

## Chapter XIII

## NATFHE's Descent into the Mire

## (a) NATFHE Myth-Makers Storm On

The February Industrial Tribunal hearing was postponed at Bis Weaver's request and until the date of the rearranged hearing arrived most of the action revolved around the *kernels* and their associates in the REC/BLC, whose determination to strike at her reached manic proportions. For Bis Weaver and I, in this imbalanced contest against an incompetent yet powerful opposition, we tried to score points not only against the REC/BLC but also in other directions where the NATFHE White 'Left' and NATFHE officialdom practised their *Black arts*.

The REC/BLC West Midlands emerged as the main arena from where NATFHE launched its attacks not only on Bis Weaver but also on the autonomous role Black members were adopting to counter NATFHE's bureaucratic stranglehold imposed on those prepared to combat racism in a meaningful way. The WMARC's Secretary, Krishna Shukla, had recognised this and spelt out what was at stake in the calling notices for the next WMARC meeting sent out on the 6<sup>th</sup> February. He mentioned "Some ominous developments have taken place recently and we have to discuss the very existence and the future of the Committee."<sup>1</sup>

The next day, along with the calling notice I received a copy of the regional secretary's 3<sup>rd</sup> February letter to Krishna. As promised I sent a copy of Day's 'Report' and the critique to Krishna. I said to ignore the rule of confidentiality that Day had affixed to certain parts of the 'report' as no such condition applied. Bournville branch had breached any condition that might have applied on the 25<sup>th</sup> June 1986 after receiving approval to do so from Triesman. Furthermore, Day's 'report' included "serious and damaging unfounded allegations...which would negate any obligation to abide by those rules of confidentiality." As far as we were concerned anyone "pursuing the rights of members to a fair and impartial hearing...should have access to the Report" and that should include every member of the ARNP.<sup>2</sup> A copy of this letter went to the regional secretary to show him that NATFHE's co-called 'rules' were unenforceable.

Krishna attended the ARNP meeting and proposed that NATFHE adopted an active role against racism in the union. This proposal was consigned to AOB by the chairperson,

who had still not contacted Bis Weaver as promised ten months before. At the appropriate time on the agenda, the attempt by Krishna and some other members to have Bis Weaver's case discussed was overruled by the chair on the grounds of the case being *sub judice* due to the impending Industrial Tribunal. Krishna then raised the issues that affected him as a Black member and had nothing to do with the Industrial Tribunal hearing: (i) the recent West Midlands witch-hunt; and (ii) Triesman's refusal to provide Krishna with the names and addresses of panel members. However, they were all deferred until the next meeting, which meant deferred *ad infinitum*. What the panel did discuss was a new modified draft of an anti-racism policy – the original anti-racism policy had been rendered obsolete by the Weaver case. Before this new draft, drawn up by Triesman and Penny Welch, was discussed, Triesman complimented Ms Welch for her work on the union's sexist harassment paper. The discussion of the draft anti-racism policy led to considerable amendments – most of the changes related to Bis Weaver's case even though they weren't allowed to mention the case.<sup>3</sup>

NATFHE's record on anti-racism had for some time caused considerable concern to Bis Weaver and other Black members but the union was now bordering on the absurd. For Triesman, who readily acknowledged his inability to determine what constituted racist motivations, and Ms Welch, who seemed incapable of distinguishing between harassment and interpersonal dispute, to be given responsibility for drawing up a policy on anti-racism and racist harassment was not only ridiculous but an affront to Black members. NATFHE's anti-racism 'programme' became more farcical with each passing day and yet NATFHE officials and officers were apparently the last to see how ridiculous their posturing had become.

On the 15<sup>th</sup> February, shortly after speaking to Krishna Shukla about the ARNP meeting, I sent Krishna observations on the regional secretary's 3<sup>rd</sup> February letter. The regional secretary's claim that the *Frew report* was "not an attack on" Krishna was at odds with the facts. Krishna was "the only one identified for criticism...for inefficiency – calling notices were often late and the Committee was generally badly organised." Evans' admission "that this type of 'criticism could be (and has been) addressed to the secretaries of all Regional Standing Committees by [Evans] in the past" meant little because "has [this inefficiency] led to [them] being specifically identified and criticised in a report produced for the Regional Executive." I described the inquiry as "too much like the *Star Chamber* or *Kangaroo Court*."

What was also disturbing was the news that the regional secretary, "without any reference to [the] ARC...[is drafting] a motion...on the future role of the WMARC." It would

have to be asked “why [Evans] was delegated such a role and what he knows about racism, its effects and how to combat it.” This was a task for the Black Lecturer’s Group, which had already prepared a paper, including the proposal for Black officers and had the proposals discussed and unanimously approved at the WMARC with the regional secretary in attendance. Apparently, advice from the BLG, accepted by the WMARC, counted for little among the REC bureaucrats. It was suggested that the regional secretary “should leave the draft to those who have knowledge...of anti-racism and allow Black people to set the agenda but, perhaps, that would disturb the cosy colonial paternalism of some of those on the REC.”

To highlight the hypocrisy of the REC/BLC in assigning the drafting of this document to the regional secretary and not to the BLG, attention was drawn to two letters in the December issue of NATFHE Journal. The author of the first letter had criticised NATFHE in general, although his criticism was particularly relevant to the recent REC ‘enquiry’. He had written:

The only way to challenge racism effectively is through collective anti-racist struggle, with a particular emphasis on black self-organisation.  
If that causes an outbreak of cold sweat among a few, wilfully ignorant, white lecturers, that seems a small price to pay.<sup>4</sup>

The second letter was written by the West Midlands regional secretary and seven West Midlands’ delegates attending a special NATFHE meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup> October 1986. He stated:

...Rather than allowing a full and fair debate of the large number of motions...Council was treated to a cynical display of procedural manoeuvring, which had obviously been planned in advance...<sup>5</sup>

These sentiments expressed by Evans *et al* would equally “apply to the REC’s own actions.” A similar pattern could clearly be seen by “The manner in which the [Frew] inquiry was set up; carried out; reported on; as well as the decision to produce a draft motion on the future role of the ARC” by the regional secretary. Furthermore, which REC members, “mentioned in the report, said that ‘dealing with individual cases was not a function of the [WMARC].’”<sup>6</sup> This was another example demonstrating how the WMARC, as a sub-committee of the REC, was considered less significant than the women’s panel, which was permitted to deal with individual cases. Referring to the *Frew report*, under problems No 5, it was “pertinent to ask Officers on the Regional Executive, who are [also] on the ARC, what anti-racist work they are doing and in what way they promote and defend the interests of Black people in the workplace.” The regional gamekeepers had turned poachers and their

action was “a cynical display of procedural manoeuvring, which had obviously been planned in advance.”

The general impression coming from the *Frew report*; Evans’ newly acquired responsibility for drafting a constitution; and the revelation of Triesman’s and Ms Welch’s new roles as co-pilots of NATFHE’s anti-racism policy; was of Black members and the BLG being expected to play subordinate roles or no role at all in developing an anti-racism policy. The White Broad Left Coalition appeared to resent the emergence of Black members with a determination to participate in the route to be taken on anti-racism. The ‘Leftist’ members appeared not to have the slightest interest in the opinions of Black people unless those opinions fitted into the ‘Left’s’ outdated approach to racism, which was to maintain the WMARC as a talk shop to indulge the white members’ perception of themselves as progressives on the race issue.

Paul Mackney, the day before, had emerged once more into the limelight on the race issue – or as it was put in the newspaper – the ‘colour bar’. Mackney was defending his action in leaking ‘sensitive information’ about the low number of Black youth on training schemes. Dr Thomas, chair of the Manpower Services Commission, deplored the fact that Mackney had “given an undertaking not to disclose the contents of the report until it had been properly considered by our own equal opportunities committee only to change his mind later.” The Commission’s intention was to make the report available to the “public at the end of the month.”<sup>7</sup> In spite of this making this undertaking Mackney released information through a Birmingham Trades Council statement. He stated to the press that “We take no oaths of secrecy when we go on this body. I am not prepared to be a party to confidential racism. I am not one of Dr Thomas’ members. I am a trade union delegate to this body and I am expected to represent trade unions and the young people on training schemes.”<sup>8</sup>

When I saw Mackney’s declaration in a local paper, on the 14<sup>th</sup> February, I dropped him a line in an attempt to prompt him into action on the *Frew Report*, to see if his commitment to oppose ‘confidential racism’ extended to taking on his comrades in the Broad Left Coalition. I wrote to him in his capacity as a member of the REC and as an REC-appointed member of the WMARC. Referring to his statement that he was “not prepared to be a party to confidential racism,” I drew attention to the *McCarthy-style* ‘confidential’ attacks, in a REC-sponsored report, on the credibility of WMARC’s Black secretary based on unattributed telephone respondents. I called on him to support those rallying to the secretary’s defence who were demanding an enquiry into those on the REC “responsible for this attempt to discredit and undermine the Secretary.”<sup>9</sup> This appeal to one of the power-brokers in the

region received no response, although he did write to the WMARC, after receiving its calling notice for the 25<sup>th</sup> February meeting, saying he was not a member of the WMARC, thus avoiding taking any overt part in opposing the *McCarthyite* enquiry or the struggle in the committee over the role Black members should play.<sup>10</sup> Mackney articulated high principle in the public arena while failing to show the same level of commitment to anti-racism issues in NATFHE other than rhetorically. He had not shown any interest either in the monitoring of Bis Weaver's movements.

We then received acknowledgements from NATFHE for both of our Rule 8 complaints – our letters to the TUC seemed to have done the trick. We were advised that the Finance and General Purposes sub-committee had decided to set up a Tribunal - a chair had been appointed by the NEC, and contact would be made “shortly to canvas for suitable dates.” Standing orders governing the conduct of Tribunals were enclosed.<sup>11</sup> The Bournville branch officers and branch committee received official notification of the impending Tribunals on the 18<sup>th</sup> February.<sup>12</sup>

How effective a Tribunal would be to deal with complaints against officers and committee members was unknown, although we knew NATFHE's internal mechanism for dealing with complaints between members was virtually non-existent? NATFE officials appeared to be able to conjure up any procedure on criteria known only to them as occurred between June and November 1985 with Day's *Whitewash* 'enquiry' and in January 1986 with Triesman's offer of a narrowly defined 'investigation'.

NATFHE's neglect and duplicity had pushed Bis Weaver along a path few would want to tread – a grievance to the LEA; an Industrial Tribunal hearing; and a Rule 8 Tribunal. Having travelled so far why not go the whole hog and explore, and perhaps bring into the light the procedures NATFHE had for dealing with complaints against officials. This was unknown territory, as everything else in NATFHE appeared to be. After all, Triesman ruled out any possibility of an 'enquiry' to deal with Day's impropriety.

To find out if this was another no-go area, Bis Weaver registered a formal complaint against Mr Day. In the preamble, she wrote of the complaint of abuse and harassment against Gates, believed by her to be racially motivated and subsequently investigated by Mr Day. In her view “the reasonable person might consider Mr Day” to have failed in both his “duty not to act negligently and to ensure that his actions did not contravene [her] rights to natural justice.” Mr Day “also had an obligation to ensure that the report was accurate before he distributed it to other officers and officials in the union.” Mr Day was also accused of making “damaging statements...that were untrue and, as such, were defamatory.”

She provided comprehensive details of the distortions, misrepresentations and unfounded allegations contained within the ‘report’; and a comprehensive account of the details omitted from it. She revealed Day’s discussion with Gates and the possibility of Day giving Gates advice prior to accepting responsibility for investigating the complaint, which “the reasonable person might consider...introduced the likelihood of bias into the inquiry and contravened [her] rights to natural justice.” She pointed out Day’s “damaging remarks about [her] credibility, integrity and competence” included in a ‘report’ circulated widely in the union and of Day not giving her “an opportunity to refute these allegations.” Also included was Day’s failure to speak to all witnesses, especially “a person who contacted him to offer important information regarding [Bis Weaver’s] complaint...This person, a White woman married to a Black person, also stated she had been suffering similar treatment in the college.”

These details had been addressed in eleven letters sent to Day and made known to the general secretary and his nominee between October 1985 and June 1986. In view of this, she was sure the union “would wish to afford [her] the same benefits, services and facilities in terms of access to information, that Mr Day has and...ensure that” she was “provide[d]...with all details and copies of correspondence” passing between the various parties. <sup>\*13</sup>

This was cocking a snoot at the union - a peashooter at Goliath, as this complaint was submitted without any expectation of NATFHE head office doing anything other than show yet again what the union leadership really thought of the interests of rank and file members when they came into conflict with *apparatchiks*.

The complaint was copied to the general secretary of the TUC; the general secretary of the ASTMS; and to Mr Day. Mr Willis (TUC) had an accompanying letter in which Bis Weaver expressed concern that NATFHE’s general secretary would “either investigate the complaint himself or delegate a nominee to do so.” To her, “the absence of formal procedures did not seem a satisfactory means of investigating serious complaints, nor did the fact that an

\* This correspondence covered (i) information “provided by Branch officers to Mr Day regarding [her] original complaint...;” (ii) any...allegations made against [her] by Branch members;” (iii) “evidence provided to Mr Day by witnesses...interviewed...on the 18<sup>th</sup> October 1985;” (iv) “correspondence between Mr Day and Head Office, Liaison, Branch and Region concerning [her] original complaint;” (v) “the intervention, in July 1985, by a West Midlands NEC member (Penny Welch),...an associate of the complained against..., who offered to investigate the original complaint after [Bis Weaver] had already followed the recommendations of [the] Branch Committee to accept the full-time official to carry out an initial enquiry.”

investigation would be carried out by a colleague and associate of the” official, who was the subject of the complaint. Notwithstanding these reservations, she submitted “a complaint of negligence, and other related matters, against a full-time official.” She related her previous experiences in NATFHE and how NATFHE dealt with a complaint of racial harassment against a lay officer, which forced her eventually “to use the employers’ grievance procedures.” NATFHE’s reasons for refusing advice and assistance in pursuit of this grievance had necessitated “filing a charge of racial discrimination against the union” to the Office of Industrial Tribunals. She considered it to be

a sad reflection on the trade union movement that a Black trade unionist,...who has followed all union directives and supported union policies and actions, including collecting regularly for the striking miners during the mining dispute, has been forced outside of the trade union movement to seek justice for legitimate grievances. Like many Black people in the trade union movement, I have become increasingly dissatisfied with the differential treatment to which we are being subjected.

Yet, “whilst...confidence in my own union is somewhat dented, I will continue to support the labour movement and urge Black people to become part of it, in the hope that the trade union movement will respond to the interests of its Black members.”<sup>14</sup> Subsequent action by the TUC general secretary showed that Bis Weaver’s interests and those of Black union members meant little more to him than they did to NATFHE officials.

Two days later, Triesman acknowledged the complaint on behalf of Dawson, who was on holiday.<sup>15</sup> Dawson made contact within a week to say he would write again when he had considered the contents of her letter carefully.<sup>16</sup> In NATFHE-speak that meant every effort would be made to avoid doing anything that might border on the principled. The TUC also acknowledged her letter, addressing her as Mr on two occasions in its reply in order to explain the constitutional position between the TUC and its affiliated trade unions, i.e. “the TUC cannot interfere in the internal affairs of its members,” but her letter would be passed on to NATFHE’s general secretary.<sup>17</sup> As far as she was concerned NATFHE could do what it liked and the TUC was looking more like the labour movement’s equivalent of the old ‘League of Nations.’

#### (b) Broad Left Boycotters Gate-Crash the WMARC

The women’s panel had met in early February and the role it was taking on for itself was similar to the role the BLG wanted for the WMARC. However, these wider responsibilities taken on by the women’s panel did not inspire the REC/BLC to bring it into

line as it was doing with the WMARC even when the women's panel's February meeting attracted only five members on an evening when the election of officers was to take place. Three members nominated and seconded each other and all were duly elected. It was announced that motions submitted by the panel had been passed by regional council, confirming the favoured position the panel had, unlike the restrictions placed on the BLG. The discussions covered crèche facilities; representation of women on public bodies; regional nominations; forthcoming TUC meetings; the nomination of Ms Pattinson as NATFHE delegate to the TUC regional council; guidelines to cover sexist harassment; a report of the Harassment Support Group meeting; and the establishment of the Harassment Help Line. The panel also wanted to set up "a bank of case material...and members were asked to contribute brief details of harassment cases in the West Midlands." This was an important development if they intended to take up those cases but no mention was made of offering this service. Furthermore, even if this was purely for statistical purposes, it was unlikely that one of the most significant harassment cases in the West Midlands would be included unless filed under NATFHE's category so favoured in the region of 'interpersonal dispute'.<sup>18</sup> The lack of attention given to this meeting by senior feminists in the REC/BLC suggests they were content with the fact that this panel would follow the line of the Broad Left Coalition unlike the WMARC, which was trying to pursue an autonomous direction. The attempt by the WMARC to plough an effective route through NATFHE's mud-clogged anti-racism path created a division between the BLG and the REC/BLC members at the forthcoming WMARC meeting.

The WMARC boycotters were expected to return to try to pull some kind of coup by outvoting the dissidents to get the *Frew Report* accepted by the committee in order to present it as a *bona fide* account of the committee's performance. In preparation, Bis Weaver contacted half-a-dozen members of the Black Lecturer's Group to remind them of the meeting. They were aware of the attacks made on Krishna Shukla in the *Frew Report* and were keen to stand up and be counted as well as participating in the direction the committee should take.

As expected the WMARC meeting on the 25<sup>th</sup> February brought back on to the scene three boycotting REC/BLC members and one surprise returnee – Ms Pattinson, who, when resigning as chair, made it clear she would not attend another meeting in any capacity and, yet, she decided to make an appearance at this meeting. Their reappearance could only be to ensure the vote on the McCarthyite report and the draft WMARC constitution went in the REC/BLC's favour. One other REC/BLC member, who was not unsympathetic to Bis

Weaver, also attended plus Krishna Shukla, who was another REC-appointed member. The returnees may also have been surprised at the presence of three other Black NATFHE members, including Alton Burnett, who had already crossed swords with Ms Welch over the harassment of Bis Weaver. Two other erstwhile members of the committee sent their apologies. Among the list of ‘apologies’ was a letter from Paul Mackney, absenting himself from the meeting on grounds of not being a member, which was rather surprising since he was on the list of REC-appointees and had previously sent in apologies for non-attendance at the 17<sup>th</sup> September 1986 meeting. Mackney, making his views publicly known on certain issues, but apparently standing on the side-lines in NATFHE to avoid being put in the position of supporting victims of ‘confidential racism’ within the union itself.

The REC/BLC members came prepared for action with what turned out to be an insufficient contingent. Under the WMARC’s previous composition, the REC/BLC contingent would have been more than enough to outvote the three dissident elements to push through the *Frew Report* without discussion; to impose a new draft constitution on the WMARC; and to pass a motion in support of that constitution. They soon found out that a few extra Black activists, whom the REC/BLC had never invited or thought to inform of the existence of this committee, would thwart these objectives. The REC/BLC members were outmanoeuvred, but only just, as enough Black members turned up to shoot this apparent conspiracy down in flames, at least temporarily. The REC/BLC, as ever, underestimated Black members over this latest attempt to silence the Black voices emerging in the West Midlands. The BLG had not expected the Broad Left Coalition members to balk at the prospect of Black officers or any other of the BLG’s recommendations by attacking the competence or integrity of its representatives on the committee - Krishna Shukla and Bis Weaver.

The meeting demonstrated the vast gap separating those experienced in education-sector racism, i.e Black activists, from those parading themselves as the spokespersons (the White Left) of Black members. The Black activists’ objectives were: (i) to eliminate racism in the workplace and the wider society; and (ii) to free anti-racism from the tokenism of some of those comprising the REC/BLC membership. To the REC/BLC appointees, the WMARC was a private fiefdom to score a few bonus points in their upward march to where a ‘commitment to equal opportunities’ was becoming mandatory for posts in Labour-controlled councils or trade unions.

Before the WMARC meeting got under way, Alton Burnett wanted to know “the criteria for membership of [the] Committee because, [as] it was an anti-racist committee, [it

should have] an open membership.” A list of REC-appointees was produced,<sup>19</sup> including many, like Mackney, Doughty, Dhési, Ms Stretton and Clarke had never attended a meeting during the previous twelve months or maybe longer. \* As a measure of REC ‘efficiency’, the regional secretary referred to the list as being “more or less correct” – indirectly confirming his comment to Krishna Shukla that the REC was some kind of ‘disorganised amateurism’. As WMARC did not have a current chair, Alton Burnett was nominated, seconded and unanimously elected as chair for this meeting – the election of a permanent chair would be dealt with at the next meeting. It was interesting to see two REC/BLC members, Lovejoy and Ms Frew, both known to Phil Murphy and Alton Burnett in the Birmingham Labour Party and in the Handsworth area of Birmingham, raising no objection to a Black officer becoming chair, who was not even, in the eyes of the REC, a co-opted member of the WMARC.

The meeting opened with matters arising from the previous meeting. One item prompted comment, although this was small beer in comparison to the *Frew report* and the regional secretary’s draft constitution for the WMARC, but it was part and parcel of the same environment that produced both the report and document – Clarke’s letter. Krishna had a copy of Clarke’s letter and intended to distribute it to all members of the committee together with our reply, which exposed “Clarke’s letter [as] nonsense.”

Krishna then gave an exposé of the surreptitious way the REC engineered the enquiry into the WMARC behind his back by deciding on the 22<sup>nd</sup> October “to have a report on the Committee’s activities” after he left the REC meeting. He moved on to Ms Frew’s telephone call advising him of the enquiry and receiving information on Ms Pattinson’s resignation as Chair of the WMARC a few days before the *Frew report* was presented to the REC; and of Ms Frew’s method of gathering information over the telephone. During Krishna’s exposition Ms Frew objected, on a point of order, to the report being discussed; her point being that “it was not in order to discuss the ‘report’ at the ARC.” This demonstrated the type of justice obtainable in the REC/BLC’s domain when a report was produced and submitted to the REC attacking three members of the Committee and the three were not even allowed to contest the anonymously provided ‘evidence’. Not only that, the ‘report’ was being presented to the WMARC for approval – a rubber stamp from the committee consisting of several members not knowing the contents. \*\* This came as no surprise as this was indicative of the way

\* We knew it was at least twelve months because that was when we first began attending the WMARC and their faces had yet to be seen there

\*\* If it had not been for Krishna sending us a copy, neither Bis Weaver nor I would have known the contents. We were two members of the committee who were anonymously criticised in the report

NATFHE operated, certainly in the West Midlands. Shades of Day and Bournville Branch! \*

The three parties criticised in the report, Bis Weaver, Krishna Shukla and I spoke against this objection because the report “concerns people ...on this committee who have had allegations made against them...[and this was] about the lack of rights afforded to Black people [and allies] when they can be attacked...without any opportunity to counter these allegations.”

Ms Frew explained that the information in the report was volunteered over the telephone and by letter, as if that was sufficient justification for anonymous and unfounded attacks on members. However, even this excuse would fail under scrutiny as not all contributions were included. I disclosed that the *Frew Report* was presented to the REC before Bis Weaver and I received written notice asking for contributions and “it was quite obvious [Ms Frew] was not going to wait for [our] reply.”

Barry Lovejoy, supporting the objection, relegated the status of the enquiry to an informal one, set up by the REC “after the [WMARC] Chair had resigned.” \*\* He described the method of enquiry as “conversations with members who attended” and he stressed “it was not an attack on Black people [because] The Committee was made up of other than Black people,” completely ignoring that attacks were made on two Black members; one for inefficiency and the other for disruptiveness while one White member, a representative of one of the Black members, was also accused of disruptiveness. Lovejoy also overlooked that “if [the enquiry] was authorised by the REC, submitted to the REC, and acted upon by the REC, then it was formal.”

Ms Pattinson supported Lovejoy’s position by claiming the report “was not an attack on Black people [as] The REC was concerned with making the Committee more efficient and effective, [adding that] you \*\*\* only have an impression of what the report is [and] This impression only raises the tempo of the debate.” \*\*\*\*

Krishna Shukla rejected this line of ‘reasoning’ and criticised the “irregular way of

\* When Gates and Ms Pattinson were senior branch officers in Bournville branch, false accusations were made against Bis Weaver and she was refused the right to reply; now in the REC, with Gates and Ms Pattinson holding the two most senior posts, history repeated itself. But this was no farce

\*\* This was incorrect as the proposed motion for an enquiry into the WMARC was first raised in October, a month before her letter of resignation was sent. The Chair’s resignation was submitted a few days prior to the next REC meeting when it was decided to have a formal enquiry into the Committee. The resignation appeared to have been tendered to give weight for an enquiry

\*\*\* The ‘you’ meaning the non-REC/BLC committee members

\*\*\*\* It seemed that she was under the impression that the ‘report’ had not been seen by the non REC/BLC members

going about [the enquiry]” – unattributed accusations with himself being “called inefficient,” while the “committee [is] badly organised,” and “the Chair (Ms Pattinson) felt she was harassed.” He emphasised the importance of people hearing what was in the report. The regional secretary said “it was members of the [WMAR]Committee who criticised Krishna,” which blew away Lovejoy’s and Ms Pattinson’s argument that no one was criticised or attacked and it confirmed our assessment that Evans’ letter contained implied criticism of Krishna. It was instructive to hear the regional secretary refer to these ‘anonymous entities’ when he and other REC-appointees, who provided ‘information’ to Ms Frew, were sitting in this meeting but not inclined to disclose their contributions. He was asked to reveal the contributor’s identities but declined to do so. Lovejoy’s point was also rejected as “it is Black people who have been criticised” and Bis Weaver added that “to have White people telling [Black people] how to interpret the report ...is an affront...” As usual, it was Black people, who were at the pit-face in the struggle against racism, who were assumed not to know the score.

One REC/BLC member, Jefny Ashcroft, revealed that she “hadn’t been asked to contribute” even though regularly attending WMARC meetings – a second strike against the report and the claim the enquiry covered the major attendees but, of course, her sympathies were not unknown and that, in itself, was sufficient to exclude her from participation. She was in favour of the report being discussed.

The arguments for non-discussion put forward by the REC/BLC contingent made no impression on the chair, who reminded them that “when a report is produced...[a] draft copy [should be] seen by each member [for]... comment [and] if the effectiveness of the anti-racist committee is in question then a sub-committee should be set-up, [adding that] The aim of any Anti-racism Committee is to enhance Black people in general.” Ms Frew’s objection was overruled by the chair, who then read out the ‘report’.

Krishna picked up on a specific error - an issue apparently causing concern to the REC/BLC – Black officers, and he referred to the minutes showing this policy was “agreed in principle” on the 9<sup>th</sup> July. \* I raised the issue of attacks on Black members, which brought a response from Ms Pattinson about “the harassment of Black people on the Committee” and

\* The members attending that meeting consisted of: six who were apparently critical of three members and the way the committee was being run - B. Basra; M Bennet; D Evans; J Frew; B Lovejoy; S Pattinson; three who were criticised in the ‘report’ - K Shukla; B Weaver; and G Weaver; one other member - A Jones; with one apology – P Yarnell. With the critics having such a majority how was it that the three criticised members could wield such influence to ensure that the proposal for Black officers could be passed with a unanimous vote

that Julie Frew was “writing about what people felt.” \* Ms Frew, apparently, was allowed to write down whatever was said or claimed to have been said whether true or false and reproduce it in a report submitted to a NATFHE body, which was then accepted unequivocally without any attempt at verification. This frontier outpost of the NATFHE Raj had become a stamping ground for McCarthyism. However, the REC/BLC approach did not succeed on this occasion because Bis Weaver was not a solitary Black person in this committee as she had been at Bournville. There were other forceful and candid Black people present this time around.

Mel Thompson, a Black equal opportunities officer at a college in Birmingham, did not see how a claim of harassment could be put forward in the absence of the two Black women making the claim. She added that “it was serious with regard to the two Black people referred to because it is easy to use Black people to undermine other Black people.” She was referring to the fact that there was no evidence to confirm that these two Black women had actually made that claim. \*\* Mel recognised “that the report was done in an underhand way, [which] Black people have to suffer...all the time” and she let it be known this was something she was familiar with as it had happened to her.

Bis Weaver also addressed this issue and found no difficulty in identifying herself as the person allegedly responsible “for the so-called harassment of Black people and for being so-called disruptive.” She was strongly in favour of Black officers in WMARC and “had nominated Maureen Bennett...for the Chair, [on the 18<sup>th</sup> June 1986], but she did not want it.”\*\*\* She also revealed having “to shame the ARC into co-opting her [as] no one felt inclined to nominate...a Black person to the Committee.” She challenged the basic assumption inherent in the references to the committee “being bogged down in irrelevancies”, by asking who made “these judgements about what was relevant or irrelevant” and answered the question herself by saying it was not “the Black members...[who] are the victims of racism,...who thought it irrelevant.” This was “an indictment of NATFHE and how it works” – sentiments endorsed by the new Chair. After all the flak targeted at her by the REC/BLC

\* Ms Pattinson was not unfamiliar with documents like the *Frew report* – as the Bournville statement was ample proof. Ms Pattinson, who found no difficulty in condemning Bis Weaver in the Bournville branch, had suddenly become particularly sensitive to the alleged harassment of Black women

\*\* The ‘report’, apparently, was not to be shown to anyone who was not on the REC, so the two women might never know what might have been attributed to them. If they did make the allegation then they could expect the person accused to be given the opportunity to challenge the allegations in their presence

\*\*\* Bis Weaver did not refer to the other ethnic minority woman, Baljinder, because she only attended the meeting on the 9<sup>th</sup> July and left early

members over many months, this was a like a breath of fresh air cutting through the stagnant odour of intrigue.

Mel observed “the antagonism on the committee” and the lack of perspective shown, as no account was taken of “how Black people perceive racism and their situation with regard to White people who have the power.” The situation was one of “a group of White people [who] get together to produce a report” but no draft was produced giving “Black people...the opportunity to attach any disagreements they have to the draft. Submitting a report like this puts Black people at a disadvantage [since those] who have seen it will already be biased.” She added, “This was the way racism works.” This was the voice of experience and knowledge speaking against assumption and guess work.

Alton Burnett agreed and went on to say the committee “should do well to bear what was said in mind, [and] not to use [its] power to undermine people in a disadvantaged situation; [it] should be seeking ways to give Black people some power and enhancing their position.” He described the report as having been “torn...to bits” and recommended putting the “criticisms with the report, and submit [both] to the REC as a report.” This proposal did not go down well with members of the BLC/REC contingent as it seemed to be working against their objective in turning out for this meeting. Concern suddenly arose amongst them about people being absent who should have a voice – they had obviously worked out by now they might be outvoted on any proposals.

Ms Pattinson refuted the view that “Whites don’t understand Black people” [or] that they were using Black people. She spoke against the proposal to submit a report to the REC as “there are people who are not here...and [the committee] should wait until they are here.” A thoughtful view considering everything in NATFHE seemed to be arranged clandestinely when it favoured the REC/BLC initiators. \* The REC/BLC members held an unusual interpretation of the concept of the ‘right to be heard’. Wanting everyone to be heard was another first as it did not enter into consideration when the April statement attacking Bis Weaver was delivered to the Bournville branch in her absence and then opposing her ‘right to be heard’ at the next branch meeting. Ms Pattinson, apparently, did not understand Black people if she thought the removal of a Black person’s rights in the union and undermining the REC’s only Black member would not meet with opposition from Black people. Noticeably,

\* If only Ms Pattinson had considered this when running around the liaison committee and the REC with the April statement when Bis Weaver was not there; or even recently when the *Frew report* was submitted to the REC in the absence of Krishna Shukla

the regional secretary did not speak against Ms Pattinson's suggestion to defer discussion. If he had been consistent in accordance with his statement to Krishna, he would have opposed the ex-chair's attempt to do so. \*

The chair overruled deferring the motion by stating that Ms Frew, who had spoken to the contributors and "wrote up the report," was acting as the REC's representative.

A motion criticising the report was put to the committee and Alton Burnett asked for speakers for and against. Barry Lovejoy opposed the motion claiming the report was information for the REC to suggest policy, which after discussion in the REC had led to a document being produced supporting the WMARC – this referred to the draft document/constitution drawn up by the regional secretary. Apparently some REC members had proposed that WMARC "shouldn't meet until the situation cooled off," which Lovejoy had opposed because "there was a positive attitude towards the ARC as shown in the draft statement" for a new constitution. He claimed the *Frew Report* "has no standing [as] it was not even minuted [at the REC, and]...was not produced in a formal way." This was a curious claim because the item was minuted. The regional secretary, responsible for the minutes which had yet to be released, could have confirmed this but chose not to reveal it to this assembly; no doubt because that would have confirmed its formal acceptance by the REC. Both Mel and Bis disputed this claim of informality. Mel referred to its formal status as it had been discussed at the REC; and Bis queried why "the report was submitted if it had no standing."

Speaking in favour of the motion, I expressed the view that the report's "conclusions were undoubtedly pre-determined as [my] contribution [to the enquiry] was not going to be considered" and "the anonymous attacks on Krishna without [him having] an opportunity to refute the allegations...was a contravention of Krishna's rights to natural justice."

Jefny Ashcroft recognised that the report gave the impression of being "produced by a White-dominated group dictating to people" but she believed this had not been the intention. Admitting the REC's "approach was incorrect," she said "the report is saying...there have been feelings of disquiet on the REC about the ARC [but] it is not consciously seeking to undermine Black people." But as Mel pointed out "you don't have to be consciously undermining Black people to undermine [them]."

One newcomer, Bajan, who had remained quiet for most of the discussion, mentioned

\* Evans had pointed out to Krishna, barely three weeks before, that "if we waited for all REC members to be present before anything was debated we would wait a long time"<sup>20</sup>

he “had been in NATFHE for four and a half years and he had never heard of the ARC” until recently. He added that “says something about what NATFHE does for Black people.” He wanted to know “what platform Black people have [in NATFHE] and pertinently compared the issue of racism in NATFHE to sexism.” He pointed out that if the debate had been “about sexism and he said anything, as a man, [he] would soon be put in his place.” As if to highlight this comparison, he referred to the BLG rejecting ‘NATFHE Against Racism’ – a document that had “no credible Black people” involved in its production. He also spoke of Black people being constantly undermined even to the point of criticising “the way Black people use the English language.” In fact, he “felt out of place at the ARC meeting”; it was “as if he shouldn’t be [there].” This was the answer to the claim that they (White BLC/REC members) understood Black people.

I spoke of the hegemonic role the White BLC/REC wanted to maintain when Black people put themselves forward to “determine the agenda of anti-racism.” This was not to the liking of the “‘all conquering heroes of the anti-racist movement’,...[who] refuse to move over...These heroes...have made a negative contribution by their refusal to listen to Black people...and...at the most generous of interpretations, [that could be put down] to their colonial paternalistic mentality.” I referred to the harassment of Black people being raised in the report and suggested that “if the Committee wanted to see the harassment of Black people, they should have a look around the branches...and they would then see what the harassment of Black people is really like.”

The REC/BLC members were driven firmly on the defensive. Barry Lovejoy accused Bis Weaver of “operating from a particular political perspective” but conspicuously did not make the same accusations at other Black speakers, whose standpoint on these issues was not unlike hers and had been expressed in an equally forthright manner. Perhaps, the constant use of Bis Weaver for target practice had made it easy for those NATFHE REC/BLC zealots who had contributed to the *Frew Report*, to articulate dubious allegations. They had witnessed attacks on her so often, in and out of her presence, that it became ‘second nature’ to them to attribute deficiencies to her to cover their own - they had learned their lessons well in NATFHE’s training academy.

Lovejoy went on to elaborate on this ‘political perspective’ but his contribution was based on a false premise. Apparently “in the meetings [he] attended the issue of Black officers was constantly being discussed” and had become “one of personalised attacks.” He referred to this as the reason he stopped attending meetings, which, as I pointed out, at least identified him as the contributor of one piece of information in the report. He obviously had

not heard Krishna's clarification earlier or had chosen to ignore it, as the Black officers' issue was resolved in July, when he was one of the voters unanimously accepting the proposal, and that was the last meeting he attended until the present meeting. \* It was not constantly discussed after July, and, if it had been, he would not have witnessed it. Why the REC/BLC was so opposed to Black officers leading an anti-racism committee was an answer in itself and did not lend itself easily to the White Left's self-description of being anti-racists.

Lovejoy spoke of the intimidating environment in the WMARC as a result of Gordon Weaver "always taking notes which put them under pressure and intimidated them." The accuracy of his comment was something I could not dispute; if he and the others felt intimidated that was how they felt; but these 'radical and revolutionary Leftists' appeared to be easily intimidated. Perhaps, the pen was mightier than the sword. His position was that the "ARC should consist of Blacks and White and be about anti-racism." A commendable approach but he then conjured up something else out of thin air, which seemed to suggest that he thought Blacks and Whites working together was not acceptable to Bis Weaver. He claimed that during the meeting she had stated the "REC could not make an anti-racist document." She refuted this as what she actually said was that "Black people should be allowed to take the lead," which was entirely different. She pointed out that he, too, had "a political view on anti-racism" and why was it "he couldn't see that." Her point summed up the REC-BLC's approach – Black people had 'political' views on anti-racism whereas the REC/BLC looked at socio-political issues 'objectively.' The gap between the Black activists and the REC/BLC 'anti-racists' was substantial.

What was also illuminating was that a REC/BLC 'anti-racist activist' had stopped attending WMARC meetings because he disagreed with Bis Weaver's perspective on Black officers, which happened to be the perspective of the BLG. What was the point in Black people meeting with White members of the WMARC, as Lovejoy advocated, if when any contentious point was raised, which was not acceptable to the White members but was accepted by a majority, it resulted in the White members ceasing to collaborate? Of course, the White members could always arrange to manipulate a majority as it thought it had done for this meeting. But misjudging the number of attendees for this meeting was no real problem for them because it had a majority outside of WMARC. This was the face of BLC/REC anti-racism; agree with us or fight on your own. This particular WMARC meeting was probably the most important lesson on NATFHE's approach to anti-racism that we had

\* If Lovejoy felt so strongly against the proposal why did he vote for it?

ever witnessed. The REC/BLC nominees on the WMARC tended not to think things through or seemed never to have spoken to radical Black activists or, more likely, not listened to them. What had happened to all their anti-racism training?

Discussion took place over the wording of the motion; Jefny Ashcroft suggested “the word ‘unconstitutional’ should be deleted from the [WMARC] motion because the [REC’s] action was not unconstitutional [as] the REC felt the Committee was not working and set [up] an enquiry into that.” This raised the question of who claimed the WMARC “was not working”; and if the REC could act in this way then “it [was] a blatant disregard of natural rights [and the] ARC and the REC should put on record that [they] disown the [Frew] report.” This had little chance of success as it was like asking the poacher to declare he/she was a poacher.

The chair then put the motion to be submitted to the REC, which read:

This Committee condemns the irregular way in which the Inquiry Committee was set up without consulting the Anti-Racist Committee and obtaining its agreement; and for the way the report was prepared. For these reasons the Committee asks the Regional Executive Committee to withdraw this report.

The motion was put and carried by a majority vote. The four voting against were BLC/REC members – three of whom were returned boycotters, Barry Lovejoy, Sue Pattinson and David Evans, plus Julie Frew. The rest voted in favour.

The members of the Broad Left Coalition were completely out-of-touch with current trends in Black radicalism; still expecting Black people to unequivocally accept its hegemony. A considerable amount of time had been spent by the REC/BLC contingent in opposing a discussion of the *Frew report*, which had been requested in the interests of natural justice. Perhaps, these representatives of the REC/BLC’s interests could be accused of wasting the WMARC’s time when they opposed discussing a very relevant matter.

With that part of the business concluded, the REC’s document and motion, dated the 23<sup>rd</sup> February, covering a new constitution for the WMARC entered into the proceedings. The second reason for the boycotters to attend was to get the anti-racism committee to rubber stamp the REC’s determination to prevent BLG members from becoming a majority on the committee. Bis Weaver asked “if any Black people were consulted and who produced [the draft constitution.” David Evans acknowledged authorship after “consultation with other bodies, none of whom were Black.” For a person with no background in anti-racism; whose only credential for membership of the WMARC was due to being regional secretary; and who considered a legitimate challenge to a person’s nomination for a post on the WMARC as

harassment; for that person to be given the task of writing an anti-racism constitution was as ridiculous as asking Ms Welch and Triesman to write an anti-racism policy for NATFHE nationally. But this was the way things were done in NATFHE.

Lovejoy had pre-empted this discussion when defending the *Frew report* earlier in the meeting by saying that the “proposals for the anti-racist committee and a motion drawn up for the regional council should also be discussed as the statement and attached motion were outcomes of [the Frew] report.” He had said the *Frew report* “must be seen in the context of what came out of it,” namely, the proposals for a new constitution. A derisory report was the justification for a new constitution for the WMARC – what was new in NATFHE? The urgency of the REC in getting a new constitution approved by the anti-racism committee had its origins in the proposals made by the BLG for changes in the composition and constitution of the WMARC after a lengthy discussion among BLG members. As a consequence, the REC’s objective in producing a draft of a new constitution was to exclude the BLG from participation in its construction and restrict the number of Black members in the WMARC to an insignificant minority. It was difficult to see how the REC/BLC members could call themselves anti-racist when they restricted the involvement of Black people in NATFHE’s ‘anti-racism’ programme? The attitude of people on the REC was exceptional; showing complete disregard for the experience and knowledge of members of the BLG, or was it this experience and knowledge the reason for excluding them?

Alton Burnett wanted the constitution to be submitted to colleges in the region for further discussion and any questions or comments to be sent to the WMARC. However, there was a problem with this proposal when it was revealed that the new constitution had to be ready for the next regional council meeting on the 21<sup>st</sup> March. How the minds on the REC/BLC work. The BLG submitted its proposals for the WMARC after the June 1986 conference and the REC did nothing about them. Yet, when the BLG sought to participate in the REC/BLC’s domain – the WMARC, the REC/BLC decided to investigate the WMARC and rush through a new constitution ignoring all the recommendations made by the BLG. It was becoming increasingly obvious the REC/BLC’s principal concern was the rise of the BLG and the BLG’s determination to influence anti-racism policy by pushing the rights of Black people in the union much further than the REC/BLC was prepared to accept. The REC had funded the BLG Conference in June but the BLG had travelled far from the subservient role envisaged for it by the ‘doyens of the White ‘anti-racist’ movement. An investigation of the WMARC accompanied by attacks on the BLG’s spokespersons on that committee and the creation of a new constitution was the REC/BLC’s response to restrict the further

development of anti-racism within NATFHE's structure. \* The reason for the boycotters' return was all too apparent. They thought they would be able to railroad the document and motion through the WMARC, while not discussing the *Frew report*, and then present the new constitution to the regional council as a WMARC-approved document to give it added legitimacy. Of course, unknown to us at the time, the REC/BLC clique had something more sinister to be presented to the regional council on the 21<sup>st</sup> March.

The haste of the REC/BLC contingent in trying to get this document accepted in comparison with the more measured approach by Black activists was placed in perspective by Bis Weaver, who reminded the REC/BLC 'activists' that

Black people have waited a few hundred years and can wait another two months. There has not been much change and Black people know what kind of changes they will get from this. The message is that it should be Black people putting forward policies that effect Black people. This document is still a paper produced solely by White people.

She described her contribution, for Lovejoy's benefit, as "a political stance [by those] who know about racism?...Black people have to be consulted and if there are no procedures which allows that then the structures must be changed." She courteously thanked Evans for producing the document but it should go to the BLG.

The regional secretary's contribution to the debate, apart from admitting he wrote the document, was minimal but he provided the answer as to why the boycotters had returned. When Alton said the "proposals [for a new constitution] need a delivery document," Evans said "that's what the REC wants this committee to do." Evans contribution to the ARC was to put up his hand in support of any REC/BLC motion, which on this occasion was not enough.\*\*

The minutes recorded that the "Document was received and noted [and] should be discussed at the next meeting of the BLG before it was submitted to the Regional Council." The next BLG meeting was to be held on the 28<sup>th</sup> March, which would have meant delaying the discussion of the document at regional council for no more than a month.<sup>21</sup> After NATFHE's shoddy performance over the years on the issue of anti-racism, a full discussion by people who know about racism and its effects, which would have delayed the 'long history makers' for a few weeks was a small price to pay for getting it right.

Of the four REC/BLC members, Evans and Ms Frew hardly said anything; only Lovejoy and Ms Pattinson made lengthy contributions. Lovejoy was supporting Ms Frew, his

\* The constitution will be dealt with below in Sect (e)

\*\* In the run up to the 21<sup>st</sup> March regional council meeting, Evans would show the REC/BLC and the Bournville *kernels* how useful he could be to their interests

partner, who was at the wrong end of an extremely ill-conducted enquiry; Ms Pattinson was supporting Gates, her partner, who was also at the wrong end of an enquiry into harassment. Somehow the idea of Gordon Weaver supporting Bis Weaver, his married partner, who had been the victim of harassment and had also been attacked in the *Frew report*, (i) was considered to be unreasonable and partisan; (ii) was deeply resented by the REC/BLC; and (iii) had to be curtailed. Was it not reported that two members – obviously Bis and Gordon Weaver – were using the committee for their own ends? Perhaps, the use to which the REC was being put by Gates and Ms Pattinson, as chair and vice-chair; and the use to which they, together with Ms Frew and Lovejoy, were trying to put the WMARC when they turned up on the 18<sup>th</sup> June 1986 to vote for Ms Pattinson, as chair, could be considered as using both committees for their own purposes.

The points made by: (i) Mel in detecting antagonism from the White REC/BLC members and (ii) Bajan in sensing that he was not wanted there; had hit the nail on the head as would be seen at a later date. The REC/BLC ‘anti-racists’ had: (i) boycotted WMARC meetings on spurious grounds; (ii) produced a report attacking Bis and Krishna, who represented the BLG’s anti-racism position on WMARC; (iii) tried to prevent the discussion of the *Frew report*; and (iv) then tried to railroad through an anti-racism constitution, produced by someone without expertise or background in anti-racism. This was the face of the White REC/BLC ‘anti-racists’ in the West Midlands, of whom at least nine to our knowledge had acted in a way detrimental to Bis Weaver’s interests with several of them trying to undermine and discredit Krishna Shukla. When they were around it was wise to sup with a very long-handled spoon. But this was a golden day in the WMARC never to be repeated and the BLC/REC White Left boycotted the committee again. It became apparent at this meeting that Bis Weaver and Krishna Shukla were icing on the cake for particular REC/BLC officers and the real objective was to deliver a blow to the rise of the BLG, whose members were thinking of entering mainstream union activity through the WMARC with direct access to the REC, rather than acting solely in a Black group confined to the periphery of union activity.

The regional secretary had already admitted that NATFHE in the West Midlands was inefficient and he could also have added inconsistent. The final comment in the REC’s draft document for the WMARC constitution confirmed this inconsistency. The comment prompted me to drop Krishna Shukla a line pointing out the contradiction between the contents of the *Frew Report* and the regional secretary’s proposed motion to put to the

regional council. In the *Frew Report*, the WMARC was described as ‘badly organised’; ‘bogged down in irrelevant arguments’; the committee’s secretary was ‘criticised for inefficiency’; ‘two members...were called disruptive’ and using ‘the Committee for their own ends’; and some Black members were ‘harassed and pressurised’. The regional secretary’s motion called for reaffirmation of the regional council’s “total support for the officers and representatives of its current Anti-racist Standing Committee.” My derisory query to him was “What kind of glowing tribute would the Committee have received” if it did not have such deficiencies.

This ‘reassessment’ of the committee’s performance, in the wake of the ‘report’s’ deficiencies being pointed out, looked like an attempt to hide the fact that “there [were] people on the Anti-Racist Committee responsible for making unwarranted anonymous allegations against...[other] members of the Committee.” These anonymous critics included REC/BLC committee members “who do not deserve the confidence of anyone.” Their unprincipled and discriminatory behaviour had to be exonerated and the only way for the REC/BLC to do that was to applaud all for their efforts on the WMARC. I speculated that this about turn resulted from the letters we sent out criticising the *Frew enquiry and report* but who was the initiator of this change of direction? Was it someone inside or outside of the region?

“As for the charge of inefficiency” in the *Frew report*, I drew attention to a NATFHE Branch that for at least four years, 1982-86, never had any “motions for Branch rule changes [for increasing the composition of the Branch Committee] ratified by the Region as is necessary according to the Rules.” As a consequence the branch committee had operated unconstitutionally during that time. In fact, “some members of the present REC, and ARC, held office in that particular Branch during the period mentioned.” Krishna did not need me to draw pictures to show the branch was located at Bournville College.<sup>22</sup> One positive aspect of dealing with the REC/BLC members was that they provided plenty of copy. \*

\* The REC/BLC was trying to bolt a door that was already wide open. One REC/BLC officer had already been brought down to earth at a LEA-sponsored conference when speaking on NATFHE’s willingness to support LEA anti-racism initiatives and was asked how she could claim that with the situation at Bournville College. Apparently, the NATFHE speaker went around the delegates saying that NATFHE had “bent over backwards making offers to Bis Weaver” but the gathered delegates “gave her short shrift.” Info from two different contacts attending Coombe Lodge Conference Centre<sup>23</sup>

(c) Resolving Racism: The Birmingham Labour Party Leadership's Way

The implications arising from her meeting with Geoff Hall on the 3<sup>rd</sup> February had caused her some concern on two fronts: (i) the prospect of facing Gates in the college; and (ii) attending the Industrial Tribunal without the report of the grievance hearing. Provisional dates for the re-arranged hearing for the 23<sup>rd</sup> or 30<sup>th</sup> March were put forward by the OIT. \*

Bis Weaver had to do something about obtaining the LEA's report, so she contacted Geoff Hall and requested a copy of the report and minutes of the hearing as agreed in October.<sup>24</sup> She was one of the central figures in the LEA's enquiry and whatever deal was being cooked up between the City Council and NATFHE she was entitled to a copy of the report.

While awaiting a response, which never came, she became aware that a city councillor from the Sparkbrook area, Amir Khan, had been drawn into the situation at Bournville College after being approached by Asian community leaders in his ward, who were concerned about the rumours circulating of the abuse suffered by an Asian female lecturer at the college attended by many teenagers from the area. He wrote to the chief education officer seeking clarification of the problem at the college.<sup>25</sup>

Amir's Khan's letter worried the chief education officer and he referred it to the chair of the Continuing Education Committee, Councillor Najma Hafeez. A letter was eventually sent to Councillor Khan on the 27<sup>th</sup> February, delayed no doubt by having to travel through the various stages of censorship to meet the Leader of the Council's directive to city officers. It was signed by a LEA officer, whose responsibility was to brief Councillor Hafeez on issues arising in city colleges. Apparently, it had been passed on to him as "Councillor Hafeez was particularly concerned to hear the nature of the rumour...and has asked [him] to enquire if [the councillor was] aware of any more details to identify the problem [to] enable [the officer] to respond more fully."<sup>26</sup> In line with this request, Amir Khan contacted Bis Weaver, who informed him of her grievance and that it was well known in the LEA. He was also told that it would be impossible for Councillor Hafeez not to be aware of it. In fact, she was more than familiar with the case, yet she was claiming that she needed more information to identify

\* The dates of the Industrial Tribunal were eventually confirmed as the 30<sup>th</sup>/31<sup>st</sup> March and 1<sup>st</sup> April.<sup>27</sup>

the problem! \* Councillor Hafeez and the Labour leadership were undoubtedly playing for time knowing that Amir Khan had been campaigning for reinstatement to the Birmingham Labour party having been expelled in 1985 for criticising the Birmingham Labour Party's failure to act on racism and was not eligible for re-nomination on the Labour ticket for the forthcoming May local elections. \*\*

Others in the Labour Party were also taking up the challenge. The constitutionally approved Ethnic Minority Liaison Committee, whose membership consisted of Black and White members, picked up on the monitoring issue. \*\*\* The committee criticised the Party for doing nothing "to investigate the circumstances surrounding the monitoring, by her city employers, of a Black member of the Labour Party, at the instigation of a member of the Labour Group." The ELMC pressed the Labour group to set up an enquiry and reminded the party that while it "is rightly denouncing the [Tory] Government for McCarthyite tactics being employed in the Civil Service,...the Labour Group appear to be operating [its] own brand of McCarthyism against Black members of the Party."<sup>28</sup> This letter was sent to all Labour group members (Councillors) and the secretary of the District Labour Party.

Bis Weaver also took up the monitoring issue with members of the Labour Party. Rumours had been circulating within the Labour Party, allegedly by NATFHE 'leftists', that the monitoring was not an employment issue but concerned her political activities during working hours. This misinformation appeared to have been put out to justify their failure to take action on this violation of an employee's rights. Nonetheless, the rumours provided her with the opportunity to circulate information to members of Labour Party wards on: (i) the motives for the monitoring; (ii) the complaint of alleged racial harassment; (iii) the deprivation of union rights by the Bournville branch; (iv) NATFHE head office's directive not to answer her correspondence; and (v) the Birmingham liaison committee's failure, despite knowing about the monitoring, to do anything about it. She asked the ward secretaries to bring this to the attention of NATFHE members in their wards.<sup>29</sup>

As the Industrial Tribunal date grew nearer and having heard nothing from Geoff

\* Councillor Hafeez had known of the situation at Bournville College since September 1985. She was also a member of Bournville Governors; a member of NATFHE; a member of the Moseley ward Labour Party where a number of local NATFHE officers were members; a councillor for Fox Hollies ward where Hartland was an active member – a ward that was part of the Sparkhill constituency, which also hosted Knowles as a ward representative.

\*\* The expulsion came after a television programme which also featured Hafeez criticising the local Labour Party for its failure to deal with racism but she remained in the Labour Group

\*\*\* NATFHE's Broad Left Coalition members in the Labour Party rarely attended the meetings

Hall, either formally or informally, of what the LEA intended to do, she decided to let the LEA know, if it had not already realised, there was no ‘forgive and forget’ route out of this grievance. The LEA could expect the same treatment as was employed against NATFHE when it played the ‘hear, see and speak no information’ routine on her after Day’s ‘enquiry’.

Geoff Hall was reminded that eight months had passed since her grievance was submitted and she put forward a number of points to let him know that Woodward and Bernstein were still active. The points raised were: (i) She was “concerned that the report...has still not yet been published...” as the evidence in support of the grievance “should have been substantiated quite early in the investigation;” (ii) she “understood that a report produced in...November, 1986 [was] returned...from whomever it was presented to for changes to be made” and asked “if the report was presented to the Continuing Education sub-Committee, or anyone on that sub-committee, either before or after the changes were made...”; (iii) she referred to “the instructions...sent out by the Leader of the Council...[and asked] is the report of [her] complaint...covered by this political vetting of all reports containing material on racial issues?”; (iv) she raised the monitoring of her movements shortly before attending the LEA hearing and of knowing that “the request for this monitoring to be carried out came from a member of the Labour Group on the Council”; (v) she expressed concern that “people at various levels of NATFHE, with partisan attitudes, have...sought to discuss [her] complaint with [him];” (vi) she asked for Gates’, Cave’s and Hartland’s replies to her grievance and (vii) for notes of the discussion between Hall and Triesman on the 3<sup>rd</sup> February, all of which “concerned matters relating to [her] interests.” To let the LEA know this issue was not going to be pushed under the carpet, she complied with Hall’s request to be kept informed of related issues by (viii) advising him of “the formal complaint of negligence (covering inadequacies, omissions, misrepresentations) against the...[Regional] Official,...[who] had a duty not to be negligent.” In conclusion, (ix) she wanted to know “when the report will be available to [her]... [as] It appears that...the Industrial Tribunal hearing...will be over before [she has] received a copy.”<sup>30</sup>

By the time this letter was received at the LEA, one decision had already been made in the LEA/NATFHE negotiations because a few days later, on the 11<sup>th</sup> March, a letter from Gates was on its way to Geoff Hall. Writing from Stockport, Cheshire, Gates wrote

I wish to place on record my apology without reservation for any offence caused to Mrs Weaver or any other colleague by any strong language I have used on 19 February 1985 or 22 May 1985. I emphasise that it happened at a moment of great frustration and should be understood in that light. I can assure you that it will noyt (sic) happen again.<sup>31</sup>

Was this an attempt to negotiate Gates back into Bournville College? However, the consequences of applying that ‘remedy’ had been drawn attention to in the February meeting with Hall as fraught with risk and that forewarning possibly alerted the LEA to abandoning this ‘solution’ and to replace it with an alternative outcome – still based on expediency over justice. \*

The LEA kept this apology close to its chest choosing not to bring it to Bis Weaver’s attention until November 1987 and it was not difficult to see why it was kept under wraps. The apology referred to strong language causing offence to a number of colleagues on two occasions occurring only in 1985. This went further than the one incident in Day’s report but it meant that the LEA, in accepting Gates’ apology for this version of two separate incidents three months apart, removed the implications of continuous harassment in Gates’ conduct towards Bis Weaver occurring during those two dates. \*\*

This apology would solve the problem for both the City Council and NATFHE. An apology for events only in 1985 left the present Bournville management unscathed for its failure to take action against Gates, Cave and Hartland for incidents between September 1985 and June 1986. A letter of apology offered benefits to the main negotiators – the LEA and NATFHE officialdom: (a) with no reference to racism, the LEA might be able to satisfy the CRE if it decided to take an interest in the case; (b) NATFHE could put it in its bundle to the Industrial Tribunal, to serve two purposes: (i) the apology referred to other parties, which minimised Bis Weaver’s grievance by deflecting attention from Gates’ behaviour directed at a solitary Black woman on to some unspecified third parties - a ploy also used by Day in his report; and (ii) by restricting the complaint to 1985, which Day’s enquiry had covered, it gave

\* Gates was soon to move out of the LEA area to take up a post at Wakefield College, South Yorkshire. This was a route out of Birmingham without the result of the grievance hearing finding its way on to Gates’ record. Gates moved around the country and after being made a Fellow of the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development he became Principal of Doncaster College in January 2006.<sup>32</sup> In August, 2006 “the chairman of the college corporation referred to a special committee of the governors her view that...it might be appropriate for the corporation to dismiss the principle Mr David Gates.” On the 7<sup>th</sup> April 2007, he was dismissed on “matters related to his conduct and performance of his responsibilities, particularly in respect of his behaviour towards and relationships with senior individuals connected with the college and its corporation (governing body) The press went further to disclose that allegations were made about the Principal’s conduct towards two senior women members of staff.<sup>33</sup>

\*\* When the courts started to wrestle with this problem with regard to sexual harassment, it was adjudged that a single incident of an offensive remark made to the victim...in a meeting of colleagues, could constitute sexual harassment if the incident was “severe enough” or “sufficiently serious”<sup>34</sup> provided, as determined in a later case of racial harassment, the complainant can establish two elements: (i) the targeting of the person who is the subject of the harassment; and (ii) causing distress to that target subject<sup>35</sup>

support to NATFHE's claim in its submission that the grievance to the LEA was covered by the union's enquiry where no racial harassment was uncovered. Did the LEA agree not to release the findings to Bis Weaver if Gates left the LEA's employ and apologised for only a small part of the grievance? Were these the reasons why the apology was addressed to the LEA and not to the victim, Bis Weaver? Although we suspected collusion between NATFHE and a reluctant LEA, forced to concede by pressure from Labour Party politicians \* into not releasing the report, we had no knowledge of Gates having 'apologised' until his letter was included in NATFHE's bundle of documents at the Industrial Tribunal hearing in June 1987.

(d) The Birmingham NATFHE White Left – Displays its Janus Head

The NATFHE White Left in the BLC/REC was fashioning its own path in NATFHE but there were other fronts where its smear campaigns found few buyers. They were concentrating their efforts to settle Bis Weaver's fate within NATFHE but there was a different world outside of NATFHE's derelict structures where NATFHE's writ did not run. One place where NATFHE had little credibility was among Black members in the Birmingham Labour Party, within whose ranks there were a few Black NATFHE members.

The White Birmingham Left, whose 'anti-racism' commitment rarely left the committee rooms and smoked filled bars, did not realise that Bis Weaver had been active in the anti-racist movement in Birmingham before they had even begun the university 'revolutionary stage' of their careers. She was known to many Black activists, who were only too well aware of what had been going on in NATFHE; hers was an experience many Black people faced in one form or another especially in the workplace. These Black activists were outside of NATFHE's control and not subject to any dictat from NATFHE demagogues in London, to whose tune it appeared the REC/BLC in the West Midlands danced.

The Birmingham Labour Party Black Section started to put pressure on White 'Left' NATFHE officers, who gave assurances of their opposition to racism - an assurance likely to fall on deaf ears as it failed to explain why these 'guardians of socialist morality in NATFHE' did not spring to the defence of Bis Weaver but, in fact, had often lined up against her. The 'Leftists' other defence was to divert the blame on to NATFHE's head office but this criticism tended to be over procedures rather than explaining the 'Left's' support for one of

\* When LEA officers were asked by a HMI officer in early 1987 what they were doing about the Weaver case, which was creating a bad reputation for the LEA, they explained that they had wanted to take effective action but were unable to do so because of the interference of local Labour politicians.<sup>36</sup>

its 'kin' harassing a Black woman or for not taking up the monitoring issue.

The NATFHE White Left in the Birmingham Labour Party were well aware of the pressure put on her by the Labour Party leadership in monitoring her movements but after an initial outburst of concern, decided to remain mute when it became known the victim was Bis Weaver. They left her to tread water for months while the sharks, in their anti-racist skins, circled around her. The non-NATFHE White Left in the Party swallowed the line fed to it by its NATFHE equivalent – the line being used was that the issue was complicated.<sup>37</sup> \* Yet not one of these 'Leftists', some of whom Bis Weaver had known for several years, ever approached her to seek her help in unravelling this 'complexity'. They were like their 'brothers and sisters' in NATFHE prepared to accept any line thrown up to avoid having to do anything; this was especially so over the monitoring of her movements.

Bis Weaver's close contacts in the Birmingham political sphere, mostly Black with a few dedicated White anti-racists, kept her in the picture. This enabled her to hit back at her opponents in NATFHE in the knowledge there was support outside the union to fall back on and who were more than a match for her adversaries in an environment where the NATFHE machine had no running power. In this arena it was impossible for White NATFHE 'Leftists' to serve up the same fare dished up in NATFHE because the hidden message of political expediency on their anti-racism calling cards when presented to Black activists, in or out of the Labour Party, was too easily detectable.

A most illuminating facet was the Janus-like face shown by the NATFHE White 'Left', on the one hand, to leading Black Labour Party members and, on the other, to their own comrades in the BLC/REC. Phil Murphy, who raised the harassment of Bis Weaver with Birmingham city council, related an account given to him by one BLC/REC officer. The officer said that "a number of people on the [NATFHE] Left are quite concerned about [Bis Weaver's] case in NATFHE" and claimed Gates was feeling harassed and complaining about NATFHE "not defending him against the attacks..."

Bis Weaver reminded Phil Murphy this was the typical response when "a complaint of harassment [is made] against White people [as] they say it is the victims who are the aggressors – the harassers," and she referred to his own experience in the Birmingham

\* Years later in 2007, this particular term 'complicated' was given to the Weaver case by one of the Birmingham White 'Left' of the 1980s, Paul Mackney, who later became general secretary of NATFHE. He provided this response to an officer of the NAAR when the Weaver case came into the light again after the Industrial Tribunal reports and documentary evidence were put on the website – [www.theplebeian.net](http://www.theplebeian.net), Mackney to NAAR<sup>38</sup>

council house. She told him that this officer's claim of Gates feeling unsupported was merely to give the impression these 'concerned NATFHE 'Leftists'' were not supporting Gates. But even if they were not backing Gates that did not mean they were helping her in any way. She pointed out that this particular 'Leftist' officer "has one face in the company of people like Phil and Alton [Burnett] – Black males, and another when he is in the company of White union bureaucrats." He is "like the rest of the White 'Left' [who] have no intention of making changes that would...mean they have to listen to Black people on any issue, especially on race."

This 'Leftist' officer apparently told Phil Murphy "he is not supporting Gates" and is concerned that she may lose the Industrial Tribunal case. This certainly was an angle he had kept from Bis Weaver. Perhaps, their support for her was being hidden under a bushel; so far down it was undetectable. Apparently, he was "dissatisfied with the way...Head Office nationally has handled the case [and] There is general agreement [among NATFHE Leftists] that the whole thing has been mishandled by the National Office" as pay back to the West Midlands region for embarrassing them over the Fernandes case. As the officer put it to Murphy, "Head Office has left the West Midlands to stew in its own juice as revenge."

This certainly was a novel idea but who were these people amongst whom there was general agreement because the majority of REC/BLC had in one way or another to a greater or lesser degree acted directly against her interests for fear of 'splitting the Left' or some other undisclosed reason. She told Phil Murphy, who seemed to have initially accepted this officer's explanation, that she was less concerned with head office's motives than with the part played by the White Left in the affair. She had not asked for their support but for them to detach themselves from those seeking to discredit her and to ensure she had the same rights in the union as other members.<sup>39</sup>

Bis Weaver had speculated twenty months before that Gates would not have sworn at her in a meeting in Handsworth but he would have no reservations about doing it in a meeting where every other person except her was White. A similar 'principle' was at work here with the NATFHE/Labour Party White Left feigning support for Bis Weaver when in Handsworth but opposing and criticising her when in an arena of all White people or a majority of them in Wolverhampton and elsewhere in the West Midlands.

Another Black contact in Handsworth had spoken to two NATFHE officers, also in the Birmingham Labour Party, both of whom, apparently, showed a certain anxiety when Bis Weaver's name was raised with them but, notwithstanding this, they still managed to put the blame on head office. They threw up the excuse that NATFHE was unable to deal with

particular issues, which, abandoning the ‘IPD variations,’ became “member against member disputes.” Did they not think that racism issues were often “member against member disputes’ and since the Weaver issue was one involving racism, why did these ‘anti-racist’ union officers not campaign about this so-called deficiency instead of hiding behind head office? They were tied up with defending the union against its ‘enemies’ and, of course, preventing a split in the Left. Their comments had little relevance to the reasons for their inaction since all these officers were paddling the same way – flowing with the stream.

They did reveal that they were amazed as to how we found the time to write so many lengthy detailed letters. Nonetheless, however much detail was provided for them it made little impression as they whiled away the time dwelling on themselves as victims of a head office vendetta.<sup>40</sup> Their wonder at the detail in our letters provided an answer to the difference between different varieties of anti-racists but they failed to grasp it themselves, how could they? Those with experience of racism, and that can include some White people, have the edge over those who have not covering: (i) experience of racist incidents; (ii) the background to those incidents; and (iii) the way others responded to the incidents. All of these elements are engraved on their consciousness and they can be integrated into an overall picture to be recalled and written about without effort. \* This was why the majority of White Left ‘anti-racists’ can switch off at 5 pm – they lacked the experience, knowledge and consciousness of racism. \*\*

The NATFHE ‘Left’ had nothing to offer in the anti-racism struggle and it seemed that it never had nor really ever wanted to have any real commitment.

(e) Born and Bred in the Briar Patch \*\*\*<sup>41</sup>

In the West Midlands arena, another example of how the views of NATFHE’s Black members counted for naught was about to unfold. Krishna Shukla received notice of a motion from the regional secretary to be presented to the regional council for approval. This was the

\* Mark Twain said “Words realise nothing, vivify nothing to you, unless you have suffered in your own person the thing which the words try to describe.”<sup>42</sup> NATFHE in more ways than one was something resembling King Arthur’s Court – a fantasy of all show and no substance

\*\* The White radicals spoke of raising the consciousness of the workers or Black people. But Black consciousness was far in excess of anything these radicals could envisage since it was wrought in the everyday experience of Black people in the workplace and other areas of British society - ‘workers of the world unite’ was the slogan of the White Left in Birmingham but it was not to be taken too seriously

\*\*\* Bis Weaver was not born or bred in the briar patch but she came of age within it

motion put to the WMARC, which it rejected and referred to the Black Lecturer's Group for comments. What the REC/BLC was about to do was nothing new and it was the type of subterfuge the BLG and a remodelled WMARC were trying to eliminate. The regional secretary's approach fitted into the one-dimensional pre-existing pattern applied by the REC/BLC when it dominated the WMARC because the draft motion and the constitution accompanying it were sent out in the name of the WMARC. This gave the impression that it had been approved by the specialist committee – another example of the REC/BLC using a committee set up to promote the interests of Black members as a rubber stamp for its own ends.<sup>43</sup>

The day after this symbol of abuse of power, and two days after Gates wrote out his *mea culpe* to the LEA, the regional secretary, on this occasion keeping Krishna Shukla in the dark, was putting the finishing touches to a motion with Bis Weaver as the target. This motion would also affect all ethnic minorities seeking redress over NATFHE's 'shenanigans'. \* He was alleged to have liaised with the Bournville branch executive to circumvent the procedures for submitting motions to the regional council.<sup>44</sup>

On the 12<sup>th</sup> March, the Bournville branch committee met under a 'three-line whip' to discuss a motion for submission to the regional council, proposed by Cave and seconded by Hartland. During the discussion a link was made between the motion; Bis Weaver's complaint; and the allegations made by Beider.<sup>45</sup> That it was part of a witch-hunt against Bis Weaver was beyond doubt.

The motion proposed under the name of Bournville college read:

Council recognises the principle of innocent until proven guilty. To this effect, any allegations of racism that are subject to procedure are to be regarded as 'sub-judice' unless otherwise provided. As a principle and policy for implementation, Council condemns any public airing until these procedures have been exhausted.<sup>46</sup>

The proposal was put to the committee under the guise that it would be presented to the branch for approval.<sup>47</sup> However, it by-passed the branch and went direct to the regional secretary in preparation for its entrée into the proceedings at the 18<sup>th</sup> March REC meeting. Bournville branch members were kept in the dark about the branch executive putting a motion to the REC on behalf of the branch, without submitting it for branch approval.

Twice in rapid succession, the regional secretary, who, on a number of occasions had informed Bis Weaver what could or could not be done procedurally, was allowing procedural

\* This motion was intended to reach the Bournville branch just a few days before the Industrial Tribunal hearing – another coincidence!; and to all the other branches in the region

‘slackness’ to reign supreme. This was an abuse of the rules and, as a consequence, accountable trade unionism lost out to the political expediency of the Broad Left Coalition and Bournville branch officers, which would come as no surprise for anyone familiar with NATFHE’s operating practices in the West Midlands.

There had been sufficient time before the next REC meeting to present this motion to a branch meeting, so why did the branch executive not follow procedures, apart from the obvious answer that it rarely did? Did the branch executive want branch members to think the motion originated at regional council, when it was presented to the branch for approval, and not from the branch committee to avoid giving the impression it might be part of a witch-hunt against Bis Weaver? Furthermore, by submitting it as a Bournville motion the impression was given to the regional council that the genesis of the motion lay in the Bournville branch and not in the REC/BLC. However, these ‘guardians of NATFHE-style’ trade union principles failed to appreciate that the worn-out recipes they were cooking up lacked originality and staying power but they did provide Bis Weaver with ammunition to continually expose the devious activities fostered by the REC/BLC.

At the REC meeting, on the 18<sup>th</sup> March, the WMARC motion criticising the *Frew enquiry* was presented with little chance of it being accepted but it revealed a division of opinion between the regional secretary and a Birmingham liaison officer. The former admitted “there were irregularities in the way the [Frew] enquiry was set up”, whereas the latter, a stalwart supporter of Bournville officers and the branch committee, “approve[d] of the report” and thought it “was well done.” For someone who never attended WMARC, he was hardly an authority on the workings of the Committee. His assessment was hardly objective and put question marks against his knowledge of how investigations should be conducted.

The reason alleged by some members for Krishna Shukla’s absence from the November REC meeting was recognised as mistaken when Krishna challenged the motives put forward for his absence from that meeting. That item was deleted from the November minutes. With that spurious allegation out of the way, Krishna disclosed that, as secretary of the Black Lecturer’s Group and acting on a decision made by the BLG, he intended to write to all its members inviting them to attend the WMARC. This turned out to be a real eye-opener for the committee and none too popular after the effort the REC/BLC had spent in trying to curb the objectives of Black members and the policies they pursued. The REC/BLC,

with the motion on a new constitution on the agenda, had already shown its hand in trying to limit BLG influence on anti-racist policies and actions?

The response of the liaison officer to Krishna's intended action was most illuminating because not only did he oppose members of the BLG attending WMARC meetings as "not right and proper" but also that "if they attended" it could be "only as observers" without being allowed to speak or vote. This boiled down to Black members, who attend WMARC, only being permitted to listen to a new REC/BLC-nominated committee consisting of fifteen members of whom only two were Black. Refusing to allow Black members to speak in a committee presumably set up to advance the cause of Black members was an insight into the world inhabited by some of these 'anti-racist activists'. Just as Bournville branch had its own particular brand of apartheid, the REC/BLC was being urged to develop a more formal apartheid structure. The Black Lecturer's Group would have jurisdiction over issues affecting Black members directly in its own Bantustan, called the BLG, but overall policy-making would be carried out by the 'Pretoria-style government' consisting of overwhelmingly White members of the REC entrenched in the WMARC. Black NATFHE members from the various colleges would be allowed to look through the windows of the committee room or stand by the 'kitchen door' to listen in silence to White people deciding on what was best for them. NATFHE looked to be importing South Africa into the West Midlands. \*

The regional secretary's motion went beyond a re-writing of a constitution and was presented as a new anti-racism policy document - training of staff, officers and officials; an anti-racist approach to the curriculum; anti-racist monitoring of college libraries; establishing anti-racist committees in colleges, branches and liaison; with a statement that "Council believes that both Black and White members have a part in exposing and opposing racism; and that its Anti-racism Committee should be composed of those members...committed to those aims irrespective of colour."

The priorities for the coming year covered "identification and removal of discriminatory practices and procedures in post-school sector education [and] within the Association (NATFHE) at all levels;...active support for victims of racial harassment;...[and] campaigning among the membership to deepen awareness of racism and discrimination within the education system and beyond." These were very laudable objectives but in NATFHE West Midlands it had a very hollow ring to it because it was to be carried out

\* "Like radical conservatives [in the USA] they are all for democracy but only if they can guarantee the outcome through dirty tricks. When it is really up for grabs, and they see themselves losing, they simply change the rules."<sup>48</sup>

under the dominating influence of members of the Broad Left Coalition, many of who had hardly covered themselves in anti-racist glory over the past eighteen months.

The motion “particularly welcomes the participation of black members at all levels of the Association and notes with concern the small number of members of regional council from ethnic minorities [and] welcomes and supports the establishment of a Black members’ Conference in the West Midlands...restricted only to black members. \* Written reports from this conference would be given urgent attention by the REC or an appropriate regional standing committee” – the WMARC. The REC’s reference to the latter committee was the key to how reports from the Black group would be dealt with because the initial Black members’ Conference (the BLG), after its inaugural conference, submitted many proposals through the WMARC to the REC and those proposals were ignored. Needless to say, this did not get a mention in the spiel given out accompanying these proposals. The motion did not say whether or not Black participants must hold their tongue in the presence of their White ‘representatives’ on the committee as was earlier suggested. The final point was that the “Council expresses its thanks to and reaffirms its total support for the officers and representatives of its current Anti-Racist Standing Committee.” This was the ultimate contradiction bearing in mind the conclusions of the *Frew Report*. The REC was for all practical purposes scuppering any opportunity for Black members to have a real voice in influencing anti-racism policy in NATFHE’s West Midlands region.

The BLG’s position in NATFHE’s structure was similar to the women’s panel, that is, in representing a particular section of the membership, who were disadvantaged in the workplace, but the REC/BLC wanted the WMARC as a mechanism between the BLG and regional council to propose policy and to vet motions from the BLG. The WMARC was a sub-committee of the regional council as was the women’s panel but there was a considerable difference in the way each was allowed to operate. The women’s panel and women’s rights committee consisted solely of women, with the functions of determining policies and

\* While the REC was calling for more participation for Black members and regretting that few Black people were members of regional council, it was actually restricting Black members from speaking and voting when attending WMARC meetings, other than for two Black members out of a total of fifteen members. As for the ‘Black member’s conference’, any proposals had to be vetted by WMARC. A similar approach to the one adopted by the REC was recognised three hundred and fifty years before by Gerald Winstanley, who said “Everyone talks of freedom, but there are but few that act for freedom, and the actors for freedom are oppressed by the talkers and verbal professors of freedom.”<sup>49</sup> For the new constitution see Motion for Regional Council First Draft, the final draft, 23 February 1986, for submission to the regional council 21<sup>st</sup> March 1986<sup>50</sup>

strategies for women; and any motions agreed upon were sent to the regional council.<sup>51</sup> Membership of the women's panel was soon to be opened to all women members of NATFHE with the right to participate in discussions and to vote. \* The WMARC was, until recently, merely a glorified multi-cultural education group and, with the advent onto the scene of Black lecturers seeking to represent the people whose interest the WMARC was supposed to promote, the REC/BLC's response was to refuse them the opportunity to participate in discussions or to vote. The REC/BLC wanted to ensure any 'anti-racist' committee would be dominated by their members and any proposals emanating from Black lecturer's would be required to fit in with the REC/BLC's 'vision' of anti-racism - a pseudo-Leftist adaptation of British colonialism's concept of indirect rule. The REC/BLC bureaucrats had learned British imperial history well. \*\*

The REC/BLC had not moved an inch, nor was it capable of doing so with its overwhelming belief that all its members were vaccinated against committing discriminatory behaviour despite evidence that some of them had never taken the serum; not even when the virus began to be noticeable within its ranks.

The Bournville branch delegates wanted the last paragraph of the motion to be amended to read "Council expresses its total support for its Officers, and expresses its thanks to its representatives of its current Anti-Racist committee." The Bournville Branch did not want to show any support for Black members on the committee other than Krishna, who was not impressed by the type of 'support' given to him. But at least there were thanks on offer for the other representatives, now mainly Black members. This was another Bournville proposal not to have obtained branch approval before submission.

Apart from this proposed amendment, the motion received an easy passage for submission to the regional council. Only one dissentient voice was heard, Krishna Shukla's, and as a BLG member he hardly counted. The white heat of anti-racism, necessary for addressing the unfavourable situation of Black people in the workplace, did not constitute even a few glowing embers in NATFHE.

The final item was the motion conceived between the Bournville branch executive in concert with the regional secretary, which omitted any reference to Evans' contribution.<sup>52</sup>

\* A decision on confining voting membership to full members (REC-nominees and co-optees) was deferred and would not be reconsidered unless voting became a problem; appointment of a permanent Chair was rejected in favour of a circulating chair to enable **all** members to take an active part.<sup>53</sup> (My emphasis)

\*\* Professor Noam Chomsky of MIT put it eloquently, "We are your masters and you shine our shoes. Any weaker enemy has to be crushed so that the right lessons are taught"<sup>54</sup>

The underlying purpose seemed to be to isolate Bis Weaver further in the union to be justified by the 'legitimacy' of a regional council decision. If the objective was to stifle her it had no possibility of achieving that as it was far too late for anything they concocted to have any effect on her whatsoever other than a feeling of disdain and revulsion towards them. Whoever the real inspiration was behind this motion was treading on very shaky ground.

Immediately after the REC meeting, Bis Weaver's trusted 'eyes and ears' rang to tell her of the Bournville motion and there was no doubt in our minds that the branch executive and the REC/BLC were keen to have another go at her by the backdoor. To see what the regional council would make of this overcooked offering, we decided to attend the meeting on the 21<sup>st</sup> March to observe the debate and see how well the Bournville actors performed their parts. Curiosity, rather than Bournville manoeuvrings, was the reason for attending the meeting.

On the Saturday, we drove the eighteen miles to Wolverhampton Polytechnic where the meeting would be held. The Bournville delegates certainly looked surprised when we entered the lecture theatre to take our seats as observers. A member of the WMARC – the first to be co-opted at the June meeting, came and sat next to Bis Weaver - a gesture that was appreciated. The early part of the meeting covered a number of reports from various standing committees and it was noticed, by us at least, that one REC officer (Ms Pattinson) apologised for not providing a written report of the TUC Women's Conference; and another REC member on the International Relations Committee (Clarke) apologised for a late report on anti-apartheid but no accusations of inefficiency followed or were there any calls for an investigation into the relevant representatives or committees.

The council was given notification of the motion on the new constitution for WMARC for it to be discussed at a future meeting. This showed that it would have been possible for it to be referred to the BLG or college branches in the region for comments prior to its discussion at a future regional council meeting. Alongside this motion and its expression of total support for the officers and representatives of WMARC was the 'Bournville' motion. When this motion came up on the agenda, the chairperson, Gates, vacated the chair in order to take part in the debate. The vice chair, Ms Pattinson, proposed the motion on behalf of the Bournville branch. It was described "as drawn up [from] various experiences at Branch and Regional level," although she did not intend to delve into or divulge those experiences.

The proposal was flagged up as a way of handling "internal disputes between

members”); protecting all those involved in “allegations of racism and sexism” \*; and to stop “campaigning at different levels [of the union by] all parties involved in these procedures,” thereby preventing a climate where “any procedure [decision?] is predetermined...before any investigation is carried out.” According to the proposer, the motion was not prescriptive about what procedures should be used; nor to put pressure on people not to pursue a course of action; nor for members having to abide by any decision made; nor to prevent debating the rights and wrongs of the case – the very things that the *kernels* had been imposing on one complainant since day one. Apparently, it was to lay down protection for all those involved – the complainant, the complained against and the Association.

These generous concessions for dealing with complaints of racial harassment should be weighed against the conduct over the previous twelve to twenty-one months, of the proposer (Ms Pattinson); the seconder of the motion (Hartland); the chair of the REC (Gates), who was also to speak on the motion; and the present chair of the branch submitting the motion (Cave) who was absent from the meeting. The Bournville contingent was certainly not shy in displaying the partisan interests promoted by the motion. The reasonable person, given these facts, might not doubt that Bis Weaver was the subject of the motion.

Despite the disclaimers, the motion was another means of enforcing any decision on a complainant by threatening them with formal sanctions if they objected to the misuse of procedures to produce a *Whitewash*. These new sanctions would leave complainants vulnerable to assailants and their lay-officer and official allies, as well as formalising the sanctions already in existence as witnessed by the restrictions placed on Bis Weaver by the Bournville branch, Birmingham liaison committee, the REC, and head office for daring to protest/campaign against malpractice. It would open the way for dissatisfied complainants to be arraigned when unfounded allegations, similar to those arising from the *Beider affair*, were lodged against them. Few delegates spoke in favour of the motion.

Krishna was not taken in by this argument and he drew attention to the proposer “doing exactly what she is condemning”, that is, campaigning on an issue involving race, and he asked directly “who the motion is against.” Several members, drawing on the Bournville College and the Fernandes issues, referred to: (i) the complexity of these types of cases; (ii) the likelihood of the union's inadequate procedures being made worse by "shutting people up"; (iii) the use of the legalistic term *sub judice* as a means of intimidating people; (iv) restricting the motion to internal union procedures; and (v) the need for complaints to be

\* The motion did not cover complaints of sexism

fully investigated.

Mackney called for better procedures than Rule 8 for dealing with complaints of racism and sexism; and proposed an amendment to the motion, replacing ‘condemnation’ with ‘advice’. He also called for a Black members section to have more influence, facilities and funds. The amendment was seconded by Lovejoy and others spoke in support.

One speaker, in favour of the unamended motion, referred to an “internal dispute discussed at a TUC regional meeting by a NATFHE member [and the union] need to do something about it,” that is, to prevent this from happening again. \* The speaker did not identify the case but it was concerned with the removal of Bis Weaver’s rights at Bournville College, which the proposer of the motion, Ms Pattinson, played a significant part in. Gates’ contribution was to oppose any amendment as being too complicated and stood by the original motion of ‘condemning’ members who campaigned. Gates had also conveniently forgotten his own procedural impropriety, or pre-procedure ‘campaigning’, when seeking advice from Day, the regional official. Gates removed all doubts, if any existed, at whom the motion was directed, when he spoke of a situation “where both parties agree to the procedures and one of the parties did not abide by them” – a whinge well passed its sell-by date.

Ms Pattinson returned to the fray by claiming the motion was an “attempt to provide procedures so grievances won’t be aired all over the place.” It was difficult to see how the motion provided procedures as all it did was to say no campaigning once procedures, fabricated or otherwise, had been agreed. The motion was consistent in that it followed the path of head office in stifling any criticism of the union’s *kangaroo-court* style of justice. This was certainly a peek into a cuckoo’s nest!

At the end of the debate the motion was amended to read,

Council recognises the principle of innocent until proven guilty. To this effect, any allegations of racism against individuals that are subject to internal union procedure are to be regarded as 'sub-judice' unless otherwise provided for. As a policy for implementation in the interim, Council advises that until new guidelines are produced it would not be appropriate for allegations against individuals to be publicly aired until these procedures have been exhausted.

The amended motion was carried nineteen votes to seven.<sup>55</sup> However, this motion, amended or otherwise, was irrelevant because Bis Weaver’s complaint to the union had

\* The speaker was referring to Alton Burnett’s attempt to raise the issue of Bis Weaver’s rights at the TUC which was blocked by Ms Welch. This showed that the motion was aimed at exercising control over raising these type of issues outside of the union too

already lapsed and the grievance was with the LEA and, at least formally, outside of NATFHE's jurisdiction. The proposer had tried to make it all encompassing covering the LEA and the Industrial Tribunal hearing, but the amended motion specified "subject to internal union procedure". Furthermore, after what Gates and *the kernels*; head office officials; and the REC/BLC had done to Bis Weaver since February 1985 did they expect this motion to cause her hair to stand on end?

At the end of the meeting, Bis Weaver spoke to Paul Mackney \* informing him that the motion was never put to the Bournville branch for approval and asked if the branch committee was in a position to do that. He confirmed motions must have branch approval unless it was an emergency motion, which he recognised this was not, and he suggested she spoke to the regional secretary. \*\* She spoke to Evans, whose view was different since he claimed the branch committee was able to bypass the branch. This was mistaken and the reason for this rare 'mistake' in his pool of knowledge on procedures, as we were soon to find out, if the allegations made against him were correct, was due to his role in 'advising' the Bournville executive to submit the motion. My parting shot was to ask him, now the motion, even in its amended form, had been passed, how the REC intended to stop us from campaigning if we chose to do so. He said nothing. Gates passed by at the time and asked if the motion pleased us. He received the same response as Evans.<sup>56</sup> This was no idle boast on our part and was carried out to the full within the constraints imposed by the impending Industrial Tribunal hearing.

Whenever Gates' allies in the REC/BLC tried to batten down the hatches they merely opened the floodgates. Their ineptitude on race issues ensured that an even greater fiasco would arise from this ill-thought out enterprise than the results of the McCarthyite inquiry. Sinking below their already low standards of propriety and competence, the REC/BLC

\* A dozen years later, Mackney, as General Secretary of NATFHE, had to apologise to a NATFHE member, Farhad Shahrokni, on behalf of the union. In reappraising its procedures for dealing with complaints of racial discrimination, he stated "These (new procedures) will stress that branches should not 'fall into the mistake of judging for themselves whether the allegations made by a complainant are true and then act accordingly by either, for example, giving support to the person against whom the complaint is made, or otherwise discouraging the complainant from continuing their allegation. Such action by a branch can lead to the union itself being adjudged to have victimised the complainant'"<sup>57</sup>

\*\* Mackney was at times an outspoken critic of organisations not acting, as he saw it, appropriately, so why did he not take up the issue of the Bournville *kernels* railroading through a motion in defiance of recognised procedures, especially as it was directed at a member of Bournville branch for the personal interests of its proposers? It might be expected that underhanded tactics aimed at members of an ethnic minority, without observing the appropriate procedures, would be an issue experienced officers would take up

created another opportunity for Bis Weaver to increase the flow of correspondence and ‘air’ her grievances. The distaste generated by the Beider conspiracy; the McCarthyite enquiry; and the latest motion added another cartridge of ink to the Weaver pen and every advantage would be taken to campaign against the motion and exploit the Broad Left Coalition’s incompetency. An enemy of dictatorship is a free press and this was one avenue beyond head office’s jurisdiction.

An important consequence of the Bournville/Evans motion appeared to have passed unnoticed by REC/BLC members and regional council delegates but it had not gone unnoticed by us. When we returned home we discussed the implications of this undisclosed gem glistening from within the motion and how best to broadcast it to interested parties as well as to those not particularly interested in what went on in NATFHE West Midlands.

The next stage in dealing with the region’s new policy was for us to present its implications to all NATFHE branches in the region. Unlike our comrades in the Bournville branch, we were aware of the new policy submitted in their name. We kept our ears open and subsequently heard of a branch committee meeting to be held on the 26<sup>th</sup> March to discuss the recent anti-campaigning policy sent out by the regional secretary. We turned up as observers at the twelve-strong branch committee meeting.

Opening the meeting, Cave referred to a recent request from the regional secretary for the Bournville branch to put “forward a motion on the issue of racism” to the REC, which the branch committee complied with, and the motion was subsequently accepted by regional council subject to amendments. In Cave’s opinion, the amendments had made the motion more “fruitful and positive...[as] it tightens [up] the Branch Committee motion.” Cave, the lawyer, failed to recognise the amendment had produced the opposite effect by loosening its impact from ‘condemnation of breaches’ to ‘advice not to breach’. Declaring the motion to be “now regional policy,” Cave suggested calling “a special Branch meeting to discuss it and other related matters.”

One member, a SWP activist, who initially voted in favour of the original motion, now decided to oppose it as he thought it “could be used against us” and he asked “what would we be able to do if something went against us in the NATFHE procedures? What would we be able to do in the meantime...[and] what do we do if someone does not accept advice?” Cave, speaking as if he did not have a direct interest, claimed that “the motion deals with a point of principle [and] does not gag people” and, following the line pursued by Gates at regional council, said “if people enter into procedures then they should abide by them.”

Cave saw “it is adopting a principle that casework is important [and] it will allow people to speak out when procedures are not appropriate.” The committee agreed to submit the policy to the branch; the voting was eleven in support, including two members of the branch’s women’s group. There was one vote against.

I sat there wondering if Cave ever thought about what he said. When Bis Weaver had initially criticised NATFHE’s ‘procedures’, the branch committee introduced a motion depriving her of the right to write to NATFHE members about problems she was encountering.<sup>58</sup> The intention now was to deprive her of any form of campaigning about these and other problems but it was a bit late for the new conditions to have any effect. Were branch committee members so obtuse not to have seen that the motive behind the motion was to pile the pressure on Bis Weaver or did they not care?

We were then asked to leave the meeting as the committee intended to discuss case work. We had no objection but their dual standards were questioned when I said that I hoped they would adopt the same propriety when “case work...relates to Bis Weaver,” which had” not been observed for over one and a half years.” Bis Weaver pointed to the several occasions when non-NATFHE members were present in branch committee and branch meetings when her case work was discussed. Nor should “Interested parties, who are part and parcel of the case,...be involved in the discussion...” As the branch committee never took minutes of its meetings, we wrote to Hartland, the acting branch secretary, placing our comments on the record. Cave’s revelation about the origins of the motion had turned the spotlight on the regional secretary and this was duly noted in the letter. \*<sup>59</sup>

After this meeting, we turned to the task of polishing the diamond in the policy for it to sparkle around the region. A letter was written bringing it to the attention of its sponsor, the regional secretary, which was soon to be circulated to an ever widening audience of interested and non-interested people. After reproducing the original motion, we gave out the details of how it came into existence and the reasons why it might be aimed particularly at Bis Weaver. The idea for the Bournville branch to submit a motion had, apparently, been the inspiration of the regional secretary and a brief history of the origins of the motion and the intentions behind it was provided. As for the implications of the new regional policy these were spelt out. The regional council had introduced a policy that “refers only to those making

\* “Nothing works against the success of a conspiracy so much as the wish to make it wholly secure and certain to succeed. Such an attempt requires many men, much time and very favourable conditions. And all these in turn heighten the risk of being discovered. You see, therefore, how dangerous conspiracies are.”<sup>60</sup>

allegations of racism. Any person making allegations of sexism, professional misconduct or any other grievance against another individual is not included in the motion,” therefore, those complainants were “free to publicly air those allegations.” The crunch line was that “As those making allegations of racism are more than likely to be members of racial minorities, the motion, by imposing this condition only on those making allegations of racism, could be interpreted as racially discriminatory.” She then referred to the Race Relations Act...1976 Part I s 1 (ii), Part II s11 (3) (c), Part III s 25 (3) (d), Part IV s 31 (i).” She was letting the recipients of the letter decide for themselves whether or not her suspicions about the motion’s purpose had validity. Additionally, as the policy had the backing of the Bournville ‘trio’, she quoted from NATFHE’s reply to the CRE’s questionnaire, in which it was claimed that “all three state that they are passionate and committed anti-racists whatever their differences with [Bis Weaver] on professional matters.”<sup>61</sup>

It was difficult to see how the REC could implement this policy since it was almost certainly racially discriminatory and sought to suppress a legal right to pursue a wrong committed by another person(s). Perhaps, the original motion was aimed at expelling perpetrators from the union but this would take the infamous Rule 8 \* many months to deal with and saddle NATFHE with even more problems. Or its purpose might be to bring greater pressure on Bis Weaver before the Industrial Tribunal hearing, due to heard in a few days’ time – corresponding with a pattern of NATFHE activity that seemed well established. It was as well the Broad Left Coalition was not on Bis Weaver’s side since everything they touched seemed to become a disaster.

A week after the regional council meeting, the Black Lecturers’ Group held its second conference attracting forty delegates. The group passed several motions for discussion at the next regional council meeting. The motions included the withdrawal of the *Frew Report*; the restoration of Bis Weaver’s rights in the union; black officers only for the WMARC; parity with the women’s panel in having: (a)(i) unimpeded access to the regional council; and (a)(ii) reserved places for Black members on the REC; (b) rejection of the new WMARC constitution; and (c) active support for Black members. The resolutions were sent to the regional secretary by the newly-appointed BLG secretary. This might cause some problem for the regional secretary since Bis Weaver was the BLG Secretary and no one in NATFHE

\* This policy could be covered by Rule 8 as it might be considered as bringing the union into disrepute as it would not be dealing directly with complaints of racial harassment and racial discrimination which were not covered by Rule 8

was allowed to deal with any correspondence from her without head office's approval. Perhaps, she should use an alias!

While the REC/BLC, under the guise of welcoming Black involvement, had introduced measures to control the increasing numbers of Black members seeking to participate in the development of anti-racist policy-making, others in the trade union movement were seeking to extend the involvement of Black women. The West Midlands women's panel had a deplorable record in its dealings with Black women, \* but this did not apply to other women activists in the labour movement. The South East Region TUC Women's Rights Committee was planning a conference at Great Russell Street – the home of the TUC, on *Fighting Racism*. The conference was intended “to draw Black women into activity; to identify issues of major concern as part of the dual fight against racism and the poor conditions suffered by Black women workers.” Bis Weaver had received invitations to speak at the conference on the 11<sup>th</sup> April, and to attend a final planning meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> April.<sup>62</sup> What a contrast in attitudes. On the one hand, recognition for her knowledge and expertise in the area of racism from a regional TUC women's rights organisation and, on the other, attacks by NATFHE officials and officers on her professional and personal competence and integrity; subordination of her expertise to those who cannot even differentiate between racism and interpersonal dispute; and anonymous criticism for presenting the policies of the Black Lecturer's Group to NATFHE's anti-racism committee. \*\* Did Triesman have the Broad Left Coalition in the West Midlands in mind when deriding people from North of Watford?

#### (f) The Broad Left's Generosity Repaid in Full

News came through of NATFHE asking for a postponement of the Industrial Tribunal hearing, which reached Bis Weaver on the 27<sup>th</sup> March. Whilst this was a disappointment, as she wanted the issue settled with or without the LEA's report, it did provide the time to release information on the *McCarthyite* enquiry; on the region's 'racism' motion; and on the prevailing situation to those bodies to whom NATFHE's activities should be of interest and concern.

\* The panel included at least one REC/BLC member who thought Black women were reactionary; another who thought harassment of Black women was nothing other than an inter-personal disputes; and another who spoke to a motion removing a Black woman's rights in the union

\*\* Bis Weaver had recently led a session in Birmingham at a NACRO event 'identifying sexism and strategies for combating sexism', on the 24<sup>th</sup> February.<sup>63</sup>

The 'WMARC 3' of Krishna, Bis and I, contacted all members of the WMARC to try to identify each individual contributor to particular comments in the *Frew Report*, although it was doubtful they would offer up anything. We listed seven criticisms "made about the Committee and against some of its members" and they were asked to confirm if they contributed any of the criticisms listed. Our reasons for seeking information were explained as being "in the interests of fairness and justice [as] allegations against members should be accompanied by the names of those making the allegations."<sup>64</sup> Jefney Ashcroft put in writing that she "was unable to give...any information for the straight forward reason that [she] was not approached at all..."<sup>65</sup> confirming her comments at the last WMARC meeting. As for the others only one of these messiahs of openness and accountability replied. The one who did, very belatedly after eight weeks, an author of books and articles on racism and multi-cultural education, hardly covered herself with glory in her response - confirming the vast distance between some academics and their active participation in anti-racism.

The contributor \* apologised for not attending the WMARC's last meeting (8th April) claiming to have received the calling notices too late to attend - a surprising apology since she had only attended one meeting with a partial attendance at another out of six meetings in twelve months; and of the four missed meetings only one apology was sent. She added that "it [was] easier to attend...when [there was] a particular and confirmed pattern..." When was this 'confirmed pattern' because the previous committee secretary arranged meetings on an *ad hoc* basis and omitted to tell certain members of the changes. \*\* This initial comment was an instructive introduction illustrating a particular stance on one of the criticisms in the *Frew report* – inefficiency.

She, apparently, found it difficult to reply to our letter, claiming "not [to] have information on the context in which the Regional Executive enquiry took place, or what is intended as a consequence etc," that is, what action would follow the enquiry. Why she chose to mention this point was not explained because no request was made for "information on the context in which the enquiry took place...[but only] if [she] had been asked to provide information..., and if so did she make any of the unattributed allegations." We had also drawn attention to the principle that 'allegations against members should be accompanied by the

\* This contribution by Ms J Williams, was sent to Krishna Shukla on the 19<sup>th</sup> May.<sup>66</sup> Observations on her contribution were recorded in a letter sent by me to Krishna Shukla and Ms Williams on the 3<sup>rd</sup> June. I also enclosed a copy of my letter to the Caribbean Times dealing with the rights issue <sup>67</sup>

\*\* There was a meeting in February 1986; the April meeting was cancelled to be replaced by a May meeting, which was abandoned due to a low attendance. The other meetings were held in June and July

names of those making the allegations.’”

Apparently, when agreeing to make a contribution over the telephone to Ms Frew, she was not curious enough to ask the purpose of the enquiry. However, despite providing information to without knowing the reasons behind the questions, she found our letter “rather like a personal inquisition, and seems to imply that there was nothing wrong with the workings of the Committee during the last year.” Again it was difficult to see how it felt ‘like a personal inquisition’ as all we asked was did she make a contribution to any of the points raised in the *Frew Report*. Nonetheless, despite not explicitly disclosing her contribution to the *Frew enquiry*, she held the view that “the Committee had achieved little in the last year.” This was as much an indictment of the previous administration, as “the last year” covered January 1986 to January 1987 but as she hardly attended the committee how would she know? \*

She became more specific by saying she was “quite happy for a decision to be taken that Committee officers should be Black providing that this is a clear decision and not debated at every meeting, and that people are willing to stand for a year to provide continuity.” The Black officers issue was undoubtedly one of her contributions but her readiness to accept Black officers if clearly decided upon showed how little she knew as “on the 9<sup>th</sup> July [1986, which she had not attended] it was agreed by all present...that in future the ARC would have Black officers only [and] it was not ‘debated at every meeting’ because it had been adopted by the Committee and needed no further discussion.” Why did the possibility of Black officers make some of the ‘original’ WMARC members feel uncomfortable? Furthermore, why was it necessary for her to make the observation on continuity in office? Did she doubt that continuity would be provided by Black officers and if so why not?

She also felt that

one issue has dominated the Committee and that this personal dispute has now reached the point where the anti-racist committee can do little to further its resolution. If this situation continues then the wider work of the committee is forgotten, delayed, subordinated. In other circumstances it would be right and proper for such a Committee to assist in personal cases of harassment, discrimination etc. in as much as they could. In this case that is not happening and probably cannot happen.

Perhaps, she should have explained why the committee can be used for harassment cases but not in this particular case. What was so different about this case ‘that it is not happening

\* Her attendance over the year was in February, September and October (part attendance)

and probably cannot happen'? Was it because it involved a union officer and it meant actually doing something rather than having a chat about multi-cultural education?

Nor was the Bis Weaver harassment case, which she erroneously described as a 'personal dispute', discussed at meetings. The only personal situation discussed at the WMARC was of Ram's isolation and from this discussion came the proposal to set up support systems for Black staff facing pressure in the workplace. This decision was made at a meeting that the contributor had partially attended. She was another of the 'feminist anti-racists', who never asked Bis Weaver to explain the circumstances surrounding her complaint of harassment but appeared to be prepared to swallow and then regurgitate the prevailing line being pumped out by West Midlands feminists.

A claim made that "attendance...has fallen off drastically and few new members have been recruited" was another error on her part and rather premature because by the time she had put pen to paper, nine new members, all of whom were Black, were attending. \* The point addressed to her was "how many Black NATFHE members attended the meetings at which [she] 'found it much easier to attend.'" As she rarely attended meetings and was in no position to make the claims she did, her overall response confirmed the way the *Frew enquiry* was conducted - the REC/BLC members appeared to have a predetermined outcome before the enquiry was carried out. She concluded by stating that she "regard[ed] the work of the anti-racist committee as extremely important and because there is so much to be done in all the colleges in the region, hoped a way [could] be found to resolve the current impasse." She informed Krishna that she would attend the next meeting and "explain points that [were] unclear." She obviously had not kept up with current events on the anti-racism front in NATFHE otherwise she would have known that as an observer, which would be her status under the system proposed by the REC, she would not have a right to speak or vote unless she thought such a restriction would not apply to her.

The position she had taken on so-called (i) inefficiency; (ii) constant discussion of Black officers; and (iii) dominance of a particular 'personal dispute, must have come from somewhere. As she had rarely attended meetings how could she have arrived at these conclusions? Were they suggested to her when making her contribution? She was obviously

\* The attendance at the last meeting that she partially attended (29<sup>th</sup> October) was eight, one more than the 17<sup>th</sup> September meeting she also attended; and one more than the February meeting, which was the first meeting Bis Weaver and myself attended albeit uninvited. The October meeting still attracted eight although the majority of REC/BLC appointees had begun their boycott

in the dark about the WMARC, therefore, a letter was sent to her covering these assumptions and inaccuracies in her contribution and couple of points were made about the *Frew Report* for her benefit.

Noting that she referred to Bis Weaver's difficulties "as a personal dispute", it was put to her, "Upon what does she base such a subjective and erroneous conclusion?" It was suggested "if she wishes to draw conclusions about the particular experiences of this Black woman member, she should ensure that she has information upon which to base such a viewpoint." Her view was linked to "one expressed by a Wolverhampton Polytechnic colleague of hers (Ms Welch) at a TUC Regional meeting, [which was] an equally subjective and erroneous interpretation."

She was reminded that two officers had resigned from the committee, comprising of "one person [who] resigned completely from the Committee,...the Chair,"(S Pattinson) and one other resigned as Treasurer (Bis Weaver). To this information was added the comment that "as an anti-racist, [she] would appreciate that it would have been somewhat incompatible for the Treasurer, who had some of her trade union rights taken away from her by the Branch...to serve in an officers capacity on a Regional Committee and under the Chairpersonship of the person who chaired the meeting which removed those rights. For this Black woman member to serve as an officer on any formalised NATFHE Committee, whilst not enjoying full rights as a member, would legitimise the union's discriminatory practices against her." It was "also interesting to find out how those who do not suffer from the effects of racism/racial discrimination are so eager to tell those who do how anti-racist committees should be run." As a final point, Nan Whitbread's comment at a TUC conference about trade unions putting "their own house in order" was quoted and it was suggested to her that was "what we have been trying to do."

This latest assault on the intelligence of the three members criticised by WMARC members in the *Frew report* with its misrepresentations delivered in a highly patronising manner by this contributor typified how the *Frew enquiry* was conducted and the highly subjective responses of its contributors.

The next port of call for Bis Weaver and I was to pick up on the comment made at regional council about an 'internal dispute' raised at the Midlands TUC and we contacted its Secretary. We expressed concern that after "the issue of Bismillah Weaver and the Bournville College NATFHE Branch was raised at a TUC Regional meeting,...a number of rumours, the origins of which are still unclear, have been circulating in the trade union and labour movement about the [negative] attitude towards trade unionism held by [Bis Weaver and

Gordon Weaver].” Doubting “whether it will scotch the rumours... [but to] set the record straight,” brief details were presented of the LEA enquiry; two Rule 8 complaints; and the Industrial Tribunal hearing. From these details it could be seen that “the issue is something more than a conflict of personalities/personality conflict between two members” as suggested by one delegate in a “highly subjective and inaccurate statement.”<sup>68</sup> “No recollection of the matter...having been raised at a meeting either of this regional council or of its executive committee” was the reply sent by the TUC Midlands secretary.<sup>69</sup> In our response to the secretary, we referred to four different sources confirming the comments made by a NATFHE delegate at the meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup> July 1986, but it was the latest disclosure in a NATFHE regional meeting that prompted our recent letter seeking clarification.<sup>70</sup>

Bis Weaver then turned in the direction of Dawson at Hamilton House – where the centre for handling unpalatable letters in search of justice was located; and where such letters were allowed to decompose in some hidden vault alongside the remnants of NATFHE’s anti-racism policy. Dawson had yet to inform her of the procedures for dealing with complaints against regional officials, i.e. if they had such procedures. There was little difficulty in arriving at the reasons for delaying his response as Triesman, on the 12<sup>th</sup> June 1986, had ruled out the union as a means for doing anything for a member wishing to complain against a full-time official. But surely NATFHE did have rules and procedures for those types of complaints when union officials acted directly against the interests of NATFHE members, and if they did have them it would not be difficult to put that information in an envelope and despatch it to the complainant. But did union officials ever act in the interests of NATFHE members bringing complaints against officials, lay officers and fellow travellers? Was NATFHE head office employing its usual tactic of delay in preparation for another *Whitewash or Kangaroo Court* courtesy of Peter Dawson?

The not surprising delay prompted Bis Weaver to write to Dawson more for the record than in expectation of any action. In her letter, she used the word ‘expect’ without conviction as any expectation of principled action coming from NATFHE meant little, even if NATFHE’s obligation to members was written in tablets of stone. Nonetheless, she told Dawson that she expected her “complaint to be subject to impartial procedures and...be justly dealt in accordance with [her] trade union rights, rights to natural justice, and to any other rights to which [she was] entitled” – a pious hope bearing in mind that NATFHE head office officials were a law unto themselves and impartiality, right and justice were unknown terms in NATFHE’s vocabulary.

Dawson was reminded that she had “still not received the material...nor any indication of when [she] can expect to receive this material” and she expected “to be supplied with the material...asked for in order...to pursue [her] complaint without being placed at a disadvantage by [her] own union.” She added that she has “a right to expect assistance in a complaint against a member of another trade union, the ASTMS - a union to which full-time officials of NATFHE [were] members, including those [officials] who may be responsible for investigating [her] complaint.” As she stated, “Head Office’s prevarication in providing this material might appear to the reasonable person as NATFHE-employed ASTMS members preventing a...member of NATFHE from obtaining information...to pursue a complaint against another NATFHE-employed ASTMS member.” This ‘expectation’ of the likelihood of bias was placed firmly at the apex of her concerns.

She also asked when head office or the NEC intended “to use its authority to restore [her] full trade union rights” removed eleven months before. In conclusion, she hoped that “no other action...taken against NATFHE is preventing NATFHE [from] honouring its obligation to a Black member of the Association.”<sup>71</sup>

Back to North of Watford with a letter to NATFHE’s regional secretary acquainting him with the interests behind the regional ‘racist’ motion and at whom the motion was directed, of which he was no doubt already familiar. The sequence of recent events in the Bournville branch committee was reproduced, namely, the motion and how it had been linked to Bis Weaver’s complaints. Furthermore, “the motion was not put to the Branch for approval but was submitted direct to the regional executive.” Without telling him that his possible involvement was known to her, she revealed only that “a member of the REC...had contacted the Bournville branch executive...suggesting that the Bournville branch submit a motion to the regional council on the issue of racism.” We thought it “somewhat unusual, to say the least, for an REC member to...request [a] Branch to submit a motion on racism and, with all the issues which could inspire a positive motion in furthering the interests of Black people, a motion is proposed and submitted...which might be interpreted as being against the interests of victims of possible racism.” What also appeared unusual and surprising was for the Bournville branch “to be asked to submit such a motion...given that [it]...is currently at the centre of a number of complaints submitted by a Black woman member” - a LEA enquiry; a Rule 8; and an Industrial Tribunal hearing.

We thought “The reasonable person might wonder if there is:

- (i) a link between the Bournville Branch and the REC which might have introduced an element of partisanship...

- (ii) a specific person in mind to whom the motion might apply.”

We linked the motion to the *Frew enquiry*, described by “the WMARC secretary...as an inquisition,...carried out on the authority of the REC...that produced anonymous attacks/allegations against the Black secretary and two unidentified members, who...are not difficult to identify.” The ‘reasonable person’ was again invoked as he/she “might come to the conclusion that the REC was intent on putting Black people at a decided disadvantage.” Following the line adopted earlier with other REC members, who had acted directly against Bis Weaver’s interests, he was asked to confirm if a REC member was behind the motion and, if so, did this member act “on his/her own initiative [or] on the authority of the REC.” He was also asked if it was “suggested to all branches in the Region [to] submit motions on racism...[and], if not, on what criteria was the Bournville Branch chosen.”<sup>72</sup> The recent letter to the West Midlands TUC was enclosed to demonstrate to the regional secretary that the regional council’s motion was moribund having no restrictive effect on her whatsoever. Needless to say the letter was never answered. The point, however, was not to elicit a response from the regional secretary. Its purpose was to inform others and a copy of this letter was sent to every NATFHE branch in the West Midlands region.<sup>73</sup> This provided the background for the next letter to be sent out in a few days’ time.

The draft on the legal implications of the regional council’s new policy restricting complainants of racism from campaigning was converted into a letter and sent to the regional secretary.<sup>74</sup> Copies were sent to all branch secretaries in the West Midlands region; to the WMARC secretary; to the Black Workers’ Group; to the TUC general secretary, Norman Willis; and to the secretary of the WMTUC Race Relations Advisory Group, Muff Sourani.<sup>75</sup> An accompanying letter to Muff Sourani asked “the TUC Race Relations Group [to] take this up as an issue of principle for the labour movement [because] It is difficult for us to take it up as certain rights which would enable us to raise it in the appropriate quarters have been removed from us.”<sup>76</sup>

The letter to Norman Willis suspected that “NATFHE at Branch and Regional level are determined to ensure that those Black members in NATFHE are placed at a disadvantage and those who might contemplate joining a trade union are dissuaded from doing so.”<sup>77</sup> This particular letter would inevitably end up at NATFHE head office and might ruffle a few feathers among officialdom. Whoever was really behind this debacle was a loose cannon firing shells as much at NATFHE as at Bis Weaver.

The accompanying letter to the WMARC Secretary dealt with the REC's failure to consult "the WMARC, or the Black Lecturer's Group...about the relevance or advisability or possible implications for Black people of such a motion." It was also clear that WMARC "is disregarded...[in] matters of general principle and policy on matters of race, in spite of...some members of the REC claiming that this was, or ought to be, the principal function of the WMARC." A request was made to place this issue on the agenda for the next meeting of the WMARC on the 8<sup>th</sup> April.<sup>78</sup>

In the run-up to the WMARC meeting, the regional secretary contacted Krishna Shukla to tell him that observers were not to be allowed to speak or vote – apparently the suggestion by a colleague from the Birmingham liaison committee had suddenly become regional policy and was distinctly different from another standing committee – the West Midlands women's panel. Krishna was also informed a member called Siddique had been elected to the WMARC and would be attending the meeting. Krishna reminded Evans that arrangements for a 'new' committee, as in previous years, did not come into effect until June but that did not deter the regional secretary, who considered the 'start-up date' for the new WMARC as flexible.<sup>79</sup> This 'new' member, who had never attended a WMARC meeting, had not been elected nor even co-opted, which would usually take place at the first meeting of the WMARC in June. Only three Black members had been appointed to Regional Council Standing Committees; (i) Krishna Shukla, as ARNP delegate, to WMARC; (ii) Maureen Bennett, who attended two WMARC meetings, was one of four women appointed to the Women's Panel, \* apparently overcoming the stigma of 'all Black women being reactionary'; and (iii) Alton Burnett to the WMARC.<sup>80</sup> The regional secretary was a 'devout stickler' for rule and procedure when Bis Weaver sought information on the means available for pursuing her rights as a member but when it came to 'racist' motions favouring union officers or interfering in a committee that was pursuing objectives for which it was established, he seemed not so committed. Anything that served the interests of the REC/BLC was 'flexible' while anything that did not serve those interests was *ultra vires*.

In the meantime there were a couple of meetings at Bournville College – one involving the governors, the other a NATFHE branch meeting. The governors met on the day of our renewed bombardment of NATFHE branches. Councillor Hafeez, chair of Continuing

\* Three of the four came from Wolverhampton Polytechnic, which included Jenny Williams, who had attended the WMARC albeit rarely; and Maureen Bennett. Penny Welch, National Council member and women's panel member who were also from Wolverhampton Polytechnic

Education sub-committee, apparently claiming to be unaware of events in the college, sent her apologies for not attending. She may have lacked interest but some interest was shown in the Weaver grievance by Downey who asked “whether the Chief Education Officer’s report was yet available” – an interest that could not really be equated with sympathy for a Black woman victim of harassment but for the interest of his associates in the *kernel*s. From the other side of the divide and with a completely different objective, Olwen Cupid made it known that “people in the Black communities are [concerned]...She had been approached by several [City] Councillors about it [and] they want action and they want it immediately.” \* The Principal “understood it to be in the course of completion” and an LEA officer, in attendance, “expected that the report would be completed before Easter.” The LEA was stalling and this did not satisfy the governors, who wanted their concern that the matter was still outstanding “brought to the attention of officers in the [LEA]”. One thing appeared certain and that was the LEA had no intention of releasing the report before the Industrial Tribunal hearing, which the LEA thought was taking place at the time of this meeting. The LEA would need to put off the release of its report until after the new date for the hearing and think up another excuse for failing to release it. No mention was made to the governors of Gates’ apology sent into the LEA almost three weeks before.<sup>81</sup>

The next day, ‘All Fools’ Day’, a Branch meeting was held, conveniently arranged to coincide with the Industrial Tribunal hearing. However, the postponement of the hearing enabled us to attend. Item 7 on the agenda was ‘Ratification of a Regional Council Procedural motion on Racism.’ The ‘airing’ of this motion and the minuting of our comments at the previous meeting more than anything else brought us to the meeting – branch meetings had a predictable ‘air’ and sitting there listening to what the branch committee could throw at Bis Weaver had reached the point of tedium.

It was no surprise to find our comments at the previous meeting recorded in a distorted manner, not making much sense and certainly not reflecting our contributions. In challenging the accuracy of the minutes, we asked for the written statements, read out by us at the previous meeting, to be included in the minutes and we produced the statements to confirm that the minutes were inaccurate. This was refused by the chair, Cave, who suggested minuting that we disagreed with the minutes and it could be discussed at another time. After our objections to what appeared to be a deferment *ad infinitum*, Cave agreed to the branch voting on whether to change the minutes with a concession that branch officers would not

\* Downey’s request was entered in the minutes but not Olwen Cupid’s

vote on the issue; no doubt confident that in a meeting of twenty seven other eligible voters and the virtual isolation of both Bis Weaver and I in the Branch, the officers' votes were unnecessary. Cave's decision should have been the kiss of death for our request and an accurate version of the minutes a dead issue - but could the unexpected happen? When the vote was called, only two members voted in favour of changing the minutes - Bis Weaver and I, voting for the first time in twelve months. Surprisingly, only one member voted against, which, understandably, was the minutes secretary, with whom we had some sympathy because the volatility of meetings and the detailed and lengthy contributions put to them made it difficult to record them accurately – a point she made after the vote. The rest of the membership (twenty four) abstained. The change to the minutes was approved. For the first time the majority at a branch meeting did not want to get involved. After playing its part over the previous twelve months in the isolation of Bis Weaver, branch members were now washing their hands off the issue and leaving the parties to confront each other.

It was, in some ways, a disturbing 'victory' since it represented non-involvement by a large number of people. This was a startling lesson in the politics of the oppressed when large numbers of people withdraw and in doing so opened the floodgates for unrepresentative but powerful minorities to impose their will on disadvantaged minorities. Freire's maxim sprang to mind; although on this occasion neutrality favoured Bis Weaver - the powerless, but that was only because the powerful had relied on the majority to do its bidding; something it would be unlikely to do again. In the minutes of this meeting, the requested amendments were made but the voting was not recorded.

Branch members also received from Hartland the news that the LEA had withdrawn its objection to Beider being employed in city colleges \*, which gave the impression Beider's allegations had been accepted as credible. With no written account of the Beider enquiry at that time Bis Weaver had nothing to wave in the face of the *kernels* and branch members. \*\* The retreat of the LEA in the face of union pressure on an issue – the *Beider affair*,

\* Hartland's exact words were: "The situation has been resolved. The City have made a retraction and said he (Beider) is not unfit to work. A letter has been circulated to all colleges so he can be employed in any college, including Bournville."<sup>82</sup> After the branch meeting, to counter the propaganda points the kernels were making out of the *Beider affair*, Bis Weaver approached the Principal to ask for a statement to be released stating that Beider's allegations were unfounded.<sup>83</sup> This might at least counteract the free hand Cave and Hartland had in using these false allegations against her. It would, at least, give Bis Weaver something in writing to wave in front of branch members. However, nothing was ever released.

\*\* The verbatim notes of the Beider enquiry came into our possession at a later date and, as shown above, the evidence of the three participants (Cave, Hartland and Beider) was rife with contradictions. See Chapter 9 sect (c)

considerably less significant in comparison to the implications to NATFHE arising from the harassment of a Black woman by union officers, was further confirmation of the LEA buckling under to the union and the politicians. The time taken to deal with the ‘previous minutes’ prevented the meeting from covering the agenda and the regional council’s motion on racism was “postponed until the next meeting.”<sup>84</sup>

The change in the branch’s voting habits may have had something to do with the information that began to circulate through the college grapevine, which was still working on full throttle; on this occasion pumping out through its varicose veins favourable news for Bis Weaver. The latest snippet finding its way around the college was of Gates’ resignation from Bournville College to transfer to a college in Wakefield. Despite the favourable quality of the news, there was a downside because it convinced us beyond doubt that a deal had been struck and the LEA’s grievance report would never see the light of day.

---

<sup>1</sup> WMARC calling Notice 6 Feb 1987

<sup>2</sup> GW to KS 7 Feb 1987 File U 45

<sup>3</sup> ARNP Mtg 12 Feb 1987; Info provided by KS 13 Feb 1987 File Y 10

<sup>4</sup> Bob Cant, NJ Dec 1986

<sup>5</sup> NJ Dec 1986

<sup>6</sup> GW to KS 15 Feb 1987 File U 41 - 42

<sup>7</sup> Dr Thomas, Chair of the MSC, BEM 14 Feb 1987

<sup>8</sup> BEM 14 Feb 1987

<sup>9</sup> GW to PMc 15 Feb 1987 File U 43

<sup>10</sup> Notes & Mins, WMARC Mtg 25 Feb 1987 File U 46 - 57; Notes/Mins, WMARC Mtg 17 Sep 1986; File Z 11 & File U 17 - 18

<sup>11</sup> NATFHE to BW 13 Feb 1987 File F 39; NATFHE to GW 13 Feb 1987 File M 44

<sup>12</sup> NATFHE to B/V BCtte 13 & 18 Feb 1987 File F 40 - 41

<sup>13</sup> BW to PD 23 Feb 1987 Rec’d Del V 407383 File F 43 - 46

<sup>14</sup> BW to TUC (NmW) 23 Feb 1987 Rec’d Del V 407382 File F 47 - 48; BW to ASTMS 23 Feb 1987 File F 49; see also BW/GW to TUC (NmW) 19 Mar 1988 File K 8 - 9

<sup>15</sup> DTr to BW 25 Feb 1987 File F 50

<sup>16</sup> PD to BW 5 Mar 1987 File G 3

<sup>17</sup> TUC to BW 5 Mar 1987 File G 2

<sup>18</sup> Agenda & Mins, WMWP 9 Feb 1987 File X 17 - 20

<sup>19</sup> WMARC List of Committee members, 9 Jun 1986 File W 21

<sup>20</sup> DE to KS 3 Feb 1987 File U 44

<sup>21</sup> Mins, WMARC Mtg 25 Feb 1987 File U 46 - 47

<sup>22</sup> GW to KS 26 Feb 1987 File U 58 - 59

<sup>23</sup> Conv, contact & GW 22 Jan 1987; T/p conv KS & BW 24 Jan 1987 File Y 9

<sup>24</sup> BW to GH 12 Feb 1987 File N 40

<sup>25</sup> AK to JC 12 Feb 1987 File N 41

<sup>26</sup> LEA to AK 27 Feb 1987 File F 52

<sup>27</sup> AR to BW 20 Feb 1987 File F 42

<sup>28</sup> EMLC to BLP 26 Feb 1987 File F 51

<sup>29</sup> BW to BLP Ward Secs 8 Mar 1987 File N 44 - 45

<sup>30</sup> BW to GH 7 Mar 1987 Rec’d Del V 407384 File N 42 - 43

<sup>31</sup> DG to GH 11 Mar 1987 NATFHE IT Bundle 188

<sup>32</sup> TES 22 Sep 2006

<sup>33</sup> Doncaster Free Press, 22 Mar & 26 Apr 2007

- 
- <sup>34</sup> Bracebridge Engineering Ltd v Darby [1990] IRLR 3 EAT; (1) Insitu Cleaning Co Ltd and (2) Brown v Heads [1995] IRLR 4 EAT
- <sup>35</sup> Thomas and another v Robinson [2003] IRLR 7.
- <sup>36</sup> IG (HMI) to BW 31 Oct 1988 File Y 13
- <sup>37</sup> T/p conv AK to GW 27 Jan 1987 File Y 9
- <sup>38</sup> PMc to NAAR, 20 Feb 2007, copy to R Kingston, File W 50 - 51
- <sup>39</sup> Conv PMy & BW 14 Jan 1987 File Z 23
- <sup>40</sup> Conv NB & BW/GW 27 Jan 1987 File Y 10
- <sup>41</sup> Harris, J C [1955] The Complete Tales of Uncle Remus; Houghton, Mifflin; Boston, Mass
- <sup>42</sup> Twain M [1979] A Connecticut Yankee at King Arthur's Court, Penguin, Harmondsworth, p264
- <sup>43</sup> Conv KS & GW 11 Mar 1987 File Z 29
- <sup>44</sup> Notes of B/V BCttee Mtg 26 Mar 1987 File R 58 - 59; GW/BW to BH 26 Mar 1987 File G 23; see also GW to DE 18 Jun 1987 File H 12 - 16
- <sup>45</sup> BW & IB Conv 23 Mar 1987 File Y 10
- <sup>46</sup> NATFHE REC Agenda for Regional Council, 18 Mar 1987, pt 16.4.4 File V 46
- <sup>47</sup> BW & IB Conv 23 Mar 1987 File Y 10
- <sup>48</sup> Flynt L [2004] Sex, Lies and Politics, Autumn Press, London, p 49
- <sup>49</sup> Hamilton L (ed) [1944] Selections from the works of Gerrard Winstanley, Cresset Press, London, in Hill C [1979] From the English Revolution 1640, Lawrence & Wishart, London
- <sup>50</sup> Evans D, WMARC constitution, 23 Feb 1987, File U 60 - 61
- <sup>51</sup> Mins, WMWP 27 Jan 1986 File X 5 - 6
- <sup>52</sup> KS Notes & REC Agenda 18 Mar 1987 File Z 30 & V 44 - 46
- <sup>53</sup> Mins, WMWP 30 Jun 1986 File X 11 - 12
- <sup>54</sup> Chomsky N, Guardian Weekly May 1991
- <sup>55</sup> Notes, Reg Counc Mtg 21 Mar 1987 File G 61 - 62
- <sup>56</sup> BW, GW, PMc, DE & DG - Notes Post-RegC1 Mtg 21 Mar 1987 File G 63
- <sup>57</sup> Mackney P, The Lecturer, (NATFHE's in-house journal, February 2000) The case was Sharokni v NATFHE – IT cases 11880/96; 44988/96; 2203069/97 and 2205178/97
- <sup>58</sup> Notes & Mins B/V Branch Mtg 29 Apr 1986 File Q 9 - 13
- <sup>59</sup> Notes, Br Cttee Mtg 26 Mar 1987 File R 58 - 59; GW/BW to BH 26 Mar 1987 File G 23
- <sup>60</sup> Ricordi, Francesco Guicciardini, 1528 – 30
- <sup>61</sup> Draft Letter produced by BW, 26 Mar 1987 File G 21 - 22
- <sup>62</sup> SERTUC to BW 3 & 19 Mar 1987 File G 1 & 7
- <sup>63</sup> NACRO to BW 14 Jan 1987 File V 47 - 48
- <sup>64</sup> KS, BW & GW to WMARC Members 27 Mar 1987 File U 63
- <sup>65</sup> JA to KS 6 Apr 1987 File U 64
- <sup>66</sup> JW to KS 19 May 1987 File U 67 - 68
- <sup>67</sup> GW to KS/JW 3 Jun 1987 File U 69 - 70
- <sup>68</sup> BW/GW to TUC WM 29 Mar 1987 File G 24
- <sup>69</sup> TUC WM to BW/GW 1 Apr 1987 File G 32
- <sup>70</sup> BW/GW to TUC WM 5 Apr 1987 File G 38
- <sup>71</sup> BW to PD 30 Mar 1987 Rec'd Del J 632267 File G 25 - 26
- <sup>72</sup> GW/BW to DE 31 Mar 1987 File G 27 - 29
- <sup>73</sup> GW/BW to NATFHE Brns 31 Mar 1987 File G 30
- <sup>74</sup> GW to DE 4 Apr 1987 File G 58 - 59
- <sup>75</sup> BW/GW to WMARC, TUC, MS, BWG, 5 Apr 1987 File G 36 - 38
- <sup>76</sup> BW/GW to MS 5 Apr 1987 File G 37
- <sup>77</sup> BW/GW to NmW 5 Apr 1987 File G 36
- <sup>78</sup> GW to KS 5 Apr 1987 File G 34
- <sup>79</sup> DE to KS reported in Conv KS & GW 6 Apr 1987 File Y 11
- <sup>80</sup> NATFHE REC Agenda for Regional Council, 18 Mar 1987, pts 16.1.4 & 16.1.7 File V 45
- <sup>81</sup> B/V Govs Mtg 31 Mar 1987 File W 36 - 37; Conv OC & BW 31 Mar 1987 File Y 11
- <sup>82</sup> BSecs Report 1 Apr 1987 File X 66
- <sup>83</sup> BW & PMT Mtg 1 Apr 1987 File Y 11
- <sup>84</sup> Agenda, Notes, Mins of Br Mtg & BrSec's rept 1 Apr 1987 File R 60 – 64 & File X 66; GW to BSec/BCttee 5 Apr 1987 File M 48; GW to BSec/BCttee 6 & 13 Apr 1986 File G 39 and File M 51