

Gazette Supplement



Oration by the Vice-Chancellor

The Role of Philanthropy in Higher Education

Colleagues, members of Congregation, thank you for joining me this morning here in Convocation House, where the weight of history and the discomfort of the seating vie for pre-eminence; a fact that makes your attendance all the more commendable and noteworthy.

This annual Oration provides a timely opportunity to take our bearings afresh at the outset of the new academic year. We do not and cannot sensibly do that in a vacuum. When, like all of you, I scan the skyline of Oxford these days I see more builders' cranes than dreaming spires and I have yet to spot an ivory tower.

Yes, there are things about Oxford that are different, and proudly so, but we are first and foremost a university of the 21st century, vitally connected to the wider world, which both shapes us and which we aspire to shape for the better through the outstanding quality of what we do.

So I make no apology for focusing, as the world does at this time, on financial and economic matters. In particular, I want to look at the role of philanthropy in higher education. It is surely an important moment to do so, given the major changes in the funding landscape through which universities in this country are living, and which are most evident this autumn in the introduction of higher tuition charges for undergraduates.

The retreat of the state from providing direct funding for important aspects of higher education is a trend that has caused a great deal of anger, sorrow and soul-searching. Its wisdom is untested, certainly in this country, but its reality is undeniable. With greater weight and reliance being placed upon the individual and the private, it is no surprise that the role and importance of philanthropy is being drawn into ever sharper focus.

I propose this morning to look more closely at three aspects of the topic: the achievements of philanthropy, its future prospects in higher education, and its possible limits and limitations.

An assumption still difficult to shift is that we in UK higher education have come to philanthropy late and reluctantly, much later and more reluctantly than, say, the United States. But one doesn't have to look very far to see how misleading this idea is. Oxford itself is a university of 900 years' standing built on philanthropy. Many of the colleges bear the names of visionary men and women of their time such as John and Dervorguilla Balliol, Walter de Merton, and Nicholas and Dorothy Wadham. The city's world-famous landmarks would not be here today had it not been for the generosity of philanthropists including Elias Ashmole, John Radcliffe and Gilbert Sheldon. And we would not be in this amazing collection of buildings this morning were it not for the largesse of people like Thomas Bodley.

The history of educational philanthropy is not just an Oxford phenomenon. In fact the origins of formal education in this country are inextricably linked to philanthropy, with the very first schools in England being set up at the end of the sixth and start of the seventh centuries by the cathedrals of Canterbury, Rochester and York. Over time these were reinforced and sometimes replaced by private foundations. However, the general value and importance of education did not easily take root.

Roger Ascham, the 16th-century teacher of Elizabeth I, lamented that even among very wise men 'commonly more care is had...to find ...a cunning man for their horse, than a cunning man for their children...God suffereth them, to have tame and well-ordered horses, but wild and unfortunate children.' Indeed, it was not until well into the Victorian era that the state determined that education was too important for the nation to be left in private hands. Just as philanthropy has a long history in UK education, so does the debate over the right balance between public and private funding. And as we are seeing that debate continues intensely today, in the university sector as in others.

Of course it is tempting to see philanthropy as all, and only, about money. That presumably underlies the story of the small boy who, when asked by his father what he wanted to be when

he grew up, replied, 'a philanthropist'. The much-impressed father then inquired, 'Why?' 'Well,' said the boy, 'they seem to have lots of money..'

So it is tempting to think only in terms of money, but misleading. For philanthropy, as the Oxford English Dictionary tells us - and therefore we know it to be true - is about much more than money. The OED defines philanthropy as 'love of mankind; the disposition of active effort to promote the happiness and well-being of others'. I find that 'active effort' phrase especially significant. It is not what you have but what you are prepared to do with what you have that really counts. I am reminded of Winston Churchill's dictum: 'We make a living by what we get, but we make a life by what we give.'

And what we give can come in many forms. Here in Oxford, each year colleges and the University nominate outstanding volunteers who have given their time, expertise, energy and commitment to be recognised as a 'Distinguished Friend of Oxford'. Just three weeks ago we held a delightful induction ceremony for the 2012 cohort of DFOs in the Sheldonian Theatre.

Another example is that of the International Internship Programme, administered by the Careers Service, which is aimed at undergraduates who spend their summer working abroad in a sponsoring organisation. As well as gaining valuable work experience students often benefit from being mentored by Oxford alumni long after the official internship has ended.

As intriguing as what people give is why they give. It seems to me that at the heart of this question are rooted values on which we cannot readily put a price: things like trust, admiration, loyalty, gratitude and kinship. It is perhaps no surprise that philanthropy at Oxford is so embedded in the University's collegiate system and structure, which seeks - in its small and close-knit communities - to foster and express many of these values.

The potency of Oxford's capacity to foster positive ties that both bind and nourish has surely been most eloquently and movingly

expressed recently by the Burmese democracy leader, Aung San Suu Kyi, on that wonderful – yes, sunlit – summer day in June when she was finally able to receive her honorary degree in person in the Sheldonian Theatre.

She recalled then that: 'During the most difficult years I was upheld by memories of Oxford. These were among the most important inner resources that helped me to cope with all the challenges I had to face... Oxford is a place of tremendous broad-mindedness... Every human being is expected to have a value and a dignity of her kind or his kind. And that's why, throughout the years when I was struggling for human rights in Burma, I felt I was doing something of which my old university would have approved.'

This is language and a vision of what a university can be about that, to my ears at least, makes some of the current discourse about the price and value of a degree seem, well, a bit out of kilter. Of course, there aren't many Daw Suus in this world and it is quite right, indeed necessary, that students and educators alike weigh carefully the costs and benefits of the education on offer. But it would be disastrous if, as a result, the understanding of education as a profound public as well as a personal benefit were lost; if we lost sight of a shared sense of a university's role in developing what Daw Suu called 'a respect for the best in human civilisation'.

So I can imagine someone asking at this point: 'the money doesn't matter then, Vice-Chancellor? We should let practical fundraising disappear into a comfortable philanthropic fog of good but vague intentions?' Well, no, clearly not. The money does matter and it matters a lot. The financial challenge of maintaining Oxford's standing as one of the world's great centres of learning and scholarship is real and present.

The point I want to emphasise though is that fundraising will be more successful and more effective if it is set clearly in the context of a strong matrix of values that guide the particular institution and its capacity to deliver on its goals and aspirations. Whether it is an old member of modest means making a donation to his or her college, or a billionaire supporting hugely ambitious research or building projects, that matrix of values needs to be operating powerfully for donor and beneficiary alike.

It should perhaps come as no surprise that a university built on philanthropic support should continue to have an impressive track record into the 21st century. In March I had the pleasure of announcing that the Oxford Thinking Campaign had passed its initial target of £1.25 billion raised for the collegiate University. This was the fastest that such an amount had been raised in European university history; the milestone was reached well ahead of schedule in under eight years, and despite a global economic downturn. Now, in October, the total amount has exceeded £1.4 billion.

Digging just a bit deeper into the figures sheds fascinating light on some of the things that

I have just been discussing. Forty per cent of the money was given as gifts to colleges. Just over half came from overseas, a potent affirmation of Oxford's global reach and impact. And while more than a third of the total came from alumni, almost a quarter of the support came from individuals who have not had an Oxford education. That last figure is especially interesting when set against a question with which I think you will be familiar. It goes like this: Oxford is wealthy, certainly by UK university standards, so why give it more?

I am going to leave aside for now all the highly relevant points about the actual cost of providing the educational excellence that Oxford seeks to embody, in favour of a perspective from the charitable sector – and Oxford is, of course, a charity.

Our near neighbour Oxfam is one of the world's best-known and most highly respected development charities, with an impressive fundraising record. People do not stop giving to Oxfam because it is successful; indeed, one assumes that a key reason they go on giving is that they believe Oxfam can and does make a difference. That, in my view, is the sensible way to look at philanthropic support for the University of Oxford. It attracts support because, when people look at the challenges the world faces, they see that Oxford is a place with the proven capacity to make a real and varied contribution to solving them. And, as the figures I quoted a moment ago illustrate, that holds true whether or not they have studied at Oxford in the first place.

So far I have focused on what philanthropy has done to date. But what about the future, especially in the brave new world of UK higher education funding? The first point I want to make is a general one: philanthropy will be increasingly important across the sector, for the many as well as for the historic few. It is no coincidence that, in the wake of successful campaigns in Oxford and Cambridge, we are now seeing ambitious fundraising goals set, and large gifts received, by universities such as King's College London and Leicester.

The scale, methods and goals will vary enormously, but my sense is that it will be an unusual university indeed that is not putting more and more effort into its philanthropic activity. That certainly chimes with the findings of the recently published review of philanthropy in higher education in the UK led by Professor Shirley Pearce, which predicts that charitable donations to universities could treble to £2 billion a year within a decade.

Here at Oxford it is remarkable what has been achieved to date; and to all who have contributed in so many different ways, our gratitude is immense. But we cannot rest there, and we know that our supporters neither want nor expect us to do so. To borrow from the Bard: 'what's past is prologue'. £1.4 billion is a remarkable milestone, but a milestone nevertheless on a continuing road, and one which we hope will lead in time to a new Campaign target of £3 billion. It is a lot of money but I am sure we can do

it, and frankly we have to do it, because it represents the essential down-payment on the future aspirations and achievements of our University. If we don't believe, how can we expect others to do so?

It would be premature for me to try to offer a detailed blueprint for the next phase of the fundraising campaign. It will, of course, be guided by the academic priorities of the University, which are themselves currently being scrutinised in a review of our strategic plan. But what I want to do this morning is to take the twin pillars of Oxford's academic mission and to look at them briefly through the philanthropic lens. They are, of course, teaching and research.

First, teaching. Well, you don't need me to tell you that the funding of undergraduate teaching at English universities is in the spotlight at present, as the new tuition charge regime introduced by the government takes effect. Millions of words have been written about the impact this may or may not have on student aspirations and behaviour.

The Independent Commission on Fees, chaired by Will Hutton, the Principal of Hertford College, has sensibly warned that it is too early to draw any firm conclusions, but it also says that there is 'initial evidence that increased fees have an impact on application behaviour'. Whatever the long-term judgement proves to be, our guiding principle remains that Oxford must admit the most able students irrespective of background. In practical terms that means ensuring, among other things, that individual circumstance – including financial circumstance – does not serve as an impediment to entry, whether the impediment be real or perceived.

So how can philanthropy help us deliver this in uncertain times? Well, the answer is that it can help us hugely. Witness the biggest gift for undergraduate financial support in European history which comes from Michael Moritz, an alumnus of Christ Church, and his wife, Harriet Heyman, and which totals £75 million. With a 'matched funding challenge' to the collegiate University, it will – in time – generate an unprecedented total of £300 million.

As a result of that gift, a first cohort of 100 students from low-income backgrounds arriving this term will be eligible for scholarships that will enable them to complete their studies with zero upfront study or living costs. And that's just in year one.

At present, around a thousand Oxford undergraduates (about one in ten) are in the lowest family income bracket of families with annual incomes of less than £16,000. Within three years more than half of these students could benefit from a Moritz-Heyman Scholarship and in time all such students would be covered by the scheme or by equivalent scholarships. And just as philanthropy is about more than money, so are Moritz-Heyman Scholarships. The scholars will also participate in a tailor-made internship programme to foster career opportunities, and act as ambassadors and mentors to encourage

the next generation of Oxford undergraduates from under-represented groups.

And that next generation is also being targeted in a highly successful programme underpinned by generous philanthropic support from the Helsington Foundation. The UNIQ summer schools give bright students from disadvantaged backgrounds a free week at Oxford University, studying a subject in depth and getting a taste of student life. By 2014 a thousand pupils a year will be participating in the UNIQ scheme. The results are impressive: four out of every ten applicants who attended one of the University's UNIQ summer schools last year were offered a place at Oxford – twice the overall success rate for undergraduate entry.

But, of course, undergraduates comprise only one part of the student community in Oxford. In fact, while undergraduate numbers in recent years have remained pretty stable, the growth in graduate students has been steep and rapid. They now account for more than 40% of the overall student body. In the last seven years graduate applications to Oxford have risen by more than three-quarters.

In my Oration a year ago, I spoke in detail about the acute funding challenges facing such students and the implications for research at the University. The problems are profound and cannot be solved overnight. But once again imaginative and generous philanthropic support can make a difference. Witness the largest gift for graduate support in the Humanities in Oxford's 900-year history: the Mica and Ahmet Ertegun Graduate Scholarship Programme in the Humanities will eventually be endowed in perpetuity to award at least 35 graduate scholarships annually. In fact, it is already up and running. The first 16 scholars are now based at the newly converted Mica and Ahmet Ertegun House for the Study of the Humanities on St Giles'.

As you can see, this is proving a more than usually busy and exciting year for new student arrivals. And, just in case you are inclined to doubt it, I have a further example: the first group of 38 students hailing from 19 different countries and many different backgrounds have just begun a one-year Master's course in Public Policy at the new Blavatnik School of Government. Two-thirds of those students are receiving full scholarships thanks to the generosity of a number of different benefactors. The school was founded with a remarkable gift by the American philanthropist Len Blavatnik as the first major centre for government studies on this side of the Atlantic. Its students certainly sound as though they are going to be busy even by Oxford standards: their curriculum embraces economics and finance, politics and law, science and medicine, and history.

It is interesting to note in the light of my earlier remarks that both the Ertegun and Blavatnik gifts come from benefactors who are not alumni. Each focuses on a particular area of the academic landscape and in doing so each opens up exciting new vistas for graduate

scholarship and research. That is their great strength and attraction. But inevitably in a university that offers more than 320 graduate programmes, and where only about half of our doctoral students are on full scholarships, there is still much to be done.

I have pointed out previously the striking contrast in this regard between the UK and the US: we have nothing here to compare with the US government's federal loans scheme which enables graduate students to finance their study. This still seems to me to be a serious shortcoming. Of course one can go on making the case, and we will. But we must also do what we can ourselves. If we want to attract the best academic talent then we must make it financially possible for those people to come here.

It therefore gives me special pleasure this morning to announce a major new initiative designed to ensure that the best graduate students from all over the world are able to benefit from what Oxford has to offer. The Oxford Graduate Scholarship Matched Fund will combine the generosity of benefactors and the financial resources of the University to fund graduate scholarships for outstanding students across the academic disciplines at Oxford. It envisages an endowment goal of £100 million, made up of £40 million from University funds to encourage and partner £60 million from philanthropic giving. We will announce more details later, but for now I simply want to emphasise our determination to do all we can to bridge the graduate funding gap – and that this exciting new initiative, drawing creatively once more on the power of philanthropy, reflects the seriousness of that intent.

Postgraduate students are the engine of groundbreaking enquiry and experimentation and the health of our research base depends critically on the continued supply of talented graduates. The significance of philanthropy in supporting groundbreaking research at Oxford is hard to overestimate. I have spoken already about the Ertegun and Blavatnik initiatives, but if one looks more widely at recent major developments around the University, it is clear that the generosity of our donors is – and will remain – key. The Oxford Martin School, the Saïd Business School and the Smith School of Enterprise and the Environment are all potent examples of how philanthropy, in association with rigorous academic values, can shape and inspire research at Oxford – research that changes how we understand the world and respond to its complex challenges.

Of course most philanthropic giving for research is not on such a scale. Sometimes smaller, carefully tailored and targeted support is the key. One such example is research into fibrodysplasia ossificans progressiva (FOP), an extremely rare genetic disorder that causes muscles, tendons, ligaments and other connective tissues to turn to bone. It affects only around 600 people in the world and causes an extra skeleton to form, imprisoning the body and making it virtually impossible to move. But Richard Simcox chose to donate

to Oxford because it is the only institution in the UK which researches FOP. His gift funded the first dedicated UK programme to study the gene responsible for FOP and how drugs can be developed to halt or prevent the disabling bone formation.

Let me turn now to the third and final aspect of my reflections this morning: the possible limits of philanthropy. At the core of what Oxford stands for are academic integrity and academic freedom. So it is right that we measure everything we do and aspire to do by that exacting yardstick. Whatever the source of potential funding we need to be sure that it serves and does not compromise those core values. This is equally the case whether the funding comes from public or private sources. There are more than enough examples around the world of governments using universities to fund 'convenient' research, or conversely where pressing research issues are deemed off limits. And there have also been cases, of course, where donor philanthropy has been inappropriate or misused. The recent Woolf report on the LSE's links with the Gaddafi family, for example, makes salutary reading and underlines the importance of having robust mechanisms in place for monitoring and vetting potential donations.

In Oxford the Committee to Review Donations works assiduously checking substantial gifts for their appropriateness. There are in all sectors certain risks associated with philanthropy, and higher education is no exception. We are well aware of that, but we are also very aware of the risks of underinvestment, stagnation and eventual decline. Managing decline is not what Oxford is about and we owe it to future generations to make sure we avoid that fate.

There is another, quite different, sense in which the role of philanthropy may be limited, and that relates to the sheer scale of resources needed to fund major research projects. For governments can bring resources to bear on a scale that dwarfs every other funding stream, even the most generous philanthropic endowment. And that is true not just here but also in the United States, where universities are often thought to have to fend for themselves in the marketplace. In reality most research income for US universities flows from government. At Harvard it is in the region of 80%. For Oxford it amounts to about 40% of research income.

Against the research backdrop, then, the much-traded notion in the media and elsewhere of Oxford 'going private', with the clear implication that it would neither need nor accept government funding, is simply misconceived.

As I said earlier, there is immense potential for universities at their best to help transform the prospects of entire societies as well as individual lives. Indeed, I would argue that, without the harnessing of that potential, societies in the highly competitive world of the 21st century cannot hope to prosper. There is, I think, a real danger that the vital connective

tissue between these two core beneficiaries of education – the individual and the collective – would be atrophied by a progressive withdrawal of public funding for universities, to the serious detriment of both.

As we see the landscape of higher education shifting around us, the need to establish a new agreement between educators and the state becomes more pressing; we need to develop a shared understanding and a sense of common purpose about what we expect from our universities: at its simplest, who does what and why? And that must include who funds what and why.

And, as part of that endeavour, governments need to think harder and more incisively about the role of philanthropy in the future of higher education. The record to date is patchy, and at times seems muddled. There is something contradictory about encouraging philanthropy in higher education and then threatening to tax donations more heavily. Sensibly the government has acknowledged this was a mistake and so we can all move on. But more encouragement of philanthropy is needed. The Pearce Report, which I mentioned earlier, suggests the extension of tax relief on certain kinds of donation and the renewal of a national matched funding scheme with universities that ran until last year, producing about £580 million in donations on a public investment of about £140 million. If governments want philanthropy in higher education to thrive they must do everything possible to create a supportive environment.

With or without that support, philanthropy can and will do a lot, here at Oxford and elsewhere. But it is not a magic bullet for the future funding of our universities, and nor is it a door through which the state can progressively leave the scene. There is too much at stake for that. In reality the role of philanthropy and the responsibilities of the public purse share a common border. To be good neighbours and partners, both need to know where that border lies.

My Oration this year has focused on the role of philanthropy. This university would not have enjoyed such success in its fundraising objectives were it not for the academic achievements of its members. Those achievements have been recognised in the past year in several ways, perhaps most significantly in the number of elections to our learned societies. So Professors Dominic Joyce and Ian Walmsley have been elected as Fellows of the Royal Society; Professors John Baines, Cécile Fabre, Andrew Hurrell, Laura Marcus, Lyndal Roper and Jeremy Waldon, and Dr Ruth Harris, have been elected as Fellows of the British Academy; and Professors Tipu Aziz, Rury Holman, Stephen MacMahon, Gero Miesenböck, Anant Parekh and Chris Ponting have been elected as Fellows of the Academy of Medical Sciences.

Since this time last year, Her Majesty The Queen has made the following awards to members of the University: knighthoods for Professors Geoffrey Hill and Diarmaid

MacCulloch; CBEs for Professors Lorna Casselton and Lionel Tarassenko; and MBEs for Professors Ann Buchanan and Robert Walker.

In terms of international recognition, Professor Frances Ashcroft was named as European Laureate in the L'Oréal-UNESCO For Women in Science Awards; Professor Fiona Powrie was awarded the 2012 Louis-Jeantet Prize for Medicine; and Professor Reinhard Strohm received a Balzan Prize for his research on the history of European music from the late Middle Ages to the present day. Closer to home, the Wildlife Conservation Research Unit, under the directorship of Professor David Macdonald, was responsible for the University's eighth Queen's Anniversary Prize.

I should like to record my gratitude to the Heads of Societies who have retired from their roles within the last year, and whose tireless work for the University is greatly appreciated. Professor Paul Langford is succeeded by Professor Henry Woudhuysen as Rector of Lincoln; Sir Neil Chalmers by Lord Macdonald of River Glaven as Warden of Wadham; Sir Michael Scholar by Professor Margaret Snowling as President of St John's; and The Revd Felix Stephens by Professor Werner Jeanrond as Master of St Benet's Hall. In an unprecedented manoeuvre for Oxford (as far as I can ascertain), Professor Steve Nickell is succeeded by Andrew Dilnot as Warden of Nuffield, and Mr Dilnot is in turn succeeded by Dame Elish Angiolini as Principal of St Hugh's. Three senior appointments have been made within the University Administration and Services: Mr Paul Goffin was appointed as Director of Estates; Mr Loren Griffith as Director of International Strategy; and Professor Anne Trefethen as Chief Information Officer. Mr Jonathan Anelay has retired after many years as Director of the Legal Services Office; I shall miss very much his comforting presence in our legal transactions. I shall miss too the robust and cheerful advice of Mr Tim del Nevo, the University Land Agent, who has retired after serving the University for 46 years.

This year has also seen the retirement of many other distinguished colleagues who have contributed to the University's intellectual life over the years: Professor David Andrews, Professor of Physics; Dr Toby Barnard; Professor Robert Barnes, Professor of Social Anthropology; Professor Jim Bennett, Director of the Museum of the History of Science and Professor of the History of Science; Dr Richard Boyd; Professor Paul Buckley, Professor of Engineering Science; Professor Jane Caplan, Professor of Modern European History; Dr Paul Chamberlain; Professor Michael Collins, Professor of Mathematics; Professor Valentine Cunningham, Professor of English Language and Literature; Professor Mark Freedland, Professor of Employment Law; Professor Malcolm Godden, Rawlinson and Bosworth Professor of Anglo-Saxon; Dr Angelica Goodden; Dr Clive Griffin; Professor Gus Hancock, Professor of Chemistry; Dr Keith Hannabuss; Professor Brian Howard, Professor of Chemistry; Dr Simon Hunt; Dr Rohini

Jayatilaka; Dr Zedong Jiang; Professor Harry Jones, Professor of Condensed Matter Physics; Mrs Margaret Jones; Professor Vaughan Lowe, Chichele Professor of Public International Law; Dr Patrick Magill; The Revd Dr John Muddiman; Professor Nigel Palmer, Professor of German Medieval and Linguistic Studies; Dr John Penney; Dr Alex Pravda; Professor Sarah Randolph, Professor of Parasite Ecology; Dr Mark Rebick; Dr Sue Richards; Professor Stein Ringen, Professor of Sociology and Social Policy; Professor David Robertson, Professor of Politics; Professor Brian Rogers, Professor of Experimental Psychology; Professor David Rogers, Professor of Ecology; Professor Vivienne Shue, Professor for the Study of Contemporary China; and Dr Francis Teal, Reader in Economics.

I would also like to mention those other colleagues who have retired from valued administrative, library or service posts in the University: Mr Reginald Boone, Mrs Jane Booth, Mrs Patricia Buckley, Dr Stephen Clark, Mrs Jacqueline Cordell, Miss Beth Crutch, Mrs Anne Gray, Mrs Jilly Grew, Mr Mike Heaney, Mr Richard Hughes, Mr Geoff Neate, Ms Graciela Nunez Alonso, Dr Christine Seal, Mr Norman Stewart, Mrs Alice Taylor, Mr Kerry Thomas, Miss Wendy Tynan, Mrs Ilana Veitch, Miss Marilyn Wiltshire and Mr Thomas Wyse.

This year the University community has lost colleagues whose early deaths have been a source of great sadness: Professor Fionula Brennan, Professor of Cytokine Immunology; Ms Sue Holly, Project Manager in the Medical Sciences Division; Dr Niklas Lindegårdh, Director of Clinical Pharmacology Laboratories at the Mahidol-Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit; Professor Steve Rawlings, Professor of Astrophysics; Dr Ib Sørensen, Information Systems Developer in the Department of Computer Science; and Dr Steven Wiltshire, Researcher at the Oxford Centre for Diabetes, Endocrinology and Metabolism.

Finally, we pause to remember the contributions of those colleagues who have died in retirement over the past year: Dr Mustafa Badawi, Mr Giles Barber, Dr John Barltrop, Miss Avril Barr, Mr Godfrey Bellamy, Mr David Blenkinsop, Dr George Burn, Sir Zelman Cowen, Mrs Ursula Dronke, Sir Michael Dummett, Dr Keith Fuller, Dr Keith Gore, Dr Joseph Hatton, Professor Dame Louise Johnson, Dr Maurice Keen, Mr Dennis Lloyd, Professor Emrys Lloyd Jones, Dr Leslie MacFarlane, Mr Denis McMiken, Dr Frederick Madden, Dr Francis Marriott, Mr Kazimierz Michalski, Dr David Petford, Mr Bill Platts, Professor Siegfbert Prawer, Mr Maurice Retter, Dr Michael Shallis, Dr Harold Shukman, Mr David Stockton, Dr Donald Tayler, Dr Gerard Turner, Dr Godfrey Tyler, Mrs Betsy Tyler-Bee and Professor James Urmson.