renders impotent, mocks and destroys those principles embodied in the Charter of its only University? Is this "in and for Wales" or merely in Wales and for an obscure but powerful few, not of Wales, not for Wales, but for themselves and themselves alone?

## The Concept of University Tenure.

A working definition of tenure is an agreement between University and Scholar whereby both parties devote themselves to the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge in all its forms. The Scholar agrees to research and/or teach in the University, which agrees to provide for the Scholar's basic needs until he retires.

This is a simple exchange of intent, and such agreements are commonplace throughout Academia on thousands of occasions every year in over a hundred countries. In many hundreds of these cases the Scholar granted tenure (and probably rightly so) is far less experienced than I am, much less qualified, much less known. How qualified must I be to obtain tenure in the University of Wales?

The concept of tenure is probably mediaeval in origin, with some roots in the monastic life of post Roman Europe and Byzantium. The great Universities of modern times, Paris, Rome, Oxford, Edinburgh among them, are in some ways direct descendants of the monastic ideal, dedication to virtue in all its forms. The first Scholars and Fellows of these Universities were "tenured" in that their bodily needs were cared for as long as they remained faithful to the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.

## Abuse of Tenure.

In my twenty years of experience of the contemporary Universities of Wales and Oxford abuses of tenure have weakened the ideal in several ways. The present British Government, which funds the fifty or so contemporary Universities of Britain, is probably working towards the abolition of the concept of tenure and its replacement with term contracts, awarded competitively. Some blatant breaches of the spirit of scholarly tenure in my own experience are recorded as follows.

1) Tenure is normally agreed upon until retirement at age 65 and I have not known one case in the three Colleges at Aberystwyth, Bangor and Swansea where tenure has been revoked on grounds of incompetence or even failure to produce research. Tenured members of staff in these Colleges were almost invariably required to teach and research but in many cases of which I had direct personal experience the recorded research output of tenured individuals fell to what I consider to be a grossly unsatisfactory level, measured typically

by three or four published articles in perhaps thirty or forty years. Once the practice of research is neglected it cannot be regained easily. This led directly in several cases I knew of to almost complete inactivity. This contrasts strongly with my own (untenured) record of 262 publications in about fifteen years as a post graduate and post doctoral Many of my publications are internationally significant papers, review articles, monographs and edited monographs. During this time I also obliged the University of Wales with my services as demonstrator, tutor, graduate and post-doctoral supervisor and Scientific Coordinator of the European Molecular Liquids Group, of which I was a co-founder. I have been rejected for tenure on over fifty occasions by the University. In contrast, tenure has been provided to some of my less prolific and less active colleagues without any form of advertisement and competition. This has been done with funds provided by the Department of Education and Science to the University, in other words at the expense of the tax-payer.

One remedy is to abolish tenure and to award individual contracts on the basis of a National Competition, involving all fifty Universities The contracts would last a maximum of five years, but would be renewable according to performance. Detailed indices of qualification, experience and performance would be devised, applicable without exception to all individuals.

2) In my experience (see chapter ( )) tenure has been awarded on numerous occasions to individual post-doctorals with few achievements and with no form of competitive advertisement. On many occasions these were considerably less qualified than I was at the time and had no outstanding or even apparent quality as non-tenured post doctorals. The award of tenure was the result of a personal decision by an official such as a head of department using his influence on a key committee of the College administration to create and ratify the post with Senate approval. The favoured appointee was then free to pursue research and teaching, if he had the inclination to do so, until retirement, normally at age 65. Sometimes the College provides the inactive tenured individual with a very large amount of money to encourage early retirement. Depending on the power and prestige of the individual within the College hierarchy, this sum would range from about two or three thousand pounds to about two hundred thousand for a powerful professor retiring some fifteen years early at the age of fifty. This is money supplied by the tax payer through the University Grants Committee. The financial details of early retirements are available by law to the General Public, and presumably can be obtained from the Registrars and Secretaries of the Colleges. The Registrars should be pressed for details, not general accounts.

The use of public funds in this way is dubious, and the situation is often made worse by the fact that the early retiree promptly finds himself another job, enriching himself enormously in the process. This is a strong argument against the award of tenure, and for a "statute of limitations" on all academic contracts.

3) The power structure of the contemporary University of Wales lends itself to the abuse of tenure. Administrative power is concentrated with very few individuals, and filtered away from the majority of the College Community. It is concentrated in the Senates, which are composed overwhelmingly of professorial staff and by powerful finance committees whose membership is derived from the Senates, not elected democratically by the College Communities. A Head of Department must gain influence in his Senate in order to procure funds for tenured appointments within his Department. The individual staff members of that Department are irrelevant, power is frequently concentrated exclusively with the Head of Department. This absurd administrative

structure was apparently deliberately created on a Victorian model. It has remained useful to some to this day. Reform will be resisted strongly unless forced upon the University by direct Government action, culminating if necessary in the complete elimination of Public Funds. Far preferable is voluntary democratic reform within the University as the result of Public Opinion in Wales.

In my experience members of Senates are not particularly concerned with scholarship, and may not even be aware of the presence of outstanding scholars within their College. Their power depends however on the perpetuation of the Status Quo, and they are concerned with this. Personal and sterile rivalry between the unelected members of Senate can ruin scholarship within a Department. A clash of personality between a Principal and a Head of Department, both unelected officers, can be equally ruinous to scholars under their administrative control. Members of the Senate become isolated in many instances from their own scholarly roots, lose their craft and art. In this atmosphere of concealed power scholarship itself finally becomes inimicable to the College administration, the very negative of the ideal. The gross torpidity of the system in my own case, as recorded in this book, is one symptom of the decadence of the University of Wales, particularly marked in the last decade. This is a large University (of some 40,000 students) that has never produced a Nobel Laureate or a Fields Medallist, and which has failed miserably to serve the People of Wales with its own high ideals.

Native scholars often choose to leave the University of Wales in search of fresh air; others like myself are forced by neglect into exile. Senate power imposes intolerable constraints on imagination. Symptomatic of the basic lack of confidence in the administration is the number of occasions during my career as post-graduate and post-doctoral on which I was forcibly and repeatedly advised to leave Wales and its University. My scholarship, however, found ample native soil in which to flower, and I resisted the attempts to have me removed for nearly twenty years. A University in and for Wales cannot in logic encourage the removal from Wales of an established and internationally recognised native scholar who holds the University's highest degree unless the University's own existence is without meaning.

An effective system of checks on the power structure of the University of Wales is needed in order to ensure that scholarship and service to the University is recognised by the award of tenure or its reformed equivalent. If the University eventually recognises this it might have some chance in future of international recognition by some means such as the Nobel Prize. Until then it will wallow in obscurity. At present the University is dangerously close to being an elaborate and murky system for gratuitous self- help among the powerful, secretive, and privileged few. The pursuit of excellence, in either language, is an afterthought. First and foremost is power, and the state salaries that go with power, its ever fruitful followers.

# CHAPTER 2 : AN APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE.

## Constitutional Basis of the Appeal.

By Charter the supreme legislative and governing authority in the University of Wales is the Court of the University, the Members of which are listed in the University's Calendar. A large proportion of these are elected representatives of the People of Wales, and therefore serve the People in this capacity. Among them are Members of Parliament and County Councillors. The powers of the University Court are defined in the Charter and decisions taken by the Court are binding on the whole University in respect of legislative and governmental affairs. It is constitutionally clear that the Supreme Authority in the University of Wales is the People of Wales.

## The Practical Reality.

How does this ideal work out in practice? In my experience very badly, if at all. The University Grants Committee assessments of 1986 have, fairly or unfairly, raised grave doubts about the University's contemporary international significance. Well over half the individual departments in some Constituent Institutions, notably U.C.N.W. Bangor, were publicly graded as "below average" by British standards. This meant in effect that the capital grant per annum from the Department of Education and Science was decreased on the recommendations of the University Grants Committee to a level where closure of individual departments became inevitable. This financial war of attrition continues at the time of writing. The way in which individual departments were selected for closure, and the way in which the U.G.C. arrived at its recommendations is as clear as the muddy Mississippi. In this context my personal experience covers the Departments of Chemistry at Aberystwyth, Physics at Bangor, and Physics at Swansea. All three were graded as "below average". The first two have been closed by the Colleges involved and by the University's rationalisation committees set up under pressure from the U.G.C. In none of these secretive procedures did the University Court play any significant role.(In this context see correspondence in Appendix ( ) urging the Court to act in defence of the University.) There was minimal consultation with members of the University's staff who did not happen to be on the rationalisation committees. The members of these committees were selected because of their past influence on University affairs, and were not democratically elected by the College Communities. The University Court was an impotent parliament, unable to meet in any significant numbers, unable and unwilling to debate the crisis. In this way power was retained by the old guard on the rationalisation committees. The People of Wales was eventually informed of their decisions via the Western Mail.

Instead of using the constitution to defend the University and the academic departments at risk from political infighting in the Colleges in the aftermath of the U.G.C. review, the University Court merely acquiesced in a fait accompli. In December 1986 at Bangor it put the finishing touches to a charade, passively participated in the U.G.C.'s own surrender to political expediency. The University Court Members who bothered to turn up (supposedly representatives of the People of Wales) made no effective effort to defend the University of Wales against crude internal and external political maneuvering within the University Grants Committee and the Department of Education and Science and on key committees within the Colleges themselves.

## The U.G.C. Grading Exercise (1986).

## Department of Chemistry at Aberystwyth.

Some of the facts upon which the above conclusions are based are known to me from personal experience (see correspondence in Appendices ( ) to ( )). The way in which the U.G.C. reached its conclusions about this department sounded the murkiest depths of hypocrisy. In one of his "circular" letters addressed to me (see Appendix ( )) the Chairman of the University Grants Committee, Sir Peter Swinnerton-Dyer, mentioned as an after-thought that some of the U.G.C.'s grading exercise was "inevitably subjective". This was, apparently, a disinterested attempt to reply to the fact that in reaching its destructive conclusions, the U.G.C. had available virtually no objective evidence upon which to base any kind of rational decision, if one were indeed possible in the ludicrously short time the U.G.C. was given by the Government to come up with the answers that it, the Government, wanted. The College authorities at Aberystwyth seriously compounded the injustice by neglecting to make the slightest effort to make sure that the U.G.C., in its indecent haste, had all the evidence that the College could provide. A proper defence of the department of chemistry at Aberystwyth would have forced the U.G.C., if necessary by the use of legal injunction, to look at the actual facts and figures. The College was apparently asked by the U.G.C., in one of its infamous circular letters, to forward some five or six examples of what the latter termed "key publications" in a period of time arbitrarily defined as 1980 to 1985. Up to Oct. 1983 my own research group was still active in the department and during the whole of this time my colleague Dr Gareth Evans continued to be active as S.E.R.C. Advanced Fellow. In these five years (see Appendix ( )) we produced well over one hundred publications, including four monographs of international significance published in New York by Wiley / Interscience No other monographs were produced by the department in this period, and the totality of our output roughly equalled that of the whole of the rest of the department combined, including professors.

None of this output was reported by the head of department, Prof. W. Jeremy Jones, to the College authorities responsible for answering the U.G.C.'s circular letter. He chose to ignore the department's best

known work in the assessment period of 1980 to 1985. This work would certainly have had to be graded as "outstanding" by the U.G.C.'s own criteria. To achieve an "outstanding" grade the work had to be internationally significant. The monographs of this period (1980-1985) built on my work in the department which had earlier earned me the Harrison Memorial Prize and Meldola Medal of the Royal Society of Chemistry. This obscure decision turned out to be fatal to his own department and led to a disastrous deterioration of relations with Principal Gareth Owen. Thereafter chemistry became marked for early closure both by the U.G.C. and by the Principal. The run-of-the-mill publications submitted to the U.G.C. could not compensate for the loss of four monographs and one hundred papers from the department's most productive research group. The U.G.C. took the decision to grade the department "below average" without being made aware of the best of that department's research work. Principal Owen conveniently used the "below average" label to close the department completely, and eventually to try to sell off the buildings of the Edward Davies Chemical Laboratory. This is despite the fact that the EDCL was originally a Bequest to the People of Wales from Lord Davies of Llandinam, a Lloyd-George Peer.

On several occasions, (see Appendices ( ) to ( )) letters of mine were published in the Times Higher Education Supplement; "Chemistry in Britain"; "The Western Mail"; and "The Cambrian News" which were attempts to bring the injustice to light. When informed of the hundred missing monographs and papers, Sir Peter said that his assessments were "inevitably subjective". The chemistry department would be "below average", evidence or none.

The missing evidence was also pointed out to the Pro- Chancellor of the University of Wales, Lord Cledwyn, the University Court, to several Members of Parliament, to Trade Union Officials at Aberystwyth and to many others (see Appendix ( )) in an attempt to obtain fair assessment for the chemistry department at Aberystwyth. All this occurred well before the fateful University Court meeting at Bangor in December 1986 which ratified departmental closures in the University's constituent institutions. By that time I had been exiled to the United States and all my arguments conveniently overlooked. I would not have been allowed to attend this meeting except as a Member of the General Public, and would not have been allowed to raise the issue except through a Member of the Court. The Members of Parliament I had contacted in this context apparently did not turn up. Lord Cledwyn remained silent and was ineffective in the defence of the University. The College Court at Aberystwyth reversed the College Senate's decision to accept the infamous "Owen Plan" which involved the closure of chemistry, but this turned out to have little effect on the events that followed. Chemistry has ceased to exist as a department offering both undergraduate and graduate degrees. The only trace of its one hundred year history is a "teaching unit" of four.

The University Court had plenty of opportunity to reverse the decision of the College at Aberystwyth to close the chemistry department on the basis that the U.G.C. had not been informed of important evidence, and when so informed had not attempted to re-assess the department. Its Chairman had admitted that some of the grading decisions were inevitably subjective in the interim period between the announcement of the results of the grading exercise and the meeting of the University Court in Dec. 1986. The Court made not the slightest attempt to reverse any decision in any constituent institution in anything remotely resembling an honourable debate. The rationalisation committees also had available the fact that the evidence had been whitewashed, Lord Cledwyn was informed, but none took any interest. They were there to do the will of the

Conservative Government. The facts were covered up therefore on numerous occasions by numerous individuals and Bodies. They are available in this book.

The will of the Conservative Government in London was imposed upon the University of Wales through the University Grants Committee, a supposedly independent Body. The University Court showed little stomach for the fight and failed the People of Wales miserably and repeatedly. It failed to defend the University against the imposed prejudice of the politically powerful few, remote from Wales and her People, unelected and unwanted by a large majority of that People.

## Physics at Bangor.

I have personal experience of this department from October 1983 to September 1985 as University of Wales Fellow, a junior and untenured post doctoral research position of two years' duration. I was obliged to move there after the University College of Wales at Aberystwyth allowed its tripartite agreement with the Science and Engineering Research Council and myself to run out on Sept. 30th., 1983. This deliberate passivity on the part of U.C.W. Aberystwyth effectively destroyed the activity of the internationally significant research group that I had established in the Department of Chemistry during my five years as S.E.R.C. Advanced Fellow. I had obtained this position in open competition among the U.K. Universities and Polytechnics.

I was forced to compete for the relatively less senior post of University Fellow in the autumn of 1982 when it became clear that Aberystwyth was intent on the destruction of my research activities in that College. I was fortunate to win the competition both at Bangor and Swansea.

As a result of intense in-fighting in the two years before my arrival at Bangor the Department of Physics there was under the technical leadership of an applied mathematician, Prof. T.J.M. Boyd, at the time of my arrival. It coincidentally became established as such on my first day there, and has now been closed after an apparently poor performance and "below average" grading by the U.G.C. in the Spring of 1986.

In my two years as University Fellow at Bangor I appealed and formally applied for tenure on many occasions, but despite the publication in those two years of about forty research articles and three monographs (published in New York by Wiley Interscience) I was obliged to leave for Swansea in September 1985, having competed for and won the Pilcher Senior Fellowship of the University of Wales.

These publications probably greatly exceeded the individual output of nearly every tenured member of staff in the Department of Physics during these two years. This claim can be verified by reference to the Physical and Chemical Abstracts Literature or by reference to the Departmental Reports. My work has been repeatedly recognised as internationally significant, but U.C.N.W. Bangor failed to impress the U.G.C. with

this asset, and rejected me for tenure on a number of occasions. My work was recognised widely at home and abroad, but was again brought to a sudden halt by the failure of the University of Wales to grant me tenure.

I have no knowledge of whether these papers and books were actually reported by the Head of Department to the College in response to the U.G.C. circular letter of 1985 prior to the infamous grading exercise itself. The department of physics at Bangor seemed to me to be in disorder when I arrived there in October 1983, and despite the efforts of an amiable and often very talented teaching staff was suffering from a lack of informed leadership. Often ruthless and careerist, with little international significance to their research, the professoriate at Bangor, with fine exceptions, were not good at lifting the intellectual activity of a department by personal inspiration.

As a lowly University Fellow I was not much privy to the organisational activity at head of department level, but disorder was apparent in the department of physics in the following ways. 1) My office space upon arrival from Aberystwyth was a cramped corner of the department of pure mathematics, very hot in summer and freezing in winter, primitive in comparison with accommodation in the United States. No effort was made to find me accommodation in the department of physics. 2) There was no scientific guidance or conversation between my nominal supervisor, Prof. Boyd, and myself in the whole of the two years of the University Fellowship. 3) From 2nd Jan. 1985 to 30th Sept. of that year, when I left for Swansea, I had no office accommodation, having been instructed to vacate what space I had in a memo from the acting head of applied mathematics. During the whole of this period no alternative office space "became available". To avoid the necessity of working in the corridor or in the middle of Deiniol Road, I removed my possessions and myself into the lumber room of the dept. of pure mathematics, from which I wrote some appeals to various people, including the Registrar of the College and the Registrar of the University. None of these appeals were successful, and the Association of University Teachers, despite many protests, was less so. The proofs of two big monographs were accordingly prepared in this junk room, and as Director of the Bangor Summer School of 1985 I received my guests here in surrealistic style.

Having tried on several occasions to obtain tenure at Bangor and having been rejected for junior positions there , I finally decided to transfer to Swansea, primarily to get myself an office. I competed for and won three Fellowships in 1985 / 1986 : - the Pilcher Senior Fellowship of the University of Wales; an I.B.M. Fellowship at the University of Newcastle; and a Leverhulme Trust Fellowship.

The many refusals to grant me tenure at U.C.N.W. Bangor disturbed many of the tenured members of staff there, and in my opinion make a nonsense of the Welsh language rule of that College. This makes it perfectly clear that all other things being equal, a Welsh speaker should be appointed to any job in the College, Porter or Principal. This rule was breached quite openly in my case on several occasions.

The practical reality of affairs at University College of North Wales, Bangor is very different from the ideal of a College of the University of Wales which frequently advertises itself as being uniquely interested in teaching and researching through the medium of the Welsh language. It has been my impression for several years that U.C.N.W. Bangor is among the most anglicised of all the Colleges, being flooded yearly by monoglot English speakers in an attempt to justify its grant from the Government. It is far too large an

institution for Welsh speaking Wales, and if my example is anything to go by, has considerable difficulty in the accommodation of native scholarship. It has many talented and sincere monoglot English speakers on its staff, but these make little or no effort to learn the Welsh language, despite the existence of the Welsh language rule. The College failed repeatedly in my case to tenure a scholar with native ability in the language and an established international reputation. Lately the attitude of some members of the professoriate there towards me has become even more obscure. An example of this (a letter from Prof. C.J.M. Stirling of Chemistry) is reproduced in Appendix ( ). I am now a Welsh speaker who is too senior for junior positions never allowed him in the past. This attitude is perverse and prejudicial, and repeatedly and stridently ignores the Welsh language rule. Incredibly, the College still advertises itself as being of special interest to Welsh speaking Wales. A tour de force of hypocrisy. To me Bangor is colonialism for colonialism's sake. Welsh speaking Wales must strongly assert its independence through its elected representatives and demand an end to this behaviour, proper practical recognition of the Welsh language rule. It might take its cue from the Equal Opportunity Laws of the United States.

The disastrous performance of the ruling elite in Bangor vis a vis its own government in London is symptomatic of the way in which education in Wales is damaged by neo-colonialism in its own University. The Welsh speakers of Gwynedd and the rest of Wales must act soon, or become a dumping ground.

## Departments of Mathematics, Bangor

These were both graded "below average" in the U.G.C. exercise. The lack of genuine research activity in both departments probably contributed to this "official" performance, together with strident and well advertised discord at senior level. In this respect the former head of applied mathematics, T.J.M. Boyd, was frequently and severely criticised by the large majority of staff at Bangor in several departments. Despite this his political power seems as strong as ever. As far as I know, he takes no interest in the Welsh language or in the design of mathematics education through the medium of the language. There are several Welsh speaking mathematicians at Bangor, but none has been promoted to professorial level, and none has real power within the College Senate.

The monoglot English speakers in the Departments are often highly talented, but blighted by unimaginative and undemocratic systems of administration. There are isolated expressions of concern for the ideal of a Welsh language College from those not yet trapped in the academic power game or who have resigned themselves to fate. Selection procedures for academic promotion within the department of applied mathematics seemed to me to be heavily weighted in favour of the head of department's interests. Those who choose not to participate in his interests seem to be passed over for promotion. One particularly active member of the department has remained lecturer for nearly a quarter of a century despite what seems to me to be a considerable contribution to the department in respect of teaching, research and administration, the three criteria for promotion. This reduces morale to near vanishing point, and is an unacceptable state of affairs. In the present system, heads of department are allowed to retain their posts, largely free from accountability for the

way in which they use their annual grant from the tax payer. To some, academia is a power game, fed by lucrative salaries. Even if his department is closed a professor in the present system retains his salary, can move elsewhere, or choose to retire with a handsome pension. The greatest tragedy is that individual brilliance is often blighted by the stress and chronic frustration generated by a dictatorial head of department. There are many remedies to this situation, the best would be to remove the post and reorganise the administrative structure of the College, decentralising power and introducing democracy into the system. A department should certainly be run by a voting committee made up of all its staff members, tenured, post-doctoral, and non-academic. This can be achieved with pressure of opinion from the People of Wales.

## Everyday Administration at Bangor.

From personal experience at Bangor the administrative machinery at U.C.N.W. (the "Buildings Office", for example) was made up of amiable people being slowly ground into cynicism and torpidity by a complete lack of discernible purpose and subsequent demoralisation. The individuals were as individuals everywhere, essentially the cogs in a rusty machine, geared for nothing in particular. They had no idea of what the "academics" were up to, and cared even less. It took many months for something to happen unless one were a head of department. For others it gradually became accepted that the Buildings Office was in charge of the College, not the other way around. On occasions the whole system seemed to me to be a crazy bulwark against unemployment, fighting one form of insanity with another; a passive and chronically unhappy acceptance of colonialism in Rural Wales, the corruption of all ideals. After many years' experience of this deadly inertia its influence is gradually accepted and one does what one can under the circumstances.

I was once innocent enough to ask the Buildings Office to do something for me, but after waiting for most of my Fellowship gradually forgot all about it. Perhaps the request was for an office.

From underneath this ludicrous system the character of old Gwynedd occasionally emerged, the heroic character of the individual in an age of cynicism. Among these, brilliant veins of language and heritage occasionally flash, even in the murkiest depths of colonialist bureaucracy. These are flashes of what the University of Wales really should be. Among the most brilliant of conversationalists were those in the mechanical workshop of the science faculty in U.C.N.W., a University in itself.

# Department of Physics, Swansea

I have personal experience of this department from October 1985 to September 1986. During this year the U.G.C. assessments were made public, the department being "below average". In this case there was no time for my own contributions to the department's research literature to be made known to the U.G.C. In my twelve months as Pilcher Senior Fellow of the University of Wales I produced some thirty published papers.

The department at Swansea seemed to be superficially more orderly but inactive as regards publication in journals of international significance. In my time there I probably produced as much published front-line material as the whole of the rest of the department combined. This carried no weight at all with University College, Swansea, which refused repeatedly to consider my written requests for tenure, and which refused to short list me for several posts for which I had applied formally. Some of the relevant correspondence is recorded in Appendix ( ).

My relations with the professoriate of the department very quickly deteriorated, the result of repeated refusals by the College to carry out its part of a Covenant that it had encouraged me to arrange with the State University of Rio de Janeiro, and its refusals to consider me for tenure. It became clear that my research was to be summarily halted for the third time, irrespective of any objective assessment of its quality.

My sense of increasing frustration was aggravated by the cynical and inconsistent attitude of the College administration towards the Covenant with Rio. The Principal of U.C. Swansea, Prof. Brian Clerkson, signed this agreement (Appendix ( )) in Dec., 1985 but subsequently made no attempt to implement the document he had just signed. This wasted months of joint planning supported by the Nuffield Foundation, and carried by the Brazilian representative, Prof. Armando Dias-Tavares and myself. The latter had flown from Rio de Janeiro for the occasion with Nuffield Foundation support.

Although superficially friendly at first the two professors in the department of physics at Swansea soon gave me the impression of amateur heavy-handedness so familiar from my days at Aberystwyth and Bangor. They also seemed inefficient and selfish in their running of departmental affairs. Secretarial help was almost non-existent for a post doc like myself but reserved for professorial work. All thirty of my research articles I subsequently typed myself, having to prepare, as usual, my own artwork. The professors' artwork and typing were done for them, despite the fact that they produced far less of the stuff than I did. The department was credited on each of my published papers. Apparently, my departmental allocation for routine postage (e.g. sending papers to journals) ran out about half way through my Pilcher Senior Fellowship and neither the College nor the University was in a position to provide further finance, or so I was told. I was obliged eventually to cover these costs personally, the more research I produced the more I had to pay. To date I have not been reimbursed for these costs.

The ideal is often remote from reality in the contemporary University of Wales, the inbred cynicism difficult to combat. The University shows little sign of reforming itself from within, and if the supreme

authority is the People of Wales, then it is the People itself that must press for change according to the six principles of chapter 1. The alternative is a financial war of attrition, resulting in incoherent change and disruption, rather than positive democratic evolution. No one can be satisfied with a University that treats scholarship with such gross contempt.

# CHAPTER 3.TENURED AND UNTENURED.

## An Incident with the British Council.

The distant and wildly inconsistent attitude of the administration at Swansea is illustrated by an incident involving the Director of the British Council, Sir John Burgh, and the Member of Parliament for Swansea East, the Rt. Hon. Mr. Alan Williams. This reveals at the very least a lack of imagination in the College at a senior level and at worst outright dishonesty.

The incident arose from my growing impatience with the College administration for taking no action whatsoever to implement the Covenant with U.E.R.J., Brazil signed by the Swansea Principal as early as Dec., 1985. By the summer of 1986, with the end of my own one year contract heaving rapidly into sight, and with still no sign of life from Swansea, the Brazilian representative, Prof. Armando Dias Tavares, wrote to me to express his concern. He was worried both by the obvious lack of practical intent by Swansea, and by the bureaucracy of the British Council. After sending a representative to meet Dias Tavares during his visit to Swansea in Dec., 1985, the Council had puzzled the Brazilians by discouraging their plans with its intricate bureaucracy. Dias Tavares wished to organise students for Swansea from several countries of the South American continent as part of the Brazilian side of the Covenant agreement. He had obviously been very active in Rio for several months after the Covenant was signed at the end of 1985. He had persuaded U.E.R.J. to help finance the agreement with Swansea, probably in the form of a Chair of Portuguese Language and Literature funded by the Brazilian side and to be set up at Swansea.

In anxious letters Dias Tavares asked me to catalyse some action by the British Council and by U.C. Swansea in respect of the Covenant agreement. Was this to be more than a worthless piece of paper signed by a Principal who seemed unwilling or unable to turn promises into action? The groundwork had been laid for him, the Brazilian side was overwhelmingly keen to help by providing much needed overseas students for Swansea, together with considerable financial support for a new Chair, exchange of scholars, and so on as summarised in the Covenant document itself (Appendix ( )).

Caught between the hammer of growing Brazilian anxiety and puzzlement, discomfort and embarrassment, and the anvil of Swansea's unbelievable torpidity and what had seemingly become overt duplicity, I

decided to contact Mr Alan Williams, my own M.P. at the time, with a request for an explanation or action from the British Council. Contact was then made between the M.P. and the Director of the British Council, Sir John Burgh. Apparently, a representative of the Council then telephoned the head of the physics department at Swansea, Prof. J. Dutton, asking for clarification. No attempt was made by the Council to reply to me direct. In a letter from Sir John Burgh to Mr Alan Williams, (Appendix ( )) the lack of action by Swansea is ascribed to "illness" on the part of Prof. Dias Tavares. This is at best absurd, because Dias Tavares was in full health at the time the Covenant was signed in Dec. 1985 and had himself been actively pursuing the terms of the Covenant in Rio and elsewhere for several months.

At worst this letter, which I was probably not supposed to see, reveals a depth of cynicism and deceitfulness which sickens me to this day. Having been fully aware and informed of the activity concerning the Covenant, having himself been present at the formal luncheon given by the Principal for Dias Tavares in December 1985, Dutton apparently deliberately supplied the Director of the British Council with the excuse based on Dias-Tavares's "illness". This message was transmitted to my M.P., who transmitted it to me, the original organiser of the Covenant. Nothing concerning the Covenant was sent directly from the College to me, and it was already apparent from the letters from Dias Tavares that the College had not contacted him in any way for several months. In effect, U.C. Swansea had drawn up an agreement with U.E.R.J. which the former had no intention of implementing, and had supplied the British Council with false information in order to cover up this lack of will.

The only honest thing I could think to do thereafter was to write to the Brazilian side asking them, if they could, to have the grace and nobility to forget the whole business. Fortunately they did so, and the Covenant was dissolved.

## Reprimand and Dismissal.

U.C. Swansea had finished with the Brazilians but not yet with me. Shortly after he received the telephone call from the British Council's Director, Dutton sent for me to attend an interview in his office in the presence of Prof. C. Gray-Morgan, to explain why I had had the effrontery to write to Alan Williams on departmental notepaper. This irretrievable piece of decadence from a minor, untenured, post doc., organiser of the Covenant or not, albeit some kind of internationally recognised scholar, would not be tolerated and left unpunished. After contacting an M.P. on departmental notepaper it was, of course, going to be impossible to provide me with tenure, I was going to leave the College at the end of my one year contract. Henceforth all my mail was to be inspected by Head of Department for signs of rebellion, envelope by envelope. As a gentleman, Dutton would not inspect the contents, but if he felt suspicious, he would return the offending envelope to me.

To all intents and purposes, this was a summary dismissal, because henceforth no attempt would be made by U.C. Swansea to grant tenure to me. Surprisingly for the current administration at U.C. Swansea,

this has turned out to be true, because all my recent applications for tenure in several departments of that College and at several levels of seniority have been rejected without interview. All this is done with Public funding.

The two professors were calculators, but cynical to the core and singularly immune to reason. I mentioned in passing that I was Welsh, and could speak the language, etc. but they squelched this like an irritating insect. I was to be proud to work for I.B.M. in the United States, and would shortly leave the department. I mentioned the Charter but this was a mouldering museum piece irrelevant to the modern world. Loosing me as a scholar would be regrettable, in an abstract kind of way, although they could not understand any of my work, but they would have no concern for me as a person. I was an abstraction of my own devising, to be made remote from the University.

"Arglwydd, Arglwydd, dyma gamwedd."

## Mr. J. Henry Jones, Tutor in Adult Education.

An element of intellectual honesty was provided accidentally by Swansea in the shape of Mr. Henry Jones, ex farm labourer, coal miner, Staff Sergeant in the Royal Army Medical Corps under Field Marshall Viscount Montgomery of El Alamein; distinguished Public Servant, Scholar, Tutor, administrator, linguist, and poet, former Member of the Council of Wales and a Justice of the Peace. A specialist in Labour Law, he is still a Tutor at Swansea after being passed over for promotion for nearly a quarter of a century.

He seems to me to have remained loyal to the ideals of Adult Education in Wales, despite the decline of peace time educational standards in the University. I had the honour to make him aware of my attempts over fifteen years to gain tenure. His immediate reaction was one of sickened resignation, which deepened as my personal crisis with the Swansea authorities hurried on my departure in the autumn of 1986 for the United States as I.B.M. Visiting Professor at Kingston, New York. During my year as Pilcher Senior Fellow he was constantly troubled by asthma, compounded by the merciless miners' disease, plagued by a chaotic departmental organisation, and by difficulties with his eyesight. He fought these with soldiery courage and independence of mind. It seemed to me that he carried out his duties as a Tutor with skill and unusual dedication, drawing constant inspiration from a hatred of injustice, using in his lectures a wealth of personal experience. None of his work has been recognised by the College with promotion.

He made several attempts to advise me with appeals for tenure and on the position of tenure in relation to the Law of England and Wales. He risked himself by writing to Mr. Dafydd Wigley on my behalf on departmental notepaper, and wrote to the various College authorities in my support. Some of this correspondence is reproduced in Appendix ( ). He also advised me of his understanding of the various legalities and technicalities of gaining tenure in the English and Welsh Universities. Some of my understanding of the legal points is reproduced below.

## Legal Points.

The legal position of a person in England and Wales who is attempting to gain tenure in a University is, in my understanding, no different from that of any prospective employee hoping to gain employment. Despite the slow evolution of Labour Law in this century a scholar has no right of appeal in English and Welsh Law to tenure in a University. The situation is apparently no different in Scottish Law. In general there is no right of employment in law if a person is not already under contract of employment. There may be certain exceptions to this rule, but a non tenured Nobel Prizewinner has no right in law to tenure in any University. On the other hand the University has the right to select whomsoever it may choose to tenure, and has the right to do this by invitation, without any form of advertisement. This includes posts funded by the tax-payer. It would take an Act of the Westminster Parliament to change this, and even then the Universities are privileged by Charter from the Head of State. No Parliamentary action is likely to ensure the rights of scholars to tenure, because this is not politically important. At the time of writing the opposite course seems more likely, that tenure will be replaced gradually by a system of short contracts under the control of powerful members of the University administration. It is unlikely that this will lead to fairer recognition of scholarship.

## The Rights of Non-Tenured University Staff.

With reference to my personal experience in three Colleges of the University of Wales and in the University of Oxford the rights in practice of a non-tenured Member of the University, a graduate, or a post doctoral fellow, are extremely limited in comparison with those of tenured staff from lecturer to full professor. Some major elements of difference are noted as follows.

1) Tenured Members of the University are contracted in law until retirement after a probationary period. The contract may therefore last for up to forty years or so. A non tenured or term contracted post doctoral fellow or assistant has a contract lasting from a few months to at most about five years. At the end of this term the University usually has no further obligation to the post doctoral. Until very recently the latter had no right even to redundancy pay, and at the time of writing this remains a very small amount of money.

2) My personal experience at Aberystwyth, Bangor, Swansea and Oxford indicates that non tenured research staff have no real right in law to adequate accommodation unless their contracts explicitly make this accommodation a right in law. In other words office and laboratory may be arbitrarily removed from the non tenured employee with no recourse to appeal outside the University itself. In my experience the University of

Wales appeals system was completely ineffective in respect of accommodation, both at Aberystwyth and at Bangor.

Tenured members of staff are theoretically under the same threat of losing office and lab. at the pleasure of the head of department, but this rarely happens.

Term contracts sometimes mention the concept of "bench space" but the definition of this may range from full working laboratory to upturned cardboard box at the head of department's pleasure. Non-tenured and junior tenured members of staff alike should make sure that their contracts with the University clearly and unambiguously define their right to office and laboratory space for the duration of their contracts. The practical consequence of a loosely written contract is absolute power for the head of department, who may be a benign or malign dictator according to personality or the time of day.

## Accommodation in the Universities of Wales and

Oxford.

My personal experience of accommodation in these Universities is in the following chronological sequence.

1) As Dr S. Williams post graduate student at U.C.W. Aberystwyth from 1971 to 1974 I had no office, but shared a laboratory bench with other graduates and term contracted post-doctorals. This was and remains the accepted practice, in strong contrast to I.B.M. in the U.S., where every employee of this seniority has an individual air conditioned office. Tenured members of staff at Aberystwyth at this time each had individual offices, the largest and by far the most comfortable of these being occupied by the head of department, together with several large research laboratories with overheads covered by the tax payer. Senior technicians were sometimes allocated shared office space, probably as the result of Union pressure. The common rooms at that time were divided into academic and non academic, with a coffee machine for all students.

2) As Science Research Council post doctoral fellow in the Physical Chemistry Laboratory at Oxford from 1974 onwards I was offered bench space in a laboratory belonging to Sir Harold Thompson's group. This served as both office and laboratory until my return to Aberystwyth.

3) Back at Aberystwyth as British Ramsay Memorial Fellow from 1976 to 1978 I was allocated half an office (about 20 sq. feet) and a share in a telephone. Being untenured I was not entitled to the other half, which was allocated to my untenured colleague, Dr G. J. Evans. We were not allowed to make many expensive telephone calls, and never to telephone abroad without express permission from Head of Department.

4) As S.E.R.C. Advanced Fellow from 1978 to 1983 at Aberystwyth I retained this half office until it became the head of department's pleasure to to try to fit into our shared mini-space another desk plus post graduate. Under these conditions (roughly 12 sq. feet each) the only way for the untenured person furthest from the door to get out was to walk over the desk tops of the other two. As in an Apollo space module we were three intellectual sardines, packed symmetrically for take - off into innovative frenzy. The consequences of these "conditions of work" are recorded in detail in my Petition to the Privy Council, (Appendix ( )). As with a lot of accommodation in the University of Wales, the Apollo capsule was a fiery furnace in summer and a freezer in winter.

5) As University of Wales Fellow at Bangor from 1983 to 1985 the office I first occupied was in the Department of Pure Mathematics despite the fact that I was formally in the Department of Physics. This office was standard and similar to those occupied by tenured members of the pure mathematics staff, i.e. intolerably cramped, leaky, fiery with heat or frozen as the elements dictated. It swayed in a big wind, ten storeys above Deiniol Road.

After a great deal of disruption the apparatus accumulated during my SERC Advanced Fellowship at Aberystwyth was transferred to a small laboratory in the Department of Chemistry at Bangor, where I painfully re assembled it in the autumn of 1983. The strategic pointlessness of the move from Aberystwyth to Bangor is illustrated by the months of time lost in re establishing this expensive and delicate apparatus in the same configuration at Bangor, and reconnecting to the same U.M.R.C.C. computers. The only difference seemed to be that I was being paid much less at Bangor for doing the same work, the College having refused to make up the difference between my S.E.R.C. Advanced Fellowship and my University Fellowship at Bangor.

Almost immediately upon arrival at Bangor I was told not to bother to apply for a tenured position currently available in his department by Prof C.J.M. Stirling of chemistry, and a little later I was also rejected for tenure in Physics, Oceanography, Engineering and other departments of the College. Therefore I knew that my stay there was going to be limited. In these circumstances the decision was made after nearly six months of re-assembly at Bangor to transfer an interferometric spectrometer back to Dr G.J. Evans at Aberystwyth, from which it had been moved in the first place on the termination of my own Advanced Fellowship. The delicate and elaborate Apollo Laser system granted to me as Advanced Fellow by S.E.R.C. was moved eventually to the Department of Physics in Pisa, where it currently functions perfectly under the expert care of Prof. Paolo Minguzzi. At the end of my University Fellowship in Bangor, in Sept. 1985, I had no apparatus left under my direct control, my own position having become so uncertain. The University of Wales, by refusing even to consider me for tenure, had deprived itself of one of the most prolific research groups in its history.

Conditions in the Dobbie Laboratory of the chemistry department at Bangor were not fully adequate for a delicate instrument such as the Apollo laser, there were no safety features appropriate to the high voltages consumed by the laser. The Buildings Office at Bangor did not respond to several requests for a proper water cooling facility, without which the laser could not be operated, and I had to improvise one myself. When I had arrived in Bangor in October 1983 I had found the laser system scattered in pieces in various

parts of the Dobbie Laboratory. Without some voluntary help from Dr Colin Reid of my former Aberystwyth group the system (worth about one hundred thousand pounds at current market prices) would have been decommissioned completely. It took skill and imagination to circumvent the ignorant indifference of the administrations at both Colleges to transfer the system to Prof. Minguzzi's competent group in Pisa. Without this the University of Wales's "policy" towards non tenured staff would have resulted in a complete waste of the S.E.R.C's investment in our group, in terms both of personnel (two Advanced Fellowships and two post doctoral assistantships) and apparatus (a complete submillimetre laboratory).

During the whole of this time, my nominal "supervisor", Prof T.J.M. Boyd, apparently took no interest in events. Being an applied mathematician he, presumably, had no hands-on experience of experimental physics. As far as I know he never saw the laboratory I occupied in the department of chemistry. I do not recall a visit of his to this laboratory in the two year span of my University Fellowship.

On 2nd. Jan., 1985 I received a memo from the acting head of applied mathematics, Dr Cunningham, to vacate forthwith my office in the department of pure mathematics. Dr Cunningham was clearly embarrassed and apologetic but nevertheless I found myself without an office in U.C.N.W. Bangor from 2nd Jan., 1985 to 30th Sept. of that year, when I transferred to Swansea. Despite numerous written protests, following the grievance procedures of the University of Wales up to the Registrar of the University no office space became available for me, and I continued to operate from the lumber room of the pure mathematics department. I was a member of the Association of University Teachers during the whole of this period. The Bangor President of the A.U.T., Dennis Wright, happened to be a pure mathematician and had daily first hand witness to my condition. He delivered many protests on my behalf to the College and University authorities, but with no apparent effect. I was finally advised by Dr Wright that my contract did not give me the right to office accommodation. There was nothing that could be done in contract law to get me an office in the College. Thus, I remained without one at the head of department's pleasure.

During the whole of this period of about nine months office accommodation was provided by U.C.N.W. for all tenured members of the academic staff and also for all non tenured post doctorals in several departments of which I had personal acquaintance. Vacant office accommodation was available, but I did not receive permission to use it. In this respect, my head of department and nominal Fellowship supervisor, Prof. T.J.M. Boyd, apparently chose to ignore the situation, and was not persuaded to change his mind by any College or University officer.

My condition was witnessed on several occasions by local and visiting senior academic staff, and by the participants in the Bangor Summer Workshop under my direction in its second (1985) season. A written request of mine to transfer to the Department of Applied Mathematics was refused. The secretarial staff dutifully and surrealistically delivered my mail to me in the junk room including a memo from Prof. Boyd in about April 1985 removing my access to the xerox machine of the department of physics and stopping my postage allowance. Henceforth I had to find alternative methods of posting my official mail, generated during the course of my duties as University of Wales Fellow. I was not reimbursed for this personal outlay.

6) Upon arrival at Swansea as Pilcher Senior Fellow of the University of Wales I found that a small office had been allocated to me sandwiched between former Principal Robert Steele and Mr J. H. Jones of Adult Education. Despite the fancy title the Pilcher Fellowship was offered to me for one year only. The promised laboratory accommodation at Swansea never materialised and was not available upon arrival. Fortunately my apparatus at that time was safely held on my behalf by Gareth Evans back at Aberystwyth, and by Paolo Minguzzi in Pisa.The former had not yet been deprived of his status as S.E.R.C. Advanced Fellow and driven into part time farming.

I was informed by Prof Dutton, head of the department of physics at Swansea, that he, Dutton, would never dream of depriving me of my office. That would be ungentlemanly. So I remained neighbours to Robert Steele and Harry Jones for one year precisely. Dutton later deprived me of my Covenant with Rio, my livelihood and my postage rights, but that is another story.

I once again went through the procedure of reconnecting to the U.M.R.C.C. computers from Swansea, this time, - the CDC 7600 and Cyber 205. Without these Manchester based computers the inadequate power of the University of Wales's own small computers means that no internationally significant research in my own numerically intensive field would be possible.

## I.B.M., Data Systems Division, Kingston, New York.

At I.B.M. I obtained my first taste of air conditioning, proper heating in winter and cooling in summer, comfortable office accommodation adequate for my needs. Every member of staff at all levels of seniority, including "technicians" was allocated approximately the same office space, about 144 sq ft. each, properly furnished. This environment and respect for the individual encouraged efficient and hard work, and helped to maintain morale at a higher level than that in the University of Wales.

Despite the difficulties put in my way in the University of Wales by a few individuals I had finally caught up with my reputation, which had got across the Atlantic before me in the shape of monographs and research articles. I believe that this supports my claim for proper tenured recognition in the University of Wales, with the purpose of serving the People of Wales as scholar and teacher in its University. I hereby appeal to the People of Wales for such recognition, the People being Supreme Authority in the University. I appeal as a native of Wales, able to communicate in both languages, and a proven scholar of international significance.

# CHAPTER 4. SELECTION FOR TENURE.

The overwhelming advantages of tenure in a contemporary university are such as to elevate the concept to supreme importance in the professional life of a scholar/teacher. Without tenure the university sooner or later abdicates its responsibility for the future well being of the untenured post doctoral or post graduate, irrespective of achievements and service. All access to services provided by the tax payer, such as the Regional Computer Centres, can be removed at the discretion of the head of department. In sharp contrast, these facilities often remain available to tenured academics, irrespective of research activity, past or present. Obviously, this is inherently and grossly unjust.

The award of tenure ties the University to the tenured academic for a very long time, possibly from age 24 (Ph. D. graduation) to retirement (usually at 65). I have never known a member of staff to be deprived of tenure. In the University of Wales and elsewhere I have known many who did no research of any real significance, and some who did none at all. In many cases the inactive researcher was a poor and incoherent lecturer, and it was difficult to know what he did with his time. About half the members of staff at the three departments where I worked in the University of Wales were in this "driftwood" category. They tended to remain like this for many years, blocking all hope of tenure for younger and more active colleagues. All this was usually painfully apparent, particularly to open minded undergraduates. Tenure is a druidical mystery, offered and taken in the mists of history. The Boss Druid is the head of department. In latter years early retirement has been offered in the form of a carrot to the inactive tenured academic, often at a heavy price to the tax payer. In contemporary times the actual research of the department is carried out mainly by its untenured complement of post doctorals and post graduates. These often lend a hand in the teaching activity on a voluntary basis, in order to gain teaching experience as advised by their superiors in the profession. The untenured research output bolsters up the image of the tenured part of the departmental staff. The work of the untenured and term contracted post doctoral is used as a basis for more grant applications, to bolster the power structure and tenured status quo.

In selecting a candidate for tenure there is often a large gap between reality and the ideal. This section is intended as a reasonable argument for the abolition of the concept of tenure based on my personal observations of the system as it is.

## Power of the Head of Department.

In my personal experience heads of department at three colleges of the University of Wales may have undue influence in the selection of candidates for tenure. I have always been unhappy at the role of Head of Department in a contemporary University, the giving of close to absolute power to one individual over fellow intellectuals is asking for trouble in many cases. This is widely recognised in the profession. How much fairer and more democratic it would be to build on experience a workable committee system where all important

decisions are on a single vote basis. The following examples are meant to illustrate the shortcomings of the present "dictator" system with some of my own experiences in the University of Wales.

## Chemistry, Aberystwyth, 1968-1983.

The acting head of department upon my arrival in the Autumn of 1968 as undergraduate was Dr Mansel Davies, replaced a few months later by the incoming professor, John Thomas of Bangor. The latter departed for Cambridge in 1978 and later to the Royal Institution in London as its Director.

Both men are fairly well known in the profession and are capable scientists with international reputations. Both are Welsh speakers, and John Thomas on particular has an expert grasp of the language. Both attempted to operate within the Edward Davies Chemical Laboratories, which housed the chemistry department at Aberystwyth, by force of character, being essentially benign dictators in any matter of importance. Neither, in my own opinion, was a particularly good lecturer, and neither had sufficient mathematical grasp of the subject to make revolutionary contributions in the field of physical chemistry. However, in their own very different ways they contributed a great deal to contemporary learning. Mansel Davies was a remote, at times arrogant, idealist and most at home as a scholar; John Thomas was gifted as an organiser, an energetic fund raiser, essentially careerist and manipulative. As far as I know neither was by that time a craftsman, very rarely did they practise experimental or theoretical chemistry with their own hands. Neither ever wrote an algorithm for a computer. All this was done for them by a retinue of scholar/liegemen. Their activities in research largely consisted in writing papers, grant applications, and delivering the results of members of their groups in internal and external fora. In other words, without the help of members of their groups, mostly untenured, they would have produced very little of significance with their own hands. This contrasts strongly with the modus operandi of a true pioneer such as Albert Einstein, who always remained essentially the artist, naturally gifted, a natural revolutionary.

These two were masters of the E.D.C.L. for a decade. With the benefit of hindsight it has become clear that by concentrating all available resources for the systematic furtherance of his own career, Thomas destroyed the ability of the E.D.C.L. to remain competitive. During his reign the number of students in the honours class (third year) declined to an unacceptably low level. For several years in succession leading up to his abrupt departure for Cambridge the class consisted of a few mediocre students, maybe as low as half a dozen. The number of staff members exceeded the number of third year students.

The methods used by Thomas in the appointment to tenure were geared systematically for the furtherance of his personal reputation, his deliberate and long drawn out pursuit of Fellowship in the Royal Society of London and the Chair of physical chemistry at Cambridge. The outward result of his activities within the College power structure was the periodic appointment to tenure and promotion of staff who thenceforth carried out research under his own direction for the enhancement of his reputation and personal influence. They sometimes gained tenure at the expense of intellectual liberty, a Faustian bargain from which they gained security and a safe job for life, but lived in the shadow of another man's reputation. Nearly every one

of the appointments to tenure at the E.D.C.L. in the Thomas decade was made for this purpose, so that by the ninth year of his reign his grip from Reader to technician was nearly complete. Much of his court moved with him to Cambridge in 1978, gutting the E.D.C.L. of much of its modern research apparatus. Staff raised to tenure in the safe obscurity of the E.D.C.L. found themselves, in some case, Fellows of Cambridge Colleges.

In none of this was there much discernible consideration for areas of chemistry outside Thomas's own specialities. After two decades of raising liegemen to tenure in much the same way, Mansel Davies found himself without influence. Although granted a personal Chair, he lacked the monarchical power of the head of department, Thomas. No tenured appointments were made outside the latter's sphere of influence after the Autumn of 1968. As a result, Thomas's areas of physical chemistry became predominantly powerful until I began to challenge him with my solo performance in the mid and late seventies. This imbalance in the department was a fatal weakness which led to its closure a few years after the king removed his court elsewhere.

New appointments to tenure under Thomas's influence were frequently made with no form of advertisement. Favoured post doctorals might be given the good news that they would henceforth be Senior Research Associate or similar, tenured mebers of staff. The College records show the date of appointment and the name of the appointee. The funds for this purpose came from the tax payer via the University Grants Committee. All the benefits of tenure were then available for the chosen person. Most of those tenured in this way were capable and competent, and probably deserved it as far as I can judge. The problem is that many others, not of interest to Thomas or not personally favoured, were as worthy if not more. This conclusion is reached by a simple comparison of qualifications and from my own judgement of post doctoral colleagues at that time. I was frequently surprised by Thomas's decisions, and disturbed greatly at the secretive nature of the decision making process at U.C.W. Aberystwyth. Monarchical power in a head of department can and should be replaced by a committee structure, candidates for tenure should be appointed strictly on the basis of scholarly excellence, especially when dealing with Public Funds.

## A Remedy.

With the abolition of tenure, as well as the post of head of department, and with the introduction of a nationally regulated short contract system for all academic appointments, strictly without exception, some essence of fairness and national purpose can be introduced into academic affairs without infringing on the liberty of the University or the individual scholar. The qualifications of all candidates should be measured quantitatively in a national competition run by a Universities Joint Committee. The measurement of experience and excellence would be made as objective as humanly possible. Five year contracts for research, teaching, or a measured combination thereof would be awarded to the winners of the National Competition, which would take place annually. Bureaucracy would be cut to a minimum.One of the major aims of such a system would be the elimination of undue personal or local influence, the elimination of discrimination against a well qualified candidate. In my opinion Parliament can and must consider such a scheme.

# Chemistry, Swansea, 1977-1978.

In my own experience, the worst example of undue influence by a local official ( a head of department) occurred in an episode involving me personally in a much talked about incident in the autumn of 1977. This severely damaged my prospects for tenure irrespective of my scholarly standing in the international world of professional academia. This worrying incident involved an established figure in British chemistry, Prof. J.H. Purnell of Swansea.

In the autumn of 1977 I was the British Ramsay Memorial Fellow at Aberystwyth, having returned there from Oxford. I was beginning the second of my two years as Ramsay Fellow, which I had won in open British competition. At that stage I had begun to forge an international reputation as a scientist in my own right, and was about to be awarded the University of Wales's highest degree, the D.Sc., at the ripe old age of 27. U.C.W.. had been promising tenure for what seemed to me to be an interminable period of time filled with half promises of a bright future. These promises were delivered, or hinted at, both by John Thomas and Mansel Davies, but the goods were never delivered. I was probably too independently minded for Thomas, too much a potential rival in a field unconnected with his own. I had submitted the D. Sc. Thesis, for example, without bothering to supplicate to his influence and without even telling him, and it was too obvious that given half a tenured chance I would do well. Relations with Mansel Davies were distant by that stage, our mutual interests rapidly diverging. I had an unorthodox outlook on social hierarchies which made it wise for these establishment figures to distance themselves. It is to Thomas's credit however that he supported my application for Advanced Fellow and was always able to recognise my efforts on a purely abstract level. This also seemed to be the case with Davies, a man who remained very much of an intellectual chameleon to me: at times brilliant, at times dull to the point of boredom. I was merely trying to survive without tenure. Things were going well, the nucleus of of what was to be an internationally significant research group had formed with the arrival of Gareth Evans and Colin Reid. I had the opportunity to stay at Aberystwyth by competing nationally for an Advanced Fellowship of the Science and Engineering Research Council, awarded to "outstanding young scientists" from Britain's universities and polytechnics.

A spanner suddenly appeared amidst the humming cog-wheels when Purnell telephoned Davies with the offer to me of a tenured lectureship at University College, Swansea, of whose chemistry department I knew nothing and cared less. Davies passed the message that I had a job if I applied. He was wearing a bland, politician's face and I was instantly uneasy. Even at that stage it was made clear to me that the job was also to be advertised. In other words an arrangement was being made to provide a candidate with tenure in a post which was to be advertised openly in the media. The other candidates for this post would have, unknown to them, no chance of getting the job. This was at the head of department's pleasure using funds provided by the University Grants Committee. This placed me between the head of department's hammer and the anvil of injustice.

In my opinion Purnell was out of order, all candidates for tenure should have an opportunity of obtaining an advertised position in fair competition in the same way that a candidate for a first degree should not be favoured by the examiners. In the award of a first degree however, all academic staff have the right of fair

assessment of the candidate, and their collected opinion is normalised by external examiners from other Universities. In the equally important matter of the award of tenure, the personal influence of a head of department is often overwhelming. This is a ludicrous inconsistency, funded publicly.

In my particular case I finally rejected the "Swansea job" as it became known in the gossip columns of the profession and opted for my newly acquired Advanced Fellowship at Aberystwyth, where I was treated with deep rooted hostility but where I would have the chance to develop an active research group. This is easy to write down ten years later, but at the time the decision caused me insufferable turmoil. Not least troublesome to my conscience was my passive participation in Purnell's farce; anti- hero turned hero with tenure.I went so far as to appear at the interview and went so far as to try out the department at Swansea for a few weeks before finally resigning my letter of intent and taking the Advanced Fellowship. I had finally been singled out for tenure in a department I had never heard of for reasons unknown by a head of department who was as obscure to me as a white egg in a snowdrift. I had been sickened by the hypocrisy and double-dealing, and rescued myself only in the nick of time from intellectual oblivion at Swansea. I was instructed by Prof. Purnell that I was too honest for my own good. I signed no contract of employment at Swansea, which was free to offer the post honestly to the best of the other three candidates invited for tenure.

## Advanced Fellow, Aberystwyth 1978 to 1983.

This was fruitful and rewarding in terms of achievment, teamwork, and evolution of scholarship, but otherwise a very difficult time.

With hindsight the appointment of Prof. W. Jeremy Jones as professor and head of department was the beginning of the end of the E.D.C.L. and Jones knew it at the time. He was appointed from a short list of four or five that included two of his future senior members of staff, John O. Williams and H. G. Heller. The latter were both Readers at the time and Jones a lecturer and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. All three men are ambitious careerists but one, J. O. Williams, is fluent in the Welsh language and all other things being equal should have been appointed on this ground alone. The fact that he was not displays a lingering prejudice against all things Welsh in some quarters of the University College of Wales. J. O. Williams was also a Thomas product, and Thomas's own unpopularity rubbed off on him. His later career at Aberystwyth and U.M.I.S.T. shows his advantage over Jones in terms of national "visibility". It is impossible to say, of course, whether Williams would have been able to save the E.D.C.L. from closure, but I feel that he would have succeeded. I hope that he would have given my own group more encouragement than we actually received.

Jeremy Jones and I first met in Mansel Davies's office in the high summer of 1978, when I was still in many minds about Purnell's spanner. This was in the immediate aftermath of his interview and appointment. He did not seem to be elated, but nervous, quiet and intense. A man wondering about the mouthful he had just swallowed. Nevertheless, he gave a few indications of interest in my work. In a conversation with Davies and myself that same afternoon he learned, seemingly for the first time, of the low student intake to third

assessment of the candidate, and their collected opinion is normalised by external examiners from other Universities. In the equally important matter of the award of tenure, the personal influence of a head of department is often overwhelming. This is a ludicrous inconsistency, funded publicly.

In my particular case I finally rejected the "Swansea job" as it became known in the gossip columns of the profession and opted for my newly acquired Advanced Fellowship at Aberystwyth, where I was treated with deep rooted hostility but where I would have the chance to develop an active research group. This is easy to write down ten years later, but at the time the decision caused me insufferable turmoil. Not least troublesome to my conscience was my passive participation in Purnell's farce; anti- hero turned hero with tenure.I went so far as to appear at the interview and went so far as to try out the department at Swansea for a few weeks before finally resigning my letter of intent and taking the Advanced Fellowship. I had finally been singled out for tenure in a department I had never heard of for reasons unknown by a head of department who was as obscure to me as a white egg in a snowdrift. I had been sickened by the hypocrisy and double-dealing, and rescued myself only in the nick of time from intellectual oblivion at Swansea. I was instructed by Prof. Purnell that I was too honest for my own good. I signed no contract of employment at Swansea, which was free to offer the post honestly to the best of the other three candidates invited for tenure.

## Advanced Fellow, Aberystwyth 1978 to 1983.

This was fruitful and rewarding in terms of achievment, teamwork, and evolution of scholarship, but otherwise a very difficult time.

With hindsight the appointment of Prof. W. Jeremy Jones as professor and head of department was the beginning of the end of the E.D.C.L. and Jones knew it at the time. He was appointed from a short list of four or five that included two of his future senior members of staff, John O. Williams and H. G. Heller. The latter were both Readers at the time and Jones a lecturer and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. All three men are ambitious careerists but one, J. O. Williams, is fluent in the Welsh language and all other things being equal should have been appointed on this ground alone. The fact that he was not displays a lingering prejudice against all things Welsh in some quarters of the University College of Wales. J. O. Williams was also a Thomas product, and Thomas's own unpopularity rubbed off on him. His later career at Aberystwyth and U.M.I.S.T. shows his advantage over Jones in terms of national "visibility". It is impossible to say, of course, whether Williams would have been able to save the E.D.C.L. from closure, but I feel that he would have succeeded. I hope that he would have given my own group more encouragement than we actually received.

Jeremy Jones and I first met in Mansel Davies's office in the high summer of 1978, when I was still in many minds,about Purnell's spanner. This was in the immediate aftermath of his interview and appointment. He did not seem to be elated, but nervous, quiet and intense. A man wondering about the mouthful he had just swallowed. Nevertheless, he gave a few indications of interest in my work. In a conversation with Davies and myself that same afternoon he learned, seemingly for the first time, of the low student intake to third

year level in the first degree honours scheme in chemistry. He began to see what was left after Thomas had gone. In terms of third year students about half a dozen. This clearly shook him and put him immediately off balance. He had apparently been interviewed without being told of this critical problem, and was soon to be pressurised heavily by the new Principal, Gareth Owen, into getting more students from anywhere at all costs, never mind research. He had inherited a mill stone which ground him to pieces in a few short years. The department he had inherited was still a strong research machine, but was soon to fall apart under the combined pressures of the Principal's fixation with student numbers and deepening inter-personal rivalry at professorial and reader level. Jeremy Jones was simply not strong enough to withstand the pressures. Two senior members of staff soon disappeared, Heller and J.O. Williams, and a third. Prof G. WIlliams, professor of physical chemistry, was a selfish careerist, ineffective in departmental affairs. Williams had received rapid promotion under Mansel Davies's patronage but had no qualities as a leader and very few as a man. He did, however, have some talents as an organiser and fund raiser for research, and was a moderately good craftsman.

Demoralisation soon spread through the department.

On a second occasion later that summer Jeremy Jones and his Cambridge colleague, Dr. P. Freedman, met me at the Sze Hing Restaurant in Aberystwyth and advised me over mouthfuls of Chinese soup to go to Swansea and forget any prospects at Aberystwyth. This advice was followed up later by a hand written letter from Jones at Trinity College. They were both nervous and negative. Jeremy told me that Purnell would "cut his head off" if I refused to be obedient to Purnell's will and stayed at Aberystwyth. Even before his arrival as head of department therefore Jones was prepared to throw away one of his most productive and internationally respected research groups to a second rate physical chemistry department at Swansea. He seemed to be frightened at what would happen to him personally, and had no concern other than this. I believe that a stronger head of department would have at least listened to my side of the argument, especially in view of the fact that I had a guaranteed five years of funding from the S.E.R.C. From this point on I set my face against both Purnell and Jones and concentrated on turning out about one hundred and fifty research papers and monographs in the five years left to me at Aberystwyth, upon building up international contacts, and upon funding and running my local research group at Aberystwyth and on a European scale as first scientific coordinator of the European Molecular Liquids Group. My efforts were recognised nationally by the award of the Royal Society of Chemistry's Harrison Memorial Prize and Meldola Medal, the award to my group of a Visiting Professorship for a year at Cornell University in the United States and the award of publication contracts by the well respected publishing house of John Wiley in New York City. None of these achievements made the slightest impact on Jones and Purnell, and I was duly asked to leave the E.D.C.L. when my S.E.R.C. contract expired.

The five year history of my Advanced Fellowship at Aberystwyth is summarised briefly in my Petition of April 1986 to the Privy Council, reproduced in Appendix ( ). Jones used all the monarchical power of his office to discourage me in many petty ways.He blocked and evaded all my formal and informal requests for tenure at Aberystwyth, refused to let me lecture in either language. During this time he made several appointments to tenure, including two in the field of physical chemistry, to post doctoral assistants who were not Advanced Fellows. He later used the same tactics against my colleague and director of experimental research

in our group, Dr Gareth J. Evans. This is despite the fact that Evans was awarded an Advanced Fellowship himself in 1981. Even a weak and ineffective local head of department has the power to wreck the investment in science and scientists of a body such as the Science and Engineering Research Council. It seems that Jones did not pursue these tactics entirely with impunity, because he has by now lost his department and apparently no longer holds office. I see this as poetic justice, brought about accidentally by the University Grants Committee assessments of 1986 and the openly hostile attitude to all things chemical by Principal Gareth Owen. Jones effectively wasted about a quarter of a million pounds of S.E.R.C. funding in my group, all obtained fairly in national competition. Both Advanced Fellows of that group, Gareth Evans and myself, were overlooked repeatedly for tenure, but are still actively seeking the opportunity to serve the People of Wales in its only University. In these tactics Jones was openly and cynically supported by the professor of physical chemistry, Graham Williams. The latter made no attempt to intervene on our behalf, despite the fact that his research interests were closely allied. Apparently this behaviour was motivated by professional jealousy and personal animosity. There was no attempt by either professorial colleague to assess our work objectively, their actions indicate clearly that they were not capable of doing so. This makes a nonsense of the spirit if not the letter of the Charter of the University of Wales and makes a crude mockery of all academic principles.

## Bangor, 1983 to 1985.

I have personal experience of selection for tenure in several departments of U.C.N.W. Bangor. Appendix ( ) includes a record of my many attempts at gaining tenure at Bangor. My informal approaches and enquiries were at that stage of my "career" met with instructions to apply and compete for posts which may be advertised. When I did so subsequently I usually received a rejection slip long after the post had been filled. This game went on for several years, even after the former President of Plaid Cymru, Mr Dafydd Wigley, M.P., had protested on my behalf in letters to Aberystwyth and Bangor. Wigley's protests and enquiries were effectively ignored, or met with perennial pleas of poverty. The statistics of my applications, both formal and informal, and representations to these Colleges over a period of many years are presumably available from the Academic Secretaries and Registrars. It is a matter of record that the appointments made to posts for which I had applied upon advertisement were in the large majority of cases to monoglot English speakers who, as far as I am aware, made no attempt at all to learn the Welsh language. It stands to reason that the appointees must have been less qualified than I in terms of research experience, about equal in teaching experience, and much less qualified in terms of honours and awards and recorded contributions to knowledge. No explanation for my repeated rejection was received from the College apart from "lack of funds". In recent months I have been rejected by Bangor for a Senior Research Associateship which was advertised in my precise speciality, and which carried no teaching duties. It is highly unlikely that during the course of these assessments U.C.N.W. Bangor could have found a candidate for relatively junior tenured positions who was already an Advanced Fellow (i. e. an "outstanding young scientist" in the opinion of the Science and Engineering Research Council) a double national medallist of a professional body such as the Royal Society of Chemistry, author of about two hundred research papers in internationally refereed journals, author and editor of standard monographs, assisted by young and active researchers, and above all a native of Wales and fluent in both its official languages. On the last criterion alone I should have been appointed to

tenure by the College's own Welsh language rule. It has therefore breached its own rule on many occasions in respect of its repeated refusals to grant me tenure in posts for which I was clearly qualified. The hypocrisy of this behaviour is shown clearly in the letter from Prof. C.J.M. Stirling of chemistry in Bangor reproduced in Appendix ( ). This makes the absurd claim that I am not qualified for the post of tenured lecturer in that department on the grounds that I am "over-qualified". These appointments are clearly going to be made at Stirling's pleasure, with Public Funds, in all probability to monoglot English speakers. These are unlikely to learn a word of the Welsh language. The end result will be that in this department, not a single member of the academic staff will be able to deliver a single sensible word in the language of the majority of the People of Gwynedd. All this despite the fact that a fully bilingual and fully qualified Welsh candidate is willing to take on the job. The head of department, Stirling, has decided that this shall be the case, and no Welsh Member of Parliament shall stand in his way. Did a monarch ever have such power in Wales? Stirling himself is a monoglot English speaker and has not attempted to learn the Welsh language in about fifteen years as head of department of chemistry at Bangor.

On the two occasions I was short listed at Bangor, once for a lectureship in bioelectronics, once for a lectureship in physics, the posts were offered to monoglot English speakers who were in all probability less qualified or at best equally qualified in certain respects. This breaches the Welsh language rule of the College, which was statutory at the time these appointments were made. This is a matter of concern to the People of Gwynedd, whom the College claims to serve in a special capacity, because of the Welsh language itself. The hypocrisy currently inherent in the College's attitude should be of concern to the local Members of Parliament and to the funding agency, the University Grants Committee. The Welsh language rule itself is reproduced for convenience in Appendix ( ).

Among the posts for which I have been rejected without interview at U.C.N.W. Bangor are : 1) lecturer in chemistry (on several occasions); 2) senior research fellow in the Institute of Molecular and Biomolecular Engineering; 3) lecturer in oceanography with special interest in analytical chemistry. On none of these occasions was the existence of the Welsh language rule advertised or mentioned in the literature sent to the formal candidates. It is unlikely that the successful candidates had my qualifications and experience, professional or linguistic.

On numerous occasions I have written informally to the Principal and Registrar at Bangor with requests for tenure. I was instructed to compete for posts which may be advertised and advised about lack of funds. The College has written to others who have approached them in my support, including the Member of Parliament for Caernarfon, Dafydd Wigley, and Prof Noel Owen, formerly of the chemistry department at Bangor itself and currently a full professor in the United States. As far as I am aware the existence of the Welsh language rule was not mentioned in any of this correspondence.

In this context, therefore, it is extremely unlikely that the University College of North Wales, Bangor, can be in and for Wales as its Charter implies, and measures must therefore be taken for reform. At times, the College seems to be an outpost of colonialism.

## Swansea, 1985 to 1986.

In the ten years following the Purnell incident I have been rejected by U.C. Swansea on every single occasion that I have applied for advertised posts, ranging from lecturer to professor, and in several different disciplines of natural philosophy. I have , however, been offered the junior, untenured posts of University Fellow and Pilcher Senior Fellow for which no College funds are necessary. I have been rejected by Swansea, without interview, for posts in chemistry, engineering, physics, and mathematics, and was not considered for tenure under the terms of the Covenant which I myself arranged on behalf of Swansea with the State University of Rio de Janeiro. It can be assumed that the junior posts were offered to junior and less experienced candidates and that each one was filled by a candidate who had no interest in the Welsh language. Apparently, U.C. Swansea has no official policy towards the Welsh language, despite the fact that it is in and for Wales according to Charter. It has a small department of Welsh and some bilingual signs. Prof Clerkson, its Principal, is a monoglot English speaker who told me at the official Covenant reception for Dias Tavares that he believed that "Welsh was not spoken around here".

On numerous occasions I have written to the Principal of University College, Swansea for tenure, but was instructed to compete for posts which may be advertised. Having competed for these posts I have, thus far, been rejected without interview. The latest letters from the Department of Chemistry at Swansea are reproduced in Appendix ( ).

## Conclusions.

The major conclusion of this survey is that the award of/in my case is not based objectively upon scholarly excellence but in the subjective behaviour of an influential local official, the head of an academic department. The same negative conclusion is supported by the rejection for tenure over a span of a decade or more of two members of my former group at Aberystwyth, Dr Gareth J. Evans, and Dr Colin J. Reid. The former is now a part time farmer, despite being a former S.E.R.C. Advanced Fellow, and the latter is an untenured post doctoral assistant in the Royal Society Research Unit at Swansea. Both have more recorded contributions to knowledge, in the form of refereed research articles and articles in monograph form than most tenured staff members of the University of Wales. The foreign members of my group at Aberystwyth are in contrast all tenured. Ironically, I still receive letters from foreign colleagues who wish to work with me although the University of Wales has effectively destroyed the opportunity to do so. The University's attitude to its own international well being suffers as a consequence.

The Purnell incident, and the John Thomas era at Aberystwyth, are examples known to me personally of the wildly disproportionate influence of a minor official, the head of department, in the allocation of funds originally obtained from the tax payer. Tenure has in my experience been awarded unfairly or repeatedly without advertisement and objective assessment of candidature. There is no reason to suppose that the head of department is less influential in other Universities.

## Suggestions for Reform.

Upon this evidence it is necessary to introduce a system whereby academic excellence in a candidate (see Appendix ( )) is recognised by the award of tenure or its reformed equivalent. In order to do so it is evidently necessary to remove all undue subjective influence from the selection procedure. One means of doing so would be to quantify nationally the candidate's credentials. This may be achieved in numerous ways, but it must be a quantitative assessment of such factors as ability and experience recognised by all contemporary British Universities in the same spirit as the first degree classification scheme (i.e. first, upper second, lower second, third etc.). A candidate for tenure in any British University would have on record a total of points against his name. The award of tenure at a particular seniority (e.g. "lecturer" or "reader") would recquire a certain number of points. Similarly for promotion of staff already tenured. Points would be awarded by a Universities Joint Committee on a nationally agreed basis. The assessment would be based on aspects of achievement including:1) research record; 2) teaching record; 3) administrative record; 4) personal initiatives; 5) other factors.

The assessors on the Universities Joint Committee would be open to election by the British Academic Community for periods not exceeding two years.

Category 1) for example, can be subdivided into 1) number of refereed publications in journals of international significance; 2) proportion of single author publications; 3) number of refereed review articles; 4) number of refereed monographs; 5) plenary and contributed conference papers; 6) evidence of requests for reprints; 7) number of citations; 8) evidence for quality and impact on professional peers; 9) awards received from funding Bodies and grading of research applications; 10) honours and recognitions; 11) award of D.Sc. degree 12) other factors of relevance.

For each sub category points would be awarded under the discretionary control of the Universities Joint Committee set up by Royal Commission. Similar sub categories would be devised for other aspects of candidacy for tenure in all individuals qualified with a Ph. D. degree. The total number of points would determine the worthiness for eventual tenure in any University. Once a candidate would have reached a nationally agreed norm he would be tenured in at most two years from that date. If necessary the Universities Joint Committee would provide the funds for that purpose. If the concept of tenure were to be abolished the candidate would be offered a five year contract for research, teaching, or a combination of both according to his aptitude as determined jointly by the U.J.C. and the candidate himself. The candidate's points total would be updated and would grow as the candidate grew in intellectual stature, both at home and abroad. There would be no local interference in this procedure.

In selecting candidates for interview, the University involved would have agreed to select the short list for interview in order of points total accrued. The candidature of foreign nationals would be assessed firstly

by the U.J.C. and the candidate awarded a points total to be forwarded to the assessing University. After interviews are complete and a candidate selected by the University from the short list, the U.J.C. would have to be fully satisfied as to the individual University's choice, especially if the post were not awarded to the candidate with the highest points total. The candidates on the short list would have the right to know which had the highest points total prior to interview. The candidate with the highest points total, if not appointed, would have the right of appeal to the U.J.C. which would review the selection procedure and if necessary appoint the candidate to a position elsewhere. This would ensure the independence of the University and the rights of short listed candidates. Eventually, all worthy candidates would be tenured.

While such a system would not be free from abuse it would attempt to remove the personal bias of influential individuals in the all important matter of selection to tenure. As this reform would strike at the power of these individuals it would be resisted strongly and would have to be imposed by Parliament through a Royal Commission.

# CHAPTER 5.MY APPEALS FOR

## TENURE TO THE PRIVY COUNCIL AND OTHER AUTHORITIES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF WALES.

Having applied for tenure on numerous occasions in the University of Wales over a decade or more, and having been rejected over fifty times, I was eventually advised by some of my tenured colleagues, including J. Henry Jones, to appeal to the University's higher authorities. These include the Committee of Principals of the University of Wales, the Court of the University, and the Visitor to the University, the Privy Council. Other individuals in authority include Members of Parliament who are ex officio Members of the University Court, and the Pro Chancellor, Lord Cledwyn.

I duly approached the Committee of Principals during my Pilcher Senior Fellowship, having been advised to do so by the University Registry at Cardiff through the University's Academic Secretary. This correspondence is recorded in Appendix ( ). I appealed to the Committee on the grounds of experience, service and qualifications, with reference to scholarly excellence in comparison with staff at professorial level in the University of Wales. In this appeal to the Committee of Principals (Appendix ( )) I asked for promotion from Pilcher Senior Fellow, a University post, to the University post of Reader or Professor. The University has the power to make such an appointment at its discretion and there is no precedent prohibiting the promotion of a Pilcher Senior Fellow to Reader or Professor. In passing my argument to the Committee of Principals the Academic Secretary presumably judged that it deserved fair assessment.

The only reply from the Committee consisted of a short note (Appendix ( )) to the effect that it "would not add to previous correspondence". It is not clear as to what correspondence the Committee had in mind, and no reason was provided for its refusal to take the matter further.

After considering this abrupt and unreasoned little note my colleagues and I decided to prepare documentation for an appeal to the Members of Parliament of the University Court who were in Office at the time. This documentation is reproduced in Appendix ( ). This was sent out to the M.P. 's in the late spring of 1986 at the House of Commons. Another copy was provided for my own M.P., Alan Williams, and for the Pro Chancellor, Lord Cledwyn, the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords. The appeal consisted of a reasoned argument for tenure developed by J. Henry Jones and myself in a covering letter reproduced in Appendix ( ).

A copy was also provided for Mr Dafydd Wigley in recognition for his work on my behalf vis a vis Aberystwyth and Bangor.

No effective response was achieved from any Court Member of Parliament. Brief notes were obtained from Cledwyn and Dr. J.J. Marek, together with expressions of support from Mr Dafydd Wigley. Dr Marek advised us not to contact M.P.'s at that stage, and Cledwyn effectively noted receipt of material. Apparently, no attempt was made to read the material or act on my behalf by writing to Principals of the University of Wales. Dafydd Wigley emerges from this episode as by far the most concerned and able proponent of my case, but even his efforts have been effectively ignored by the University. In this context it should be noted carefully that the Court M.P.,s were asked to act in their ex- officio capacity as Members of the University Court. The argument of interference by Parliament in a Chartered University's internal affairs is therefore not valid. Cledwyn was of course the Chairman of the University Court and therefore a Member of this the University's highest authority.

Having exhausted the University's internal authority I decided to appeal to the Visitor to the University, the Privy Council in Whitehall.

Appeals to the Privy Council

These took the form of several letters and Petitions covering the period 1984 to mid 1987. Most of this correspondence is reproduced in Appendix ( ). This was directed at the Clerk and Deputy Clerk, who normally decide whether to forward the information to the Council for assessment. After considerable delay my petitions were eventually put before an "academic advisor" whose identity was not revealed to me. This advisor looked at my complaints, the reply of the College at Aberystwyth, and my comments on that reply. My original complaint was dated April 1986, the reply of the College did not become available until November, 1986, and the final adjudication of the academic advisor arrived in Kingston, New York only in mid 1987. This represented a three year delay or more after my initial approach in 1984, after reading a Times higher Educational Supplement article on the role of the Visitor.

The "Visitor" in my case meant in effect an unknown advisor whose final verdict was nearly completely equivocal. He or she delivered a non-verdict, merely confining the judgement to a comment that there was insufficient evidence to prove my complaints. This merely reduces the role of the Visitor to insignificance, and makes a mockery of attempts to obtain independent assessment from this Office.

Several other suggestions of mine for a possible solution to the long drawn out failure of the University of Wales to assess my applications objectively were evaded or ignored in voluminous correspondence with the Clerk and Deputy Clerk in the period 1984 to 1987. My specific complaints were usually dismissed by the Clerk as matters for the Officers of the University even though the approach to the Visitor had originally been made necessary by the failure of these Officers to take any effective action. For example in the incident of my office removal at Bangor, covered already in this book, the Registrar of the College and the Registrar of the University had been kept aware of the problem by the A.U.T. President and myself but made no effective attempt, and apparently no attempt at all, to procure me office space. This prompted my complaint on the same topic to the Visitor, in which Office the Clerk either ignored the complaint completely or apparently attempted to refer it back to the University Officers.

Other Means of Appeal

Other means of appeal are theoretically available, such as Petitions to Parliament, Members of Parliament, the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration (the Ombudsman) and even the Commission for Racial Equality, the last on the grounds that the Welsh Language Rule at Bangor has been breached repeatedly in my case and rendered a mockery by the College authorities.

Members of Parliament

The interest of M.P.'s in my case has been indicated by correspondence with Mr Dafydd Wigley, M.P. for Caernarfon, Mr Alan Williams, former minister and M.P. for Swansea East, and brief correspondence with Dr J.J. Marek , M.P. of Wrexham. After several ineffective attempts to obtain an explanation and positive