

# *CAFAS Update No. 54*

*10 April 2007*

*Council for Academic Freedom & Academic Standards*

*<http://www.cafas.org.uk>*

*AGM & Ordinary Meeting:*

*Saturday 21 April 2007  
1.30pm (AGM); 2.00pm (OM)  
Room 252  
Birkbeck College  
Malet Street  
London WC1*

*SSS*

*Underground: Goodge Street, Euston Square, Euston, Russell Square, Holborn*

## **The UK Panel for Research Integrity: The pointlessness of working within the system**

**Aubrey Blumsohn**

To the naïve, it might make sense that a national "Research Integrity Panel" should be established. After all, university science is conducted in the public interest. Such a panel might ensure that attempts to distort the scientific record are properly

investigated, exposed and corrected. These attempts might involve individual misconduct, academic bullying leading to distorted science, university breaches of academic freedom or industrial interference. Such a body might also ensure that institutions adhere to their own rules in terms of research integrity.

Most other developed countries have bodies which (at least to some extent) do exactly that. The Office for Research Integrity in the USA, despite many failings, does an important job, and has at least a few very sharp teeth. Plans for a "UK Panel for Health and Biomedical Research Integrity" have been in gestation for a decade or more.

Such a panel opened its eyes and blinked in April 2006. The fathers of that panel, Professor Sir Ian Kennedy and Professor Michael Farthing

understood very well why such a panel was needed. Both are individuals of great integrity and wisdom. They understand the nature of the problem, the implausibility of internal university investigation, the attempts at obfuscation, and the very great difficulties experienced by those who have attempt to state the truth in the face of considerable power. They have both written about these problems extensively.

In 1998 Professor Sir Ian Kennedy wrote (1):

*"There has increasingly been the stated perception that the public interest means not staying quiet in the face of wrongdoing... The witness fears that if s/he risks speaking out s/he will lose his/her job, promotion, or prospects of ever working again in the field. And it does not seem to matter to whom the witness chooses to speak--whether it is to the researcher whose work is in question, or to the line manager, or to the head of the institution. Abundant anecdotal evidence suggests that this fear is not misplaced". .... "it is suggested that they report their concerns to the "responsible authority." But herein lies a major problem. Currently, there is no institution which can fill the role of the "responsible authority"..... "Clearly, any whistleblowers protocol will be stillborn unless an appropriate "responsible (investigative) authority" is created at the same time. In the USA, this role at the Federal level is fulfilled by the Office of Research Integrity. The Danish Committee on Scientific Dishonesty was created precisely to serve as the agency to which complaints of research misconduct could be referred. It is available to all and is recognised as such by the general public and those involved in research, whether scientists or editors. It investigates allegations of misconduct at arms' length from the editor, the researcher, and the organisation in which the researcher works. A similar body is urgently needed in the UK. Its creation would give both the whistleblower and the editor an independent arbiter to which they could turn. As a public body, its primary remit would be to act in the public interest."*

That was an excellent summary of the problem and the required solution.

As the new body continued gestating, these principles were forgotten. After a further five

years of gestation, it was finally announced (2) in March 2005 that the birth would take place in October 2005 - but not quite. October came and went. In April 2006 UK-PRI emerged from the womb – and blinked.

The headlines screamed (3) "Panel to expose fraudulent medical research", "Watchdog eyes scientific fraud", "New panel calls on researchers to blow whistle and stamp out complacency over cheating"

But what was born was not quite what was expected. UK-PRI is hosted by Universities UK, the body that promotes the interests of UK Universities. This is not a UK version of the American ORI – not by a long shot. The body immediately faced criticism from some. Peter Wilmshurst, a consultant cardiologist who has exposed a number of research fraud cases, said "Your stakeholders have a stake in keeping research fraud under cover" (2) and "My concern is that this is set up under the auspices of UUK. If you look at the record of the universities, they have consistently concealed research fraud and protected the crooks." (3) The body has reportedly received some funding from the pharmaceutical industry - a critical mistake. I am disappointed that we have moved so far from Sir Ian's vision and his clear understanding of where the problems lie.

In March 2005 the University of Sheffield declined to allow UK-PRI to get involved with the problem in Sheffield, stating that UK-PRI was not an investigatory body, but that the MHRA (the UK drug regulator) would investigate. This was despite the fact that the MHRA had already stated they have no remit to investigate scientific misconduct in research involving licensed drugs (but that's a story for another day). This is the way problems and those raising them get bounced from implausible pillar to implausible post. It is not clear whether UK-PRI will be yet another such post.

Perhaps the greatest insight is to be gained from the way in UK-PRI now describes itself, and the discordance between that and the earlier clear vision.

Dear Dr Blumsohn

**Re: UK Panel for Research Integrity for Health and Biomedical Sciences.**

I am responding to your letter of 1<sup>st</sup> June to Professor Farthing concerning the role of the UK Panel for Research Integrity for Health and Biomedical Sciences.

The Panel is a new initiative with a UK-wide remit to; develop a Code of Good Conduct in handling cases and allegations, support a register of advisers with experience of research conduct issues, develop a programme of training to embed the Code of Good Conduct and put in place a dissemination programme to support all aspects of the programme and promote excellence in research conduct.

The approach taken by the Panel is based on support and guidance. The aim is to enable all involved in health and biomedical sciences research - individuals and organisations - to demonstrate commitment to integrity in research and to develop a robust national procedure for investigation of conduct issues.

The Panel does not have investigative or regulatory roles and has no statutory responsibility, those are vested in other organisations. Panel input to research conduct issues will be advisory but will be well grounded and based on experienced individual and expert input.

Thank you for your support for the work of the Panel; all those involved are committed to its success. I note your concerns as to potential pitfalls for the implementation for the Panel's work. The initiative does have wide support, particularly from the Higher Education Community, the basis for Universities UK leading Panel development.

The Panel's work is focussed on the initial investigation stages of research conduct issues rather than those in more advanced stages. In addition, the Panel's work is still at an early stage of development. The UK Research Integrity Office is collating case information as background towards the development of the Code of Good Conduct.

Overall the Panel's aim is to (further) embed, within the research community, both a UK standard procedure for the fair and overt investigation of allegations with respect to all aspects of research conduct and systems to promote good practice.

I hope that you will have confidence to reference the Panel's work in promoting research integrity in future presentations.

Yours sincerely



Andy Staintorpe  
Director - UK Panel of Research Integrity in Health and Biomedical Sciences

I feel that what we now have is potentially worse than nothing at all. UK-PRI may assist to provide an impression that "all is well" and that those wishing to raise concerns really have somewhere to turn. That will cause others to offer even less support than they already do, and will surely cause further harm. I wondered whether they spoke to even a single person who had tried to raise concerns during their long gestation? There are already many perfectly good "procedures" and "Codes of Good Conduct" and other such cosy documents. These documents may not be perfect, but that is not where the problem lies. What we need is courage and some guts.

Pat Brady of CAFAS and I met members of UK-PRI on the 15th of December to discuss the situation in Sheffield in relation to Procter and Gamble Pharmaceuticals, and the general remit of

UK-PRI. They promised to help if they could. It is possible that they might in fact be of assistance and I will report back if that proves to be the case. In the meantime I must report with some sadness that those raising concerns should not yet be encouraged that it is any easier to do so since April 2006.

1. Cope Report 1998
2. BMJ 19 March 2005 330: 616.
3. Guardian April 12th 2006, THES April 14th 2006

---

## County Court Hearing

**Moroney v Anglo European  
College of Chiropractic  
Winchester County Court  
Claim Number BH 303 847  
Date 23<sup>rd</sup> to 27<sup>th</sup> April 2007**

CAFAS member Phillip D Moroney would like CAFAS members, who can, attend as observers of his court case at Winchester County Court. Your presence in such court hearings is a most valuable means of support. It is a case of student v college.

**Please contact Winchester County Court (01962 814100/85381) or Majzoub B Ali (01702 587995; E-mail: [MajzoubBAli@gmail.com](mailto:MajzoubBAli@gmail.com)) to confirm the time and dates.**

---

## LETTERS

Dear All

I have set up an online petition to get the Commission for Racial Equality to investigate the General Medical Council.

The evidence suggests that they are tougher on foreign doctors. On 14 February 2003 BBC news wrote an article called "GMC tougher on foreign doctors" (1). In that report a spokeswoman said: "The council will be considering the preliminary report at their meeting

on 26 February and assessing what action, if any, needs to be taken as a result. The GMC is committed to continuing work in ensuring the future procedures are fair and transparent."

I regret to say however that if you look at the website of the British Association of Physicians of Indian Origin ([www.bapio.co.uk](http://www.bapio.co.uk)) you will see a recent story entitled BAPIO raises the issue of disproportionate disciplinary actions against ethnic minority doctors with the GMC. President Professor Graeme Catto promised action. (2) I am saddened to say that this article states "Dr Prabhu who has been studying this issue for several years pointed out that long term suspensions amongst the ethnic minority doctors were 3 times higher, Man slaughter charges six times higher and report to the GMC's Professional conduct committee was four times higher."

It seems that three years little, if anything has changed especially if you look at the recent article from Dr Peter Wilmshurst who has been campaigning for reform for the last 10 years. (3)

I was wondering therefore if members of CAFAS could go to [www.general-medical-council.com](http://www.general-medical-council.com) which is my online petition to get the CRE to investigate the GMC.

The GMC has a statutory role to regulate undergraduate medical education. However the government's chief medical officer has recommended they be stripped of this role. I warmly welcome this proposal- if you go to my website [www.examfraud.co.uk](http://www.examfraud.co.uk) you will see why.

I am pleased to tell readers that I have had some positive feedback from student unions about the benefits of my proposals on my site i.e. the unconditional return of exam papers to candidates. I see no reason why this cannot be a universal practice because students at Kings College London can get their papers back for a fee.

Yours sincerely

**Sushant Varma**

Email [sushant@sushant.plus.com](mailto:sushant@sushant.plus.com)

- (1) GMC 'tougher on foreign doctors' BBC news Friday, 14 February, 2003  
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/health/2757243.stm>  
Date checked 22 November 2006.
- (2) BAPIO raises the issue of disproportionate disciplinary actions ethnic minority doctors with the GMC. President Professor Graeme Catto promised action [www.bapio.co.uk](http://www.bapio.co.uk) Date checked 22 November 2006.

- (3) The General Medical Council – a personal view. Cardiology news October/November 2006  
[http://www.pinpointmedical.com/cardiology/article\\_archive/2006/ON06\\_gmc.pdf](http://www.pinpointmedical.com/cardiology/article_archive/2006/ON06_gmc.pdf) Date checked 22 November 2006.

---

Dear CAFAS,

I am sending you this as I thought it might be appropriate for the CAFAS update/newsletter. It has to do with the power of academics, how they use knowledge, and more importantly, the matter of academic freedom and standards. Are there specific rules in place for getting a book review published, for example, or does it depend on who you know? Should academics really have the freedom to tie up valuable space (in academic journals and at conferences), which others without that essential credential and the right network could also be contributing to (or at least, contributing to AND having their contribution seen as having worth, if they are not excluded right from the start)?

**Sue McPherson**

---

## Academic Freedom in the USA

*(The following report is from the defending-academic-freedom e-list. Subsequent postings on the issue are now in the archive. Readers are reminded that Cafas does not have a position on the Israel/Palestine conflict and has not discussed it. The Council's concern is academic freedom and it welcomes opinion and discussion on cases irrespective of the position individuals may have. Members have asked that the case of Norman Finkelstein be discussed at the meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> April. You can obtain further information on the internet e.g. [http://chronicle.com/temp/email2.php?id=tqxfjnxDdNnvzcffqm3kYcxKjWm3pgDH\\_\(Eds.\)](http://chronicle.com/temp/email2.php?id=tqxfjnxDdNnvzcffqm3kYcxKjWm3pgDH_(Eds.)))*

Date: Tue, 3 Apr 2007 16:33:48 -0700 (PDT)  
From: tony greenstein  
Subject: Norman Finkelstein, DePaul Scholar and Son of  
Holocaust Survivors, Struggles for Tenure

As people may be aware, there has been a concerted campaign by Alan Dershowitz against Norman Finkelstein being granted tenure. Hopefully enough counter pressure can be put on this attack on academic freedom in the USA.  
**Tony Greenstein**

---

## **Norman Finkelstein, DePaul Scholar and Son of Holocaust Survivors, Struggles for Tenure**

Sunday, April 1st, 2007

Chuck Suchar, DePaul University's Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, opposes tenure for Norman Finkelstein in a three-page memorandum dated March 22, 2007. Dr Finkelstein received his Ph.D. from Princeton University. The Political Science department voted 9 to 3 in favour of granting tenure. Three filed a minority report and the dean sided with that. The five-member College Personnel Committee was unanimous in favour of granting tenure. The dean's letter basically attacks the tone of Finkelstein's scholarship for not being kind to his critics; it is cited as too personal and not in the tradition of DePaul collegiality. It sounds to me like persecution of a man who dares oppose supporters of Israel and dares to question aspects and motives of those who blindly accept every traditional interpretation of the holocaust.

The dean in recommending against granting tenure to this great scholar and courageous defender of free inquiry in areas concerning Jewish history and politics, describes his research as "character assassination," containing "personal injury and attack," as "demeaning those with whom he disagrees."

Dean Suchar is also furious that he heard from the "General Consul's (sic?) office" at DePaul that Professor Finkelstein "was considering filing a law

suit" against DePaul and those who authored the minority report recommendation of his department that he not be granted tenure.

Does one really believe a competent and impartial administrator would attempt to deprive a national scholar of his livelihood, in whole or in part, because he may use the legal and juridical channels afforded American citizens in a democracy? Does the dean expect Dr Finkelstein not to seek academic freedom and justice against arbitrary and ideologically motivated judgments on the "tonality" of his scholarship?

It is cited that Professor Finkelstein, whose parents survived German concentration camps during World War II, is violating the spirit of the Vincentians: the founding order and charisma of DePaul. There is repeated citation that he violates "personalism," a tenet of the Vincentians that emphasises the value of individual dignity. I believe a scholar who defends the right of the Palestinians to live in an environment other than apartheid, who breaks through the taboo thinking of the holocaust, who courageously attacks elite scholars and groups who attempt to suppress dissent on Israeli issues or history, personifies "personalism." "The notion of human dignity and worth.

I also wonder if that religious order and Vincentian spirit would exclude the right of a professor to seek legal remedies for an ideological witch-hunt or protect a leading scholar from such an egregious and palpable denial of academic freedom.

What next? I am not privy to the internal dynamics at DePaul but I think I am correct. The dean's memorandum and the other documents will be sent to the "University Board on Tenure and Promotion." They can choose not to adhere to the dean's denial of tenure recommendation and accept the recommendations of various faculty units cited above. The final decision, of course, rests with the president and governing board.

---

*(Eds: Should you wish to write to DePaul University the addresses of the President and the Provost of DePaul University are...):*

The Rev. Dennis H. Holtschneider, C.M., Ed.D.  
President  
DePaul University  
55 East Jackson Boulevard, 22nd Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60604 U.S.  
Phone: +1.312.362.8000  
Fax: +1.312.362.6822  
E-mail: [president@depaul.edu](mailto:president@depaul.edu)

Dr. Helmut Epp, Ph.D.  
Provost  
DePaul University  
55 East Jackson Boulevard, 22nd Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60604 U.S.  
Phone: +1.312.362.8760  
Fax: +1.312.362.6822  
E-mail: [hepp@depaul.edu](mailto:hepp@depaul.edu)

---

*The article below was recently posted on the 'For-Academic-Freedom' and the 'Defending-Academic-Freedom' e-lists.*

### **Redefining Academic Freedom**

Scott Jaschik  
InsideHigherEd - Apr 2, 07  
<http://insidehighered.com/news/2007/04/02/adjuncts>

**The modern concept of academic freedom is built around the idea – from 19th century German universities – of *Lehrfreiheit* – or freedom to teach. Broadly defined, it was intended to protect the right of professors, in their teaching and research, to follow their ideas wherever they led them. In the United States, this idea led to the founding of the American Association of University Professors in 1915, and the organization's statement on principles of academic freedom, <<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubs/res/policydocs/1940statement.htm>> which was designed to protect professors from political firings and to assure their meaningful role in the governance of colleges.**

The American Federation of Teachers, which represents about 160,000 faculty members, academic

employees and graduate students in the United States, wants to restate the values of academic freedom – and to make them more relevant to the realities of academic life in the 21st century. There's not much if anything in the original document that the AFT objects to. But in discussions this weekend in Portland, Ore., at the AFT's annual meeting of higher education union leaders, and in a draft of a new statement on academic freedom distributed at the meeting, the AFT is acknowledging that relying on the tenure system to protect professors' academic freedom doesn't work when more and more faculty members don't have, and may never have, tenure.

"The greatest threat to academic freedom today is the subtle removal of many faculty positions from the tenure track and from engagement with institutional power through shared governance structures like faculty senates," says a background paper the AFT produced to explain the idea of drafting a new statement of principles on academic freedom. "The mechanisms of tenure (or similar protections against arbitrary treatment), peer review and shared governance are vital to the maintenance of academic freedom."

In the draft statement and in sessions for program participants, the AFT was operating on dual tracks. There was plenty of discussion of the importance of creating more tenure-track positions, and plenty of strong rhetoric attacking administrators who like the flexibility and savings institutions may achieve with a large adjunct teaching pool.

But much of the emphasis was on getting more rights for people who are not on the tenure track. The draft statement on academic freedom repeatedly refers to "all" faculty members and states explicitly areas in which non-tenure-track faculty members should have full participation in decision making. Packed rooms of union leaders were briefed on contracts for adjuncts that have won non-tenure track faculty members "continuous employment

status" (not identical to tenure, but much closer to tenure than the typical semester-to-semester employment status of a typical adjunct). And discussion of the AFT's Faculty and College Excellence Campaign <<http://face.aft.org/>> — which seeks to add more tenure-track positions and also to improve the working conditions of adjuncts — always included mention of both of those goals. (The campaign, which started in a few states in the fall, <<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2006/11/30/fulltime>> has now led to legislation being introduced in 10 states, officials said.)

Joe Berry, chair of the Chicago Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor, said that with so many professors working off the tenure track, it can be "a little scary and degrading" to admit how little protection most of them have. But it's time, he said, to make the link between academic freedom and tenure status explicit. "There is no real job security for people without job security," he said.

The draft policy on academic freedom of the AFT says that non-tenure track faculty members should have:

- Identical freedom to that of tenured faculty members with regard for what they teach or study.
- Participation in selecting instructional materials, defining course content and determining grades. (The statement calls for such decisions to typically rest with a faculty member teaching a particular course, but in cases where a committee of professors makes a decision for a course with many sections, "the principle of participation in such decisions should not be withheld from any faculty members."
- Full participation in college governance, including eligibility to serve on various committees on a range of topics.

- Full intellectual property rights for materials that they develop.

Much of the draft document is similar in substance to the AAUP and other statements on academic freedom, talking about the importance of protection academe from political intrusion, the value of allowing professors to espouse unpopular views, and the importance of freedom of thought in the classroom.

But the AFT's draft statement makes the treatment of non-tenure-track professors much more central to these questions.

The draft notes that "the protections and rigorous evaluations of the tenure system" have historically been crucial for academic freedom. "For contingent faculty (full-time as well as part-time/adjunct), either the tenure system has to be adapted or a similar set of protections has to be put in place," the report says. "These freedoms are, of course, not absolute, but are grounded in the mutual social contract among educators, administrators and society — past, present and future. This social contract must confer special authority and responsibility to faculty and academic staff as critical and independent thinkers who collectively set the standards by which knowledge and evidence are evaluated. Although contingent faculty were historically excluded from this mutual social contract, they must become an explicit party to it."

On the topic of "a similar set of protections," there was considerable interest in contract provisions that would seek to do this.

"I do not think tenure is the answer for most contingent faculty members," said Elaine Bobrove, president of the Camden County College Adjuncts Faculty Federation. "For most of us, it isn't going to happen."

Bobrove encouraged fellow adjuncts to push for more involvement in college governance, to volunteer to serve on

committees, to seek to have peer review used in evaluating part-timers, and to look for "other methods of job security" besides tenure.

When Roberta Elins, vice president of the United College Employees of the Fashion Institute of Technology of the State University of New York reviewed all the rights non-tenure-track faculty members there can earn (seniority, layoff protection, full participation in governance), one union leader in the audience said that FIT "sounded like paradise." Elins noted that FIT was particularly receptive to helping non-tenure track faculty members because of the institute's historic ties to the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. But she and others stressed the possibility of gaining real protections for professors off the tenure track.

The lecturers in the University of California system are currently enjoying the results of a 2003 contract that created the status of continuing employment. Lecturers go through what Karen Sawislak, executive director of University of California AFT, called a "tenure review for teaching" to earn the status. After five years of work as a lecturer, a department is asked to certify that there will be a continuing need for someone to teach the courses the lecturer is handling. This isn't typically hard to obtain, Sawislak said, because those tend to be courses that tenure-track faculty members don't want to teach.

Once need is certified, lecturers go through an "excellence review," in which their teaching is evaluated, a department makes a recommendation, and the candidate moves up through the hierarchy and, if successful, is granted continuous employment status. This makes the person entitled to a better salary scale with regular reviews for merit raises, a longer notice period on whether courses will be offered for the person to teach, layoff protection, "bumping rights" for teaching courses taught by those with less seniority, and due process procedures in the case of

any push for dismissal.

Because lecturers were given credit for time already worked when the contract took effect, Sawislak said that people are already coming up for these reviews, with 30 to 40 people a year going through the process "and most of them are getting it," she said.

Sawislak said that a major focus of this effort was obviously to help the individuals receiving this designation. But she said that creating this status also served a broader purpose: showing the entire university that lecturers are long-term faculty members and are thus entitled to meaningful participation in university life, not just the right to teach freshmen. "This is an effort to change the culture of the university," she said.

While the emphasis on getting more rights for non-tenure track faculty members was generally applauded at the meeting, there were sometimes tensions evident over how to balance the sometimes conflicting rights of faculty members with different status in higher education. For instance, Sawislak acknowledged in response to a question that her union members still wouldn't earn nearly as much as tenure-track faculty members at the university.

And at one session, an adjunct faculty member said that professors themselves share responsibility for the treatment of adjuncts. He said that to really deal with these issues, professors needed to confront the "surplus issue," and rethink graduate school admissions. Law schools and the legal profession don't let the market for lawyers get flooded, he said, but professors keep letting more people into Ph.D. programs than there are jobs, he said.

Others in the audience disputed this view, saying that if states appropriated funded universities, there would be plenty of jobs — and that the problem is lack of sufficient funds, not too many Ph.D.s.

But this adjunct held his ground, with several in the audience nodding in agreement as he said that "it's easy for administrators" to keep adjunct wages

and benefits low "when we keep flooding the market."

Still, there was an upbeat mood among many about the prospect of using contracts to improve the situation of those off the tenure track, rather than just lamenting the lack of tenure-track jobs. At the session where the FIT and California contracts were reviewed, a show of hands in the audience found only a few who had similar provisions in their contracts, but a room full of raised hands when asked if they were attending to learn how to get contracts like those.

---

## NOTICES

### AGM

**21 April 2007 1.30pm Room 252**

**Officers' Reports and Elections.**

**Ordinary Meeting to follow at 2.00pm**

#### Agenda

1. Minutes;
2. Matters arising;
3. Academic Freedom;
4. Cases;
5. AOB

**There will be an officers' meeting in Room 252 at 1.00 pm**

**Informal lunch and chat from 12.00 in the Junior Common Room, 4<sup>th</sup> floor. All welcome.**

### **Next Meeting 2.00pm**

**14 July 2007: Room 252  
Birkbeck College, Malet Street,  
London**

## CAFAS AGM: ELECTIONS

**Please send nominations for positions on the Committee to the Secretary, Dr John Hewitt. Members are urged either to nominate someone or to put themselves forward for a position.**

---

## Committee

### Chair:

#### **John Fernandes**

76 Bois Hall Rd, Addlestone Surrey KT15 2JN  
john.fernandes66@yahoo.co.uk

### Secretary:

#### **Dr John Hewitt**

33 Hillyfields, Dunstable, Beds LU6 3NS  
john.hewitt22@ntlworld.com

### Membership Secretary & Treasurer:

#### **Dr Eva Link**

17 Highcliffe, Clivesdon Court, London W13 8DP  
02089982569; rekgemL1982@yahoo.co.uk

### Co-ordinator & Founding Member:

#### **Colwyn Williamson**

3 Canterbury Road, Swansea SA2 0DD  
01792 517 473; m:07970 838 276  
colwynwilliamson@hotmail.com

### Founding Member

#### **Michael Cohen**

50 Queens Road, Mumbles, Swansea SA3 4AN  
m:07917 670 555  
mike.cohen4@btinternet.com

### Cafas Update Compilers:

#### **Pat Brady**

3 Ingleby Way, Chislehurst BR7 6DD  
0208 467 2549; patrickbrady@onetel.net

#### **Geraldine Thorpe**

7 Benn Street, London E9 5SU  
0208 986 3004; geraldine.thorpe@onetel.net;

### Auditor:

#### **Majzoub Ali**

36 Viking Court, Gunfleet, Shoeburyness,  
Southend-on-Sea SS3 9PT; 01702587995;  
majzoubali@hotmail.com

### **David Regan Appeal**

#### **Coordinator: Dr Janet Collett**

University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9QN  
01273 473 717; j.i.collett@sussex.ac.uk

#### **Students' Complaints:**

##### **Dr Harold Hillman**

3 Merrow Dene, 76 Epsom Road,  
Guildford GU1 2BX  
01483568332; harold.hillman@btinternet.com

##### **Committee Member**

##### **Dr Aubrey Blumsohn**

11 Carsick View Road, Sheffield S10 3LZ  
0114 229 5595  
ablumsohn-1@yahoo.co.uk

##### **Website**

##### **Dr John Hewitt**

33 Hillyfields, Dunstable, Beds LU6 3NS  
john.hewitt22@ntlworld.com  
<http://www.ahabitoflies.co.uk>

##### **Health & Safety Spokesperson:**

##### **Dr David Heathcote**

Dept of Applied Psychology, Bournemouth  
University BH12 5BB  
01202595283; dhealthco@bournemouth.ac.uk

---

## **CAFAS - ISBN Publisher**

Cafas is now a certificated holder of the ISBN  
Publisher Prefix 0-9550782

We have been allocated 10 numbers two  
of which are now assigned to:

**Michael Cohen & Colwyn Williamson, 2004,  
*The Mission Betrayed, Cafas.***

**ISBN: 0-9550782-0-2**

**Michael Cohen & Colwyn Williamson, 2004,  
*The Tangled Web, Cafas***

**ISBN: 0-9550782-1-0**

Copies of *The Mission Betrayed* can be obtained  
from Cafas Membership Secretary for £3  
(including postage) and of *The Tangled Web*  
(including the petitioners' final submission) for £2  
(including postage).

**Further details are on [www.cafas.org.uk](http://www.cafas.org.uk)**

---

## **Defending-Academic- Freedom JISCMail List**

You can join by going to the Cafas website  
<http://www.cafas.org.uk> and opening the link.

## **CONSTITUTION**

CAFAS' aims are outlined on the membership  
form. The full constitution can be obtained from  
the Secretary or [www.cafas.org.uk](http://www.cafas.org.uk).  
CAFAS was founded in February 1994. It depends  
on subscriptions and an active membership. It  
meets in January, April, July and October.

## **NEAR**

**Cafas has linked to the Network for Education and  
Academic Rights (NEAR).**

Information is on the website

<http://www.nearinternational.org/>

'NEAR's purpose is to facilitate the rapid global transfer  
of accurate information in response to breaches of  
academic freedom and human rights in education.'

---

### **Next Cafas Update**

Please send letters, news items and articles to:

Pat Brady

[patrickbrady@onetel.net](mailto:patrickbrady@onetel.net)

Geraldine Thorpe

[geraldine.thorpe@onetel.net](mailto:geraldine.thorpe@onetel.net)

**Deadline: 25 June 2007**

---

***CAFAS Update* seeks to  
provide an open forum for  
opinion and discussion.**

**Items do not necessarily  
reflect the views of the  
Council.**

## **SUBSCRIPTION**

**Dear Members!**

**Some of you have forgotten to pay your membership fee.**

**Could you please be kind enough to check the date of your last payment on the address label? If you should find there "\*\*\*" or "\*\*\*!!!" could you please send a cheque without further delay as your contribution is absolutely crucial to the well being of CAFAS.**

**Many thanks for your contribution.**

**Your Treasurer and  
Membership Secretary  
Eva Link  
17 Highcliffe,  
Clivesdon Court,  
London W13 8DP**