

Meeting between Bournville management, B Weaver & D Gates - 8th March 1985

Gates said that a senior member of NATFHE was considering bringing charges of professional misconduct against BW. He provided no information as to whom or why.

BW said to Gates that he owed her an apology for accusing her in front of a CRC visitor and a colleague of taking documents [from his desk]

Gates replied "Are we going to start asking for apologies? I can ask you for an apology for what you have done."

BW asked "what do I owe an apology for?"

Gates said "about Barbara Lee."

BW said that she thought it had already been agreed that what Gates thought had happened did not happen

DT said there seemed to be a lot of mistrust here.

DG said "Yes, I do not trust her (BW)"

BW said "I do not mistrust him (DG) but think that he is not prepared to recognise her role on the course." She asked DG where were the schemes of work and the validation of the provision.

DG accused BW of "prattling about."

DT asked DG to provide the information required so that BW could carry out the role of coordinator. He said BW should ask for the information through DG.

15th January 1986 Letter to Brian Pinto

Dear Brian

Here is a copy of Triesman's letter to me with offers of options!

I draw you attention to 4 items:

1. Part 2 of his letter referring to motivation – I thought that anti-racism **is** about investigating motives. By excluding sexism or sexist harassment and racism are eliminated before the investigation. Anyone who is concerned with anti-racism must be concerned with motives of actions and behaviour.
2. They are trying to steer me away from Rule 8. If not Rule 8 and not to involve panels or bodies then I am expected to carry on on my own relying on two White males to repeat the procedure. This time not to make mistakes! And, therefore, efficiently stifle a Black woman with a legitimate complaint. The witnesses will be now strongly influenced by the tenacity of the Black woman who had the cheek to question White officials and their machinery.
3. After an initial mention of the investigator, no further reference was made about the official in question nor of his investigative technique
4. The letter refers to differences not complaints. I have no differences with D Gates but I have some serious complaints against him which shows his behaviour detrimental to other Blacks and woman.

Please phone me as soon as you can with any advice you can offer. I also have some other information which may be of interest.

Bismillah W

34 Christopher Road
Selly Oak
Birmingham B29 6QJ
30th March 1986

Dear Mr Carter

On the 25th March 1986 I wrote to the Regional Secretary regarding the procedures for making a complaint against a full-time Regional Official.

In his reply, the Regional Secretary said that one possibility could be to raise the issue with a sub-Committee of the Region who could then bring it to the Regional Executive in the form of a motion or report.

I would like you to raise the issue in the West Midlands Anti-Racism sub=Committee when it next meets. As a Black member of the Union I am looking for support from a body set up to promote and defend the interests of Black people in NATFHE.

Please find enclosed a copy of the letter I sent to the Regional Secretary.

Yours sincerely,

Bismillah Weaver

To Vice Principal (undated - 1st May 1986)

When the vacancies for the job of senior lecturer in race relations and equal opportunities was about to be filled, I, as a student governor, was selected to be on the interview panel for the post. Mr David Gates knew that and said to me that Mrs Bis Weaver was not in his mind a good candidate for the post. I replied by saying that the best applicant, who is suitable, would get the job. He also said (asked) if he could have a look at the application form(s) but I refused immediately.....

I believe that Mr Gates has got something against Bis and it should be sorted out. With a weak staff you create weak students

Student Governor

17 May 1986 BW and D Evans telephone conversation

I (BW) acknowledged receiving the copy of the letter he sent to Peter Dawson at 11am on Saturday (today) and was surprised to find out from the letter that my case was discussed at region without notice given to me. The only way I found out was from the letter three days after the meeting. Did members of the REC ask the executive if I had anything to say regarding the matter? Did any of them seek to ensure that I had representation or someone to speak on my behalf?

Evans: There are no mechanisms in the procedures to allow for what you are asking. The item was put on the agenda by me as an item that came from the branch.

BW: The branch did not discuss or decide to send the item to region. There is nothing in the statement made by S Pattinson that suggests that the motion passed by the branch should be put to the region. Perhaps you could clarify the matter for me. Is it an automatic procedure that once a motion has been passed by the branch that it goes to region?

Evans: No, I assumed that it was a branch decision to send the matter to region.

BW: I attended the last branch meeting and the decision of the meeting on the 28th April was reported to me. I know that the branch was not approached and that discussion did not take place at the branch committee. It may have been a decision of the Branch Executive/ Did Pattinson say who sent it?

Evans: That matter was not raised. I put it on the agenda because it was suggested that the branch could not carry out its normal functions because of the letters received.

BW: I am passing you over to Gordon (Weaver) because as you can see I am short of breath because I have been ill.

Gordon Weaver explained the events in Branch Committee and the Branch re: the statement (explained elsewhere)

Bis took over again:

BW: Just a few points quickly

(i) the question of the discussion which took place between Gates and Alan Day:- I gathered that at the REC meeting it was suggested that the informal nature of the discussion/advice makes it harmless and did not jeopardise the procedure of investigation. As a sociologist I would like to point out that the formal structure allows best for procedural forms. It allows access from the rank and file – it provides mechanisms which can be clearly defined and checked and scrutinised. In relation to my case if formality was observed it would provide me with the information which will enable me to see that justice is done. The informal structure is what the “old boy network” works on. It is inaccessible to those outside the elite groups of people who rub elbows or drink together or whatever they do in informal relationships. That it was argued and indeed stated in writing by Day that the discussion or advisory conversation was informal is much more serious than the final discussion. The rank and file members and especially Black people who are not yet part of the ‘elite’ of the union structure have no way of countering the influences of ‘informal’ relations.

It is a serious miscarriage of justice to argue that the informal discussion between Day and Gates is to be disregarded. I would have liked to put my argument as I have outlined to the executive but I was not given the right to be represented. S Pattinson made out a statement as far as I know drawn up entirely on her own, which she maintains is on behalf of the branch committee and on her own decision brought it to the region. Where are my rights? Who ensures my trade union rights are protected?

(ii) The motion that was passed by the REC suggests that I made allegations. I wish to state that I made no allegations I have simply written letters to ask questions. I asked P Welch questions regarding her attempt to intervene. She has not answered. I made no allegations

against her. I simply wish to know why she chose to intervene. Whom did she discuss the matter with? Whom she saw? How she approached the BCFE Chairperson? All I am asking is for information to put into my jig saw of events. Could you advise me if she intends to answer?

Evans: I have asked her but there is nothing I can do if she decides not to.

BW: Could you please pass to her this message that I voted for her on her platform of accountability but her refusal to answer simple questions to provide me with an account of her role in my case has led me to believe that for her accountability may be to other trade unionists, to White women and not to Black people.

Evans: I do not share your view

BW: Then she will have to explain to me why, if she stands for an accountable union, she refuses to be accountable to a rank and file Black member? Could it be that her loyalty is to a Communist Party member? I gather that she is a member of the Stalinist wing of the Communist Party to which Gates also belongs.

Evans: I do not think she is a member of the Communist party

BW: My informant says she is. Could you pass my message to her that in the absence of evidence to demonstrate her willingness to give account of her actions to me, a Black woman member of the union, I have to conclude that she acts in the interest of White trade unionists only.

Evans: I disagree with your conclusion. I do not think that Penny is like that

BW: I can only conclude from her failure to account to me

iii)

BW: The motion is clearly not one that would find favour with Pattinson whose intention was, I think, to ask for an investigation into my behaviour. It is clear that there are some people whose goodwill enabled them to question the inaccuracies, misrepresentations and accusations made about me and who managed to put a more representative position. However, there are two points I wish to make, one I have already made but which I stress, I have made no allegations, I have sent letters asking questions, but the motion assumes that allegations have been made. I wish to put it on record that no allegations have been made. The other more important point in terms of procedure and rules is that a reliance on the presence of people who are progressive and act with good will to see through such a statement as that presented by Pattinson is not the way to safeguard the rights of trade unionists. There must be a mechanism which ensures that an individual's trade union rights are not railroaded in the way it was done at BCFE branch and attempted at region. This as you pointed out is not at present available for individual rank and file members. There must be rule changes.

Evans: Rule change is a slow and laborious procedure – the motion suggests an ad hoc investigation team

BW: My interest is to ensure a formal structure which protects the rights of women and black members of the association to work without abuse and harassment

18 May 1986 (sun) Telephone Conversation BW and Robin Doughty

Doughty returned call. He had phoned yesterday but BW's phone always engaged

BW: I was talking for some time with D Evans and P Mackney mainly to say that it was a shock for me that (the statement) had gone to the region when liaison had refused to discuss it

Doughty: we discussed it at liaison on Thursday, after regional executive. I have resigned my position as secretary over this issue. It was a very acrimonious meeting. Teresa Daly was not there as the Chair and Gates was in the chair. Bournville was over-represented, they had five people in attendance instead of the usual four. When the agenda item 'problems in branches' came to be discussed, Gates vacated the Chair assuming that a motion was going to be put by BCFE branch regarding the problems in that branch. Terry Mandrell took over as chair. I objected to the motion being raised saying that head office had clearly stated that the matter should not be discussed at liaison. Mandrell upheld the objection, declaring that the motion should not be discussed. There was a challenge to his Chairing. The challenge was upheld. Barry Lovejoy took the Chair. He was fair in his chairing. The motion was again put. It was an acrimonious meeting. We were discussing the meeting until 9 pm. Gates and the others had also been drinking – many interesting revelations were made. Gates demanded support and Downey was backing Gates all the way. All three (Gates, Pattinson and Downey) resigned over the issue.

WMARC 18 June 1986 – GW Notes

Election of Chair: S Pattinson nominated by B Lovejoy; seconded by J Frew

GW opposed the nomination of SP on the grounds that she had produced a statement, and spoke to it, attacking the only Black person in the Bournville branch and making unfounded allegations against her. The WMARC would have no credibility in the Black community if a person became chair who had attacked a Black person in this manner

DG: GW has made an inflammatory statement

GW: You've silenced me in the Branch, are you now trying to silence me here?

BW: It is not inflammatory

DE said we should not bring up other issues.

BW nominated MB

MB turned it down

SP: initially I decided not to stand but I have been on the WMARC since its inception. You are referring to only the last six months and not my record over the previous five years. You should consider that.

DE: Sure we will

BW: What about Krishna

DE: Krishna's not here

SP: If Krishna is nominated he can take the chair

MB to SP: I don't think you should stand down

R Carter: Why should officers be Black?

DE: leave election of chair

DG suggested that acting chair rule nominations closed

RC: Can't do anything else.

The rest of the notes recording the election of co-optees have been lost but they were recorded in a letter from GW to KS dated 24 January 1987

Gordon Weaver

7th July.

Dear Branch Committee,

I have received a letter from Ann White (attached) which alleges that I wrote to D.Gates' senior management accusing him of missing lectures. I was also approached by Jan Cairns Smith (on behalf of the branch committee) about this matter. The letter contains serious allegations against me which are based on a misunderstanding and which I want to clear up.

1. I have not written to D.Gates' Senior line management (Judy Parsons) alleging he has been missing lectures.

2. I understand from Judy that Dave has not been asked about such an allegation by Senior management.

The letter refers to a note I left on Judith's desk on Tuesday 29th April at 2pm asking for a PICAS form belonging to Barbara Lee, an Access student. Barbara needed this form urgently and could not find Dave who apparently had it. I approached both Brendan and Norman Cave at about 1.45 pm in the Business studies division staff room about this. I was told where Dave was teaching and went to his class to find that he had given the students a study period. I then left a note on Judith's desk the gist of which was that I couldn't find Dave and asked her to trace B.Lee's form as soon as possible. That evening I went into Sue Fattinson's evening class to ask her to tell Dave that I had been looking for him.

I wish to set the record straight. Judith Parsons and Barabara Lee will confirm what I have written above. They are even prepared to send statements to branch committee. Given the present difficult situation I do not want this letter misconstrued as an attack on either Dave or Norman. It is an attempt at clarification.

A union's best defence against the victimisation referred to by Dave is in the unity of its membership.

Gill Butchere

WMARC meeting 9th July 1986 - GW Notes

GW raised issue of co-options (see letter)

SP wanted MB co-opted

BW: Black Lecturers Group want Black lecturers to fill all officer's position on the WMARC with the membership of WMARC to be White and Black

GW mentioned that two minutes required amendment.

AJ: This is legalistically nit-picking. He invited KS to be secretary and had sent out the calling notices in KS' name.

KS: I have no recollection of confirming that I would be secretary. It came to my knowledge when visiting Garreets Green college. I would have liked to have been given advance notice of this.

BW nominated KS to be chair.

KS: It is not open now.

DE: This committee had an election. It was agreed constitutionally and it can't be changed. Can't overturn the committee's decision. This elected don't want to vacate.

BW: the election was not irrevocable. The spirit behind the committee should enable a change. But it was systematically ensured that a Black person was kept out of the chair.

SP did not accept that it was systematic. She wanted to keep it as it is.

GW: in the spirit of the committee, you could resign

JF said that should not be asked.

SP: proceed to item 3. [Election of secretary]

WMARC Meeting 17th September 1986– GW notes

BW statement resigning as Treasurer

JA: I can't understand it. All agreed that you have problems and that NATFHE let you down. You are participating in the committee.

BW: I have no support from NATFHE.

GW: I advise BW not to speak further on the issue as it may compromise her.

JF: We all appreciate that NATFHE has a long way to go but it's our union and there are not external pressures on us. (Implying NATFHE can change within its own structures) I hope that no other Black person decides to do this. At the last meeting it was agreed that in future officers (in WMARC) will be Black.

GW: Whose union is it? It seems as if NATFHE is run by the ASTMS. Resigned as co-opted member in favour of Sharma.

GW raised issue of returned letters

Discussion of WMARC's structures and aims and objectives: the difference between the armchair theoretician and those calling for practical action; and for greater attention given to Black people's views.

Discussed the limitations of the ARNP as identified by GW in his communication with Triesman.

WEST MIDLANDS NATFHE WOMEN'S REGIONAL PANEL

Notice of Meeting to be held on Monday 29 September 1986 at
7 30 pm in the Teachers' Martineau Centre, Bristol Road,
Birmingham.

A G E N D A

- 1) Apologies
- 2) Minutes of last Meeting
- 3) Matters arising
- 4) Creche facilities - members reports
Working party - J Debenham
G Butchers
I Widdows
- 5) Equal Opportunities
- 6) YTS - Discrimination in Placements
- 7) Secretary - Reports for minutes
- 8) Any Other Business

Secretary's Note:

The Minutes are presented in Draft form - it is realised they
are an incomplete record of the last minutes. Members will
please write in any record they wish to be added.

Please note earlier time of meeting.

Minutes of Women's Regional Panel Meeting held on 29 September 1986 at 7.30 pm at the Teachers Martineau Centre, Birmingham

Present I Widdowson (Chair)
 M McDaid
 D Andrewes
 J Debenham
 P Welch
 M H Smith
 J Frew
 M Green
 M Bennett
 P Ord

1 Apologies – J Ashcroft

2 Minutes of Meeting of Monday 30 June 1986

These were presented in draft form and amendments welcomed. A report received from Ms M Smith is attached and will be filed with the minutes

3 Matters Arising

Membership of Women's Panel

It was agreed that the undermentioned women should be contacted regarding co-option on to the Committee on any issues where their co-operation may be of help.

N Campbell, Bilston
Dee Edwards, Kidderminster
Balvindar Bassra, Dudley
M Bennett
Jane Collins, Coventry (Part-timer)

b) P Rolfe had not reported to the Women's Panel.

It was proposed that the secretary write to Ms P Rolfe requesting a report and asking if there are difficulties preventing her attending National Women's Panel suggesting a substitute is elected to attend. Ms J Debenham agreed to attend meeting as a substitute if required.

4 Reports – Sexual Harassment

a) Guidelines for dealing with Harassment cases:

No definite guidelines have been drawn up, although it was suggested by Ms P Welch that members of the Panel work through the channels show on the flow chart. (Handed out at last meeting.)

Motion on guidelines – P Welch reported that it would be on agenda of next Regional Council meeting on the 25th October 1986

D Andrewes will submit, seconded by M Green

It was agreed by the Panel that all women should be informed that there is a procedure for reporting any acts of sexist or sexual harassment. It was proposed and agreed that Ms P Welch would re-write this procedure and pass to NATFHE officials for analysis. Ms M Green agreed to draft a letter to be circulated regionally to all secretaries of Women's

Panels asking them to inform all members of present procedures, also giving the names of Women's Panel support group.

Ms M McDaid asked for her thanks to the panel for their support to be recorded

b) Creche

The sub-committee had not been able to arrange a meeting.

Ms J Debenham had circulated a letter through Regional Secretary asking for information.

Members of the Panel supplied the following information:

Dudley C of T: Small crèche (12 places) will commence in November 1986

Wolverhampton Poly: Funding available – although not officially acknowledged.

Bilston College: Play groups

Telford College: Creche provided under Community Programme for unemployed people.

Cannock: Ms M Smith report that good crèche facilities provided through MSC funding

It was agreed by the panel that more pressure must be put onto management to provide nursery facilities. Ms P Welch suggested NUPE and NALGO be contacted.

Motion to be provided by Ms M Smith and forwarded to Regional to provide crèche facilities at Regional Council.

5. Equal Opportunities

All members were asked to provide statistics for next meeting on grades/promotion/sex of lecturers/ It is agreed by the Panel that it is necessary to raise the consciousness of all women in other Colleges. Ms P Welch agreed to write a paper on the "promotion of women" to be discussed at next meeting.

6. Any Other Business:

The Panel agreed that a logo be designed to be printed on any correspondence or leaflets produced by a Womens Panel. Ms M Green agreed to produce some artwork for the next meeting.

WMARC meeting 29th October 1986 - GW Notes

Discussion on NATFHE

BW: NATFHE should demonstrate its support for Black people. The branch did not provide support when I was in derious difficulties in the nbranch.

DG: BW said that she did not receive support from the branch. That is an unfounded allegation – she should withdraw that remark.

BW: The branch took away my rights and NATFHE services and facilities were withdrawn from me.

DG: Why haven't you put in a complaint then?

GW: Is that what you are recommending?

KS to DG: BW is entitled to her opinion as you are entitled to yours. Don't you agree?

GW: I agree with BW. I'm from Bournville branch and the branch gave no support at all to a Black person (her). There, now we've all had our say.

GW informed WMARC of case taken by member of this region against NATFHE for racial discrimination. He was informing the WMARC as it is an anti-racism body and a sub-committee of the region. The case will probably have wide publicity and he would not want members to find out about it first in the newspapers.

DG: I knew if informally.

GW: Now people know of it formally.

Wednesday, 20th November 1986 Mr Woods of ACAS phoned – GW answered

1. Officer said there was some confusion and asked what the complaint was about. His colleague in Birmingham had said no racist language was used.
2. GW said the complaint was about the refusal of NATFHE to provide facilities and services, no advice and assistance when she took her complaint to the LEA
3. GW: NATFHE was saying that racial harassment not mentioned but the full-time official was told. I was there.
4. GW explained that NATFHE's response to the OIT and the CRE were misleading, Triesman said for her to go to the CRE – there are two witnesses. There was a letter on the 17th April 1986 from Triesman pointing to the LEA's procedures.
5. A letter of the 13th January 1986 was sent not as officer of ARNP but as official in charge of casework
6. BW had asked for details of Rule 8. It was a long drawn out exercise
7. The branch motion removing BW's facilities and services
8. Day's report was a whitewash – there were 11 letters pointing out the deficiencies

The officer said he had spoken to Pierce looking for a settlement out of court.

GW told him BW had a solicitor and he should speak to him.

Mr Woods asked what BW wanted

GW said he had an idea but he should speak to BW. He added it seemed very serious the manner in which BW had been treated by NATFHE.

Bournville Woman's Group meeting – 5th December 1986

Attendance: H Stretton; A White, C Deeson, B Weaver

Apologies: J Cairn-Smith, G Butchere

AOB:

BW: This is a women's meeting and I am addressing you two women (CD had left) on a woman to woman basis. I am not speaking to you as the secretary of the branch, Heather, or you, Anne, as a branch committee member.

Do you realise that a woman in this branch has been deprived of an important right in this union. - the implications of which I shall go into in a while.

On the 29th April, without being informed in advance, without a charge, without a hearing, without reps, without being told what procedure was being used and when I was sick in bed and helpless, a statement was made to the branch. It was recommended that facilities, which include my right to have access to members of the committee, access to information and accountability by representatives, were withdrawn. I have not to date received my own copy of the statement. Heather, who knows the details of the way the statement was issued, can verify what I have just said. Are women going to stand by and allow another woman to be treated in this way. I am asking you, as women, to put a resolution withdrawing the motion of the 29th April.

Now the implications I referred to. I have been monitored by the city for attending two meetings on the 11th and 19th September 1986. [BW provided the details]

I am in a position where I am unable, because of the withdrawal of my rights, to notify the branch of what has happened to me. They have withdrawn any responsibility to respond to any request should I make one to them to do something about it.

12. 30 Tuesday 16th December 1986

Present BW, GB.AW, IB

AW: There does not seem to be much point to hold a meeting since there appeared to have been a confusion of days. No notice has been sent out and HS is not able to make it.

GB: I think we should try and reconstitute the Women's group as we have important things to discuss. We need to discuss crèche provisions and conditions of service for the workers and the whole provision.

BW: This meeting was specially called because I raised the question of my rights in the branch at the last meeting. I made it clear to AW and HS that as it stands I do not have the full rights of a NATFHE member. The branch voted to remove my rights on the 29th April without my being informed of the charge; without being informed in advance that such a motion was going to be put to the branch; without being told what disciplinary procedure was being used; without giving me the rights to representation. I asked HS and AW what they were going to do to restore my full rights, which I explained has left me, a black woman, vulnerable as shown by the way no action can and has been taken to bring about an enquiry as to why I was being monitored by the city council.

GB: I spoke against your rights being removed, and for your right to have Gordon Weaver speak on your behalf. But I think others did not know the details of why that action was taken because they are not familiar with the case.

BW: Yes you did and I did not mean you. The other women here did vote to have my rights removed. They did as you have just pointed out without asking for the reasons and the procedures being explained. One woman made a statement about another woman without following any trade union procedures and other women voted with the men to take away the rights of a woman without her being able to defend her rights. Why have I not had the support of the women? What have I done to deserve their lack of support? On what did they make up their minds to deprive me of my trade union rights? Is it because I am Black?

GB: I experienced the same thing. I suffered a similar situation

BW: Yes, but you also have a special interest in ensuring Black people have rights and equality – your son is Black. I think the Women's group treatment of you is a further example of the appalling situation we are in. I have never seen a so-called women's group behave in the way they did when you brought your case to the group. I was appalled at the reaction of some of the women in asking you to define what you meant by sexual discrimination, sexism and sexual harassment; and the defensive position they took over certain male members. They also took the position of acting as a group which will discipline women members when indicated by certain male branch officers – an unprecedented position I would say for a women's group - using the group to 'bring to order' women who had the courage to complain about the behaviour of certain males.

X: You are shouting at us and I don't like being shouted at

BW: I am not shouting. I am very angry, perhaps, being angry is the way to survive the constant harassment and attempts to discredit me. I am angry with women who claim to protect the interests of women and to challenge the people and systems that perpetuate inequality – to be angry with the so-called anti-racists. No one other than GB has been able to act to in support of what they are full of words about.

X: I think the way you are talking is aggressive and angry and I find it difficult not to be alienated when you take this attitude and I can understand people not being involved.

BW: I was not aggressive or angry at first but they still did not come to my support. People can please themselves what they do but if they call themselves a women's group or anti-racist group then I shall challenge them. I am still having a dialogue with White people but there are more and more Black groups and those groups do not beg to be supported. If White anti-racists act to support their Black counterparts then good – if not then Black people will go their own way and the dialogue will stop. This is fast becoming the pattern.

AW: I think we have to do something but there are too few of us here. We need to have a discussion. It is too late this week. We need to meet in January but when I talk to you I don't want to go through Gordon. I find it difficult because we have to work together. The other day when you asked me to act as your woman's rep I found it difficult because when I was speaking to you I had to go through your representative.

BW: Gordon was protecting my interests; he had been my only support. He did not choose the role.

GB: Gordon has been the only support for Bis, I can understand both you and Gordon's anger

AW: The women's group has to do something. We must make sure we give plenty of notice of the meeting.

BW: So that no one turns up! I have no illusions when it comes to supporting a Black person against a White person or against a White group that there will be no action. I was refused a representative in the branch committee the other day – to ensure that I was slandered. A member of NATFHE slandered me and to take his case to NATFHE will continue to slander me.

GB: Like many other people he has become involved – an innocent party in the case.

BW: He is no innocent party – he appeared to know about me and the details of the case, which is strange. He then chose to slander me to member of staff. He got himself involved for motives best known to himself.

Meeting ended at 1.30. Meeting to be re-arranged for early January.

BW returned SD's call 18th December 1986

SD: Are you coming to this evening's party

BW: No, I am angry with a lot of people. I don't think I'll bother

SD Is it something to do with the thing you said happened but which you could not tell me about?

BW: Have you heard?

SD: Yes. It's about the bloke who got the sack. What is his name? If you tell me I'll remember

BW: Did you know that the Liaison Committee came to the college in the form of Lovejoy and Barr?
And Gates came from the Region; and Richard (Downey) from regional council?

SD: No. We have to meet to have a talk

BW: I'm fed up talking. I have talked enough with you. You know all the details and I have asked you to act. But you have not done a single thing to show people at liaison where you stand. I don't know where you stand. You have never made it clear and your inaction has suggested you have not given me any support. You have left me to fight for my rights all by myself .
You know my rights in the branch have been removed and what have you done?

SD: I don't know where I stand either.

Telephone conversation BW and Roy Benjamin 21st December 1986

RB: I have some news about you being monitored by the Education Office. I told you when I spoke to you last that I was going to write to John Crawford. Well I did that and I had a reply from him to say that he was asking about your absence from college according to instructions from the chief executive, Tom Caulcott. I then wrote to Caulcott about the beginning of November and saying to him that your absence had already been explained and I asked him why there was a need to have your absence explained. I said that that kind of activity is tantamount to racial harassment give that a satisfactory explanation had been made.

Caulcott has replied to say he does not consider an enquiry about a city employee as being racial harassment.

BW: Do you know who asked the CE to initiate the enquiry

RB: No. I have not been told that but I think it is possibly Kurshid Ahmed or Bill Gray. Caulcott will not tell me. He is stonewalling. I have sent a copy of my letter to BG and will talk to him about it.

BW: I met Bill Gray on 11th December at the Council House. BG raised the issue himself saying that he did not ask for my movements to be monitored and that he had said so to Alton Burnett. He told me that he had written to Caulcott and will send me a copy of Caulcott's reply when he gets one. He also told me that it was not his method of working to go in an underhanded way; and that he is more astute politically than the action has shown to be. I believe him on this. In fact there are rumours that the directive came from someone higher.

RB: Yes, Dick (Knowles) is capable of that. He has done similar things

12 January 1987 Telephone Conversation KS and GW

KS said that Julie Frew phoned on the 11th January to tell him that the REC had decided to have an investigation into the running of the WMARC as they are not happy with the way things are going. She and Tony Henry will be conducting the investigation. KS told her that the committee is doing the work it should be doing and they are only concerned because real issues affecting Black people are being taken up.

JF said she did not agree – the issues about harassment should be taken up by the Black lecturers group's meetings. The WMARC is for other issues of policy and principle.

KS asked if only Black people are to discuss issues of harassment and the Whites are not going to be discussing them.

JF said that Bis Weaver's case was being investigated and that it should not be dealt with.

KS said that he hadn't time to discuss it now and said why wasn't he informed in writing. I don't want to discuss this over the phone.

JF said that outsiders are going to the meetings and proper procedures are not being followed. She said that Pattinson had resigned as Chair.

End of conversation with J Frew.

KS said to GW that he had thought of resigning.

GW said not to do anything hasty and suggested he sent a letter to Evans, writing down your conversation with Frew. This will place it on the record. Ask questions as to who these outsiders are and what procedures are not being followed. Send a copy of the letter to Evans, plus Clarke' and BW's letters to every member of the committee.

Conversation Phil Murphy and B Weaver 14th January 1987

PMY: I had a long chat with B (Leftist) about two weeks ago about NATFHE and what's been happening in NATFHE. He said that a number of people on the left are quite concerned about your case in NATFHE. He said that Gates is feeling totally paranoid. He feels that NATFHE is not defending him against the attacks against him. Gates is saying that he is totally harassed and being made to look like a monster. Gates and his girl-friend have moved away from Birmingham as a result of the harassment and their effects. Did you know that they had gone to Sheffield?

BW: No I did not. But it is always the case that when one makes a complaint of harassment against White people they say it is us the victims who are the aggressors – the harassers, as in your experience in the recent council house incident. B (Leftist) says about Gates feeling unsupported to give you the impression that he – B (L), is not supporting Gates. But that does not mean that he is helping me or ensuring that I do not suffer from abuse and harassment. He has one face in the company of people like yourself and Alton – Black males, and another when he is in the company of White union bureaucrats. I told him and his girl- friend to their faces. I said to them in particular in a meeting that certain people have a face they put on when they with Black people in Handsworth and another when they are with their White colleagues and when Black people are in a tiny minority. He is much like the rest of the White Left. They have no intention of making changes that would mean or may mean that they have to listen to Black people on any issue, especially on race.

PMY: B(L) says he is not supporting Gates and that he is concerned about the industrial tribunal – he feels that you might lose the case. He explained his general dissatisfaction with the way that head office nationally has handled the case. There is general agreement that the whole thing has been mishandled by the national office and he knows why. It is to do with the way the West Midlands had acted in the Fernandes case. Head office was embarrassed by their actions in the Fernandes case and they were embarrassed by the Midlands' action. Apparently, head office has left the West Midlands to stew in its own juice as revenge.

BW: I am not asking B(L) why head office did what they did. I have been asking the White left about their part in it. What have they done to ensure that justice and fairness operates? I have not asked them to help me or support me but to show that they do not support these people who have been trying to discredit me. And at the very least to detach themselves from the persons I complained against and point out to NATFHE that I have certain rights like other members of the union. For example, why I was not given the usual procedures where I can present my case to the branch committee. I was asked to present my case to the chairperson on her own and thus I am now dependent entirely on her interpretation of what she said I said or did not say. Luckily, I have some written evidence because the ex-chair, who could provide me with crucial evidence has now, after contacting head office completely lost her memory of her formal meetings with me. Since I was not given the opportunity to present my case to the committee but to the chair on her own, I have no way of having any statement verified by her.

Bournville College Women's Group meeting, 22nd January 1987

Present: IB, AW, JT, GE, GB, BW

AW: Notices to everybody to discuss issues raised by BW at last meeting

GB: What is it that you want us to do Bis

BW: As I said before. I am not discussing the case in the city nor details of the IT case nor issues relating to the motion passed in the branch yesterday (Beider issue) because they are sub-judice. But I am discussing about my lack of full rights in the branch. Of course, there may be links with the motion passed on the 29th April 1986 with certain issues, which are subjudice. Where they link up I will tell you the link but not the details.

An overview was given of (i) no right to correspond with the branch committee; (ii) no right to look at records relating to her case in the brnch; (iii) no right of access to branch committee members both in terms of her own case work and recent case work effecting her directly.

As a result of this lack of rights (a) I have not been able to get advice and help when I was monitored by the city council – gave details of the monitoring.

(b) When I wanted to nominate a candidate for the regional I could not have my nomination paper dealt with by the branch – gave details.

These like other correspondence have to be sent to head office.

(c) Serious casework in the branch involving the dismissal of part-time member of staff – I had no access to the branch committee on the way its decision was made and there are direct implications to me as a professional and as a long-standing union member in the position taken by the branch committee. The branch committee have not told you the details [of the Beider case] yet put a motion through the branch for branch to take a decision which by its logic affects me. The case against Haris Beider, who made serious slanderous allegations against me to two people about who I have serious complaints in the city. These two members were on the branch committee when it made the decision to support Haris Beider when they have a direct interest in the matter.

GB: Agreed.

BW: You other members voted in the branch without asking for full details in the same way that the branch voted to take away my rights. Nobody in the union came to ask me about my side.

AW: What do you want us to do?

BW: I want my rights back. You have to think what you have to do to get my rights back

AW: We don't know the details of why the motion was put

BW: You seem to vote on issues that you don't know the details when it goes against me. But when its in order for me to obtain my rights it doesn't matter how much detail I tell you, you still seem unable to make a decision. This seems like Nazi Germany in the 1930s when people voted without knowing details and taking decisions based on the decisions of a few.

AW: But the motion was to do with asking for your case to be dealt with by head office.

BW: Not all. Head office had been dealing with my case since 13th January 1986. The sequence is like this: complaint 10th June 1985 to the branch; and from 18th June 1986 the region dealt with it until the 13th January 1986, when I had a letter from Triesman suggesting a method of dealing with it. My rights were taken from me on the 29th April 1986 when head office was already dealing with it.

On the 25th June 1986, I took the case to the city and the union did not have anything more to do with the complaint and, therefore, my correspondence with the branch has nothing to do with that case. But it has stopped me from having the right to have representatives (committee members) accountable such that when I was monitored by the city I could not write to the branch asking it to provide support and assistance – details of monitoring provided and when it initially became known to her on Tuesday the 30th September 1986.

On the Thursday [2nd October] in the branch meeting I was again attacked indirectly by the comments made by the chair in his opening remarks and by David Lightfoot, who talked about the stresses and pressures on the three people I brought the complaint against. I was getting attacks from the branch as well as from the city at all levels and I have only one person to stand by me, although one or two other people have come to my assistance at various times. Where are the other so-called socialists and trade unionists? Where are the women who boast about their support for women to pursue their careers? None of you have given any consideration to the kind of pressure I have been suffering.

GB: I can't stay any more. It reminds me too much of what I have already gone through. I cannot see Bis suffer in this way anymore. I'm getting out of here.

AW: We can't do anything in the branch because the case is in the tribunal.

BW: I explained to you that the case if not at the tribunal it is in the hands of the city. The IT complaint deals with head office refusing me assistance to pursue my case. There is nothing in the branch that is related to the case at the tribunal – details were given of the IT case and the racist and sexist discrimination policy of the union

The women's movement in the region has not helped me at all. I am not surprised because I don't think that the White women's movement concern themselves with Black women's issues. This is about the last bit of dialogue I shall engage in with a White women's group. I am checking out what you aim to do about getting a Black woman's rights.

AW: We can't do anything until the IT is over. That will be in early February. It is only a couple of weeks.

BW: Is it? How do you know?

AW: Heather told me that it will be on the 3rd February

BW: You know more than I do and yet you say that you don't have any details. I don't want action after the IT. I want it now. I have been a fee-paying member and a good union member since 1977. Why should I not have full union rights? What was my crime? What rules did they use? Who made the decision to withdraw my rights and the rights of another union member, who had been standing by my side? I know why his and my rights were withdrawn.

I'm going anyway, it is no use talking to you.

Governor's election issue

27 January 1987: Branch officer approached Robbo and said the other candidate (JB) had withdrawn from the election. Robbo drew the conclusion that she had been put under a lot of pressure. Robbo told the officer, he did not want to get involved in their shenanigans but would withdraw from the election.

28 January 1987: Robbo then discussed the Governor's election with the other candidate. She told him she had not withdrawn and showed him the letter from her NAS/UWT (her union) that advised her only to withdraw if the other candidate did. Robbo told her that a NATFHE branch officer had said that she had already agreed to withdraw. They both agreed to approach Bournville management.

16 February 1987: Both Robbo and JB told by NATFHE officer that if elected would be sent to Coventry.

Robbo went to see Downey on another issue – that is about the way he had been treated by NATFHE. Downey told him that he would propose him for the Governor's place and Cave would second him. The branch officer, who put pressure on him, apologised to Robbo and put the blame on the other union. The officer said he wanted Black people to participate in the union.

As Soon As This Pub Closes

I could have done it yesterday if I hadn't a cold,
But since I've put this pint away I've never felt so bold.
So as soon as this pub closes, as soon as this pub closes,
As soon as this pub closes, the revolution starts.

I'll shoot the aristocracy and confiscate their brass,
Create a fine democracy that's truly working class.
As soon as this pub closes, as soon as this pub closes,
As soon as this pub closes, I'll raise the banner high.

I'll fight the nasty racialists and scrap the colour bar,
And all fascist dictatorships and every commissar.
As soon as this pub closes, as soon as this pub closes,
As soon as this pub closes, I'll man the barricades.

So raise your glasses, everyone, for everything is planned,
And each and every mother's son will see the Promised Land.
As soon as this pub closes, as soon as this pub closes,
As soon as this pub closes, I think I'm going to be sick.

11th March 1987 Telephone conversation KS and GW

BW received a copy from KS of a motion proposed by D Evans. This was the motion put to the WMARC on the 25th February 1987 and which the WMARC said should be put to the Black Lecturer's Group for approval when it next meets. However, the motion has been sent to regional council members and the motion has been sent out above the signature of the WMARC.

GW spoke to KS, who said he would write to D Evans and would raise the issue at the regional council meeting when it meets.

(It seems that D Evans, and others, are trying to railroad through D Evans' motion and claim it is a motion from the WMARC)

GW phoned AB and told him of the situation.

(It is quite obvious that the REC, or some of its members) consider the WMARC as a rubber stamp for themselves)

REC Meeting 18th March 1987. Information from KS 18 March 1987

Present: B Lovejoy, J Frew, S Pattinson (chair) D Evans, KS, R Doughty, M Smith, Kett

JF: referred to minutes of January meeting, which said REC accepted the report into the WMARC. She wanted an addition to the minutes – two people had written in to say WMARC functioning OK

KS: Two people's views not recorded. There is a contradiction. The REC gave full support to a motion saying the WMARC operating OK yet the report attacked the WMARC. He referred to the November 1986 minutes: (a) In the light of the equal opportunities officer's failure to send in a report and (b) chair of WMARC resigning because of harassment. This led to an enquiry into the WMARC

DE: This is a mistake in (a) as the equal opportunities officer left early and could not know of the decision to submit a report. In the January minutes the REC noted that the equal opportunities officer had sent in apologies

KS: I had good reason for not attending and the REC is drawing conclusions on my motives for not attending. Only half present today. What are their motives for not attending?

The REC decided to delete reference to the equal opportunities officer from the minutes.

27th April 1987 Conversation EP and GW/BW

EP said he had written to Doughty at Garrets Green College asking what Garrets Green is doing about BW's case at Bournville College and if any of the branch members/officers have been involved in any way with the case or have knowledge of the case and, if so, wanted to know what they have done and in what capacity.

EP wanted the case raised at the next branch meeting and be discussed and minuted. EP made the point that he will have nothing to do with a union that has discriminated against or acted in any way against a Black woman.

30th April 1987 Conversation EP and GW/BW

EP spoke to Garrets Green branch secretary and a women's representative

EP wanted the issue of the deprivation of a Black woman's rights at Bournville College raised at the next branch meeting and he wanted to know what members of this branch had done about it.

Branch Sec said this is a matter for Bournville and the branch could not interfere

EP said that a few weeks ago he had lost half a day's pay because the branch secretary had convinced him that he should come out on strike for people in the Hereford and Worcester area. He said that she (the secretary) had told him that they could not be parochial about these issues. It was alright then to get involved in another branch's affairs but not to protect a Black woman from discrimination. He said he would raise it in the branch and ask what the branch was going to do and have it minuted.

The Branch secretary and a woman's representative left him in disgust because he would not see their point.

REC Conference 1987 Information from KS to GW 29th May 1987

- (i) At the Conference, the police were called in by the hotel management to deal with the situation.
- (ii) There was an argument between Gates and others. Gates pushed Julie Frew to the floor; and the others had to hold Lovejoy and Gates from fighting
- (iii) There was a meeting to discuss Gates' behaviour. The chair of the meeting said that it was about his assault on a woman. It was suggested that he was asked to withdraw from the delegation and conference.
Mackney said that he had many disagreements with Gates but Gates was entitled to put his point of view.
Gates came in and apologised. He said that he had been under pressure for a couple of years. He asked to be released from the delegation and to leave the conference. He had sent a written apology to Julie Frew. Gates was asked to wait outside.
Julie Frew said that as long as he remained on the delegation she felt intimidated. They agreed to let Gates leave.
Pattinson should have assumed the chair but she asked to be released and to leave the conference.
- (iv) The press heard of the situation. It was suggested no one said anything about it.
- (v) Alan Day and Paul Mackney met Gates before the meeting and advised him to ask to withdraw or he would be excluded

REC meeting 17th June 1987. Information from KS 17th June 1987

Discussion on BLG motions

DA: Motions from BLG should be withdrawn and two dropped. D Evans motion on should be supported. The wording in the BLG motions is wrong. The REC should advise BLG on how to improve wording and procedure. The equal opportunities officer is spending time on Black people and not women and those with disabilities

KS: Black people don't want patronising speeches about them. There is nothing wrong with the wording. Why is she attacking me? My brief is to deal with anti-racism

DA: I wasn't attacking you.

KS: Who else is the equal opportunities officer?

RDty presented report on Weaver v NATFHE and referred to misrepresentations of the Tribunal chair

KS: The chair made critical comments about Alan Day. Are you saying press reports accurate or not? If they are accurate then there is no distortion

RDty: There is some distortion. Three or four paragraphs on Day were selective.

KS referred to the Evans motion and the patronising attitude of DA; and said that people have learnt nothing from the Bis Weaver case. A NATFHE official was castigated by the tribunal

RDty: Rubbish

D Evans on his motion: Both Black and White have a part to play in anti-racism

PMc supported Evans and said that the BLG see it as only Black people know about anti-racism. There is an implication that Whites cannot be anti-racist. There must be a role in anti-racism (for White people)

BW and JB (Staff Governor) 17th June 1987

- a) BW informed JB of the complaint against Cave, Hartland and Gates, submitted under A2 of the TGP on the 25th June 1986 and not dealt with yet.
- b) BW informed her of the December incident – Beider. Discussed Beider and the issue of unfair dismissal taken up by the union. When the union case (in support of Beider) was settled BW invoked A2 of the TGP against Cave and Hartland. After Whitsun saw management who had not heard anything and the Principal said she would contact Banting
- c) BW wrote letter to Banting. Banting replied to say, he had inadvertently filed the complaint. JB said, she understood that could happen. BW said but not in her case as it was known nationally and all in the city knew of it.
- d) BW told her of being monitored by the city. JB was shocked at this

JB was aware of the implications and said that BW was asking for equal treatment, equal opportunities

Aide Memoire for Meeting BW and PMT, 22nd June 1987

1. There was an investigation on behalf of Cave and Hartland
2. BW recognised their right to approach management but not the right to make unfounded allegations
3. BW making a counter charge using formal procedures – that is my rights as a member of staff:
 - (a) The Governors have not observed the procedure
 - (b) She still has the right to the procedures
4. If the Principal is now advising BW that matters need not go to the A2, how is she going to give BW the right to bring a grievance against staff making unfounded and defamatory allegations? What is the Principal's advice?
5. BW had pointed out in her letter that this is not an isolated incident and that there are serious implications.
6. Where is their evidence to support their claim?

BW spoke to R Downey (in presence of GW) 30 June 1987 (9.45 am)

BW told RD that she had registered a grievance under A2 (against two members). She asked him about NATFHE's view on the right of members to use the grievance procedures.

RD said he was not on the branch committee.

GW but you are on the governors

BW said she wanted her right under the grievance procedures to have her grievance heard

RD asked if he had to know the details of the grievance

BW said no

RD said that she was entitled to have her grievance heard under the grievance procedures. What do you think is going to happen.

BW thought the Governors would say yes but the City would say no

GW said he had been in contact with Banting as BW's lay representative

RD said that he will see to it

RD telephoned 11am

RD said

1. The governors meeting has been called off as it was inquorate
2. He spoke to Banting re: item of grievances. RD said to Banting that he was concerned to impress upon him that when procedures exist for staff to pursue grievances these procedures, which are part of agreement, should be implemented. If agreed procedures are not used then there is a danger of [the complainant] going outside of procedures, which will not be a good thing. Banting did not comment
3. RD made the same comment to management. RD was concerned that agreed procedures are followed
4. As this was his last appearance (as a governor) he has already made his contribution and will not be involved further

JB phoned to say the meeting was abandoned so the matter is undecided

34, Christopher Road
Selly Oak
Birmingham B29 6QJ
10 February 1988

Ms Alice Mahon
44 Prescott Street
Halifax HX1 2QU

Dear Alice Mahon

I have heard that the Humberside and Yorkshire Regional Council are interested in having the implications of the Ms B Weaver v NATFHE raised to “generate a debate on this serious and fundamental issue to the Trade Union movement.”

In order for this to happen the issue needs to be raised formally by an affiliated union within the region.

If you are in a position to have the issue raised in the Yorkshire and Humberside TUC it might lead to a much wider debate within the movement and, hopefully, into changes in policies and practices.

Best Wishes

Gordon Weaver

Tuesday 8 November 1988 BBC

Debra Perkin of BBC 2 phoned BW about the programme *Rough Justice*. It had been suggested to DP by the EOC to contact her about her case.

BW explained her case against NATFHE and the city council.

DP showed interest in the case and would contact BW in the future.

Friday, 11th November 1988

DP phoned, spoke to GW

DP said they had been interested in BW's case and had discussed it but there were a number of cases that had also to consider and they would not be following up BW's case. She asked GW to keep her informed of developments in the city council case.

GW agreed to send her the report of the IT and EAT and keep her informed of the city case.

BW: I would like to say something about the removal of my trade union rights in the branch by a branch motion without any disciplinary hearing

Unknown: I don't know in what context. What is the case?

BW: Context not important. The principle is important. The branch committee met and proposed a statement and motion with a day. At the branch meeting, the branch chair spoke to the motion and a vote was taken and a motion passed to send my letters to the branch committee to head office. It is unconstitutional as there must be disciplinary measures taken.

HS: This is BW's case of abuse and harassment. She was sending letters asking for information. The branch committee couldn't cope. It was interfering with branch business.

BW: I sent 17 letters. The reason for the letters was that branch officers had access to information and were familiar with procedures and the parts individuals played. I had no recourse but to seek information in writing. HS spent a lot of time providing valuable information. The reason for requesting information was that there are no minutes of the meetings. I had to ask about the meetings. There were some letters to members of committee; some were not answered and I had to repeat questions.

This is not a matter of other union business. I am talking about a woman in a case of abuse and harassment and who was dissatisfied with the investigation.

GB explained that when statement put out BW was off work ill. She did not know about the meeting; and had no representation. She didn't know about meeting.

HS: There will be a right of reply next week.

BW: I asked at the following meeting for a right of reply. HS said I could have it at the next meeting as there was important business to discuss. I was then told I could have it at the end of the meeting.

BW mentioned an issue in the complaint; explained when DG called her a liar in meeting with JP and PH;

JP confirmed the issue.

BW: I was also told to take my f...ing finger out in a meeting.

JP: Management should have done something about that. All throughout the management should have done something to take the pressure off a woman doing her work.

JP referred to a NATFHE conference on women's rights. There were many cases of harassment. She mentioned A Day as being seen as inept.

BW: the pressures on me are tremendous. I am ill, walking with a walking stick. I need support of women and I have had no support whatsoever. Management didn't act. This was racist. If a Black man had sworn at a white woman, he would have been out of the college.

AO: You could guarantee that.

JP: I am very supportive but I am not taking sides on the case. I was a witness who saw Day; I was selected by the branch chair

BW: The chair is the partner of the person I complained against; and she selected the witnesses.

GB: The problem is that if it was anybody other than DG, Bis would have had a lot more support and NATFHE would have looked at the case differently. The branch chair was person in charge. NC is a branch officer. They were all teaching on Access course where the problem started. Bis is not going to get any support.

BW: NATFHE structures have to be changed and the procedures improved. It doesn't help if members of the union who have a special interest in a case seek to defend existing structures and act as a brake against changes. In that respect they are no different to management.

KS: These are important issues to the women's group. The whole thing about harassment is something that we have to take seriously. This group is about protecting women.

GB: I put in a complaint to the women's group against DG and they ignored it. They were not interested. I had a nervous breakdown.

JP: We are aware of this

GB: HS told me that somebody has been asked to read a complaint about me in the meeting.

BW: What do you mean? Is it you HS?

HS: Not me. It is AW or JCS

GB: I asked HS not to bring it up because we have such a lot to discuss at this meeting

BW: I know what it is, It is the PECAS form details.

KS: This is not a group for males to bring up complaints about females. We are not a kangaroo court to judge other women.

BW: GB's case is important.

BW then told them about the HMI issue and the notes she had filed away about her dealings with DG, NC and BH.

BW: That should tell you something. Why would I need to file away notes. That is the environment I am working in.

JP: They came and spoke to me. There was no consultation.

AO: What is the principle behind this? There is one rule for him and another for you. Hardly trade union behaviour