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Master’s Introduction

I am delighted once more to introduce this issue of the Pelican, brought to you by Liz Winter and the members of our energetic Development team. We try to use the magazine to show the diversity of College life; and this issue is no exception. It has a strong legal flavour, highlighting the lives and achievements of some of Corpus’s lawyers, and demonstrating the strength we have in this subject and in the profession. You will be interested to read the interviews with Baroness Elizabeth Butler-Sloss, our newest Honorary Fellow, and also with Sir Terence Etherton and Lord (Patrick) Hodge; Professor David Ibbetson also features – many of you will know him as Regius Professor of Civil Law and Warden of Leckhampton, shortly to leave us to become President of Clare Hall.

This year we lost one of our most eminent Honorary Fellows, Joe Farman, renowned for his work on the ozone layer. This Pelican has a feature on his life and work, and pays tribute to a very remarkable scientist.

Current Corpus personalities appear in these pages in the shape of the porters, our wonderful team of stalwarts who present the face of the College to visitors and who solve a wide range of practical problems in order to help Fellows, staff and students. The task they do, 24 hours a day and 7 days a week, is often thankless; but this article recognizes and appreciates the excellent contribution they make to College life.

Each Pelican issue seeks to highlight one or two of our Fellows, and this one has profiles of Nicholas Chen, our Microsoft Research Fellow, and Pietro Cicuta, Fellow in Physics.

I am glad also that we are able to report on the opening of the Kho Building at Leckhampton, which is already making a big difference to the lives of those in our post-graduate community. This gives me the opportunity to recognize the wonderful contribution made to the College by a number of donors, including in this instance the family of old member Philip Kwee, especially his parents and his grandmother Mrs Kho, after whom this building is named. Other benefactors, including alumni and the families of alumni, have been particularly generous this year, leading to the highest receipt of benefaction that the College has known for several years. I pay tribute to the imaginative and tireless efforts of the Development Office, and the response from our donors (including of course many Pelican readers), through whom this has been made possible – remarkable in any college, but especially so in one with such a small number of alumni such as Corpus. These donations really make a difference, changing the lives of young people who are thus enabled to benefit from the Corpus experience.

With best wishes to you all,

Stuart Laing
The Right Honourable Baroness Elizabeth Butler-Sloss GBE, PC, says she is ‘absolutely thrilled’ to be an Honorary Fellow of Corpus but, with typical candour, at once remarks that she is ‘slightly embarrassed’ about it. She drops her voice confidentially. ‘You see, I’m already an Honorary Fellow at Peterhouse. I’m wondering: Can I do this? Is it proper to accept a second one?’ (As it happens, the heads of both houses, having been consulted, discreetly rule that it is, indeed, ‘proper’). By the time you read this, the pioneer of women’s careers at the British bar – a beady-eyed and vigorous eighty-year-old, a lively mix of Elizabeth I, Miss Marple and Aunt Dahlia – will have been inducted into the mysteries of the Corpus Fellowship.

The Baroness, as she does not especially like to be known – ‘Call me Elizabeth’ she says, “Elizabeth” is such a nice name’ – is a natural for the College. ‘My father, 2 out of 3 of my brothers, my nephew Philip and my son, Bobby all went to Corpus,’ she goes on, chatting in a secluded, neo-gothic corner of the House of Lords. ‘Actually, I’ve only visited a few
times. The one May Ball I’ve ever been to, when I was sixteen, was at Corpus. I came with my parents and I remember it was huge fun.’

The Honorary Fellowship, a late honour in a career rich in gongs of all sorts, is especially piquant: Elizabeth herself never made it to Cambridge. She remembers, ‘I applied to Newnham, but they turned me down – could see I wasn’t really interested – so I went to Lausanne, learned a lot of French, grew up, came back, took a secretarial course’ (where, needless to say, despite being left-handed, she excelled at shorthand).

Ann Elizabeth Oldfield Havers was born in 1933, the only daughter of Sir Cecil Havers, a distinguished judge. Like many of her generation, her childhood was defined by the war, and her brisk, no nonsense manner is redolent of ‘business as usual.’ Here, you say to yourself, on first meeting, is a woman who will never make a drama out of a crisis and who will, indeed, keep calm and carry on.

Her wartime memories – the family was living in Kew – are mainly of bombing and aerial combat in the bright blue skies above the London suburbs. ‘I was a war child,’ she remembers. ‘Once the bombs came, we lived largely in the cellar. I can still see the V1s coming over. We used to stand in the garden and watch. You see, it was quite safe. We only had to worry when the engine cut out.’

‘Occasionally I’d say; “Look here, chaps, remember that I’m a woman!”’

Once the war was over, life returned to normal, and Elizabeth could begin to fulfil her purposes. Ever since she was about eleven, confident Miss Havers had always startled grown-ups by the clarity of her ambition. ‘I’m going to be a barrister’ she would say. This had the effect that her schools (Broomfield House, Kew, followed by Wycombe Abbey) would choose her for public-speaking duties, votes of thanks and so on. ‘I learned from an early age to stand up and speak in front of people’, she says. ‘Oh yes, I’ve always been happier speaking than writing.’

This precocious career choice was perhaps doubly predictable. Her father, to whom she was, she says, ‘very close,’ was a High Court judge, steeped in the law. She grew up surrounded by
brothers, most of whom ate and slept the law, though two of them went into business. Her brother Michael later became Lord Chancellor and her nephew Philip is a distinguished QC. Throughout her childhood and adolescence, her mother was ill with MS and Elizabeth and her brother were raised by a nanny. Later, before her legal career took off, Elizabeth came home to run the house for her father.

The law, never far away, became an integral part of her youth. Her father was a ‘red judge’ (in red robes for the judging of serious crime). Young Miss Havers would go along to the Old Bailey to watch. Sir Cecil often sat in judgment in cases of capital murder, most famously in the case of Ruth Ellis, the last woman in Britain to be hanged. Elizabeth remembers that as ‘a very sad case – but she was, finally, the author of her own execution. If she’d applied for a reprieve sooner, she might have got off. In the end, it was just too late.’ She says now that she will never forget the occasions when her father passed the sentence of death by hanging. ‘There was an absolute silence when the black cap went on. Whatever the case, it was always an awesome moment.’ When, finally she studied law in London, she put her family background to good use, completed the course in two years flat, and was called to the bar at the age of just twenty-one.

‘I saw myself as a pioneer. There was no need to challenge the men.’

From the first, Elizabeth Havers stood out. She was one of 64 women among 2000 men who ‘didn’t take us seriously’. Soon, however, it became clear that this new young barrister should be taken very seriously indeed. She now says that having a father as a judge was not much help in getting work, but that, once assigned a case, his counsel and advice was invaluable. In another flash of candour she says, ‘Father did not think I was an especially good lawyer, but I was good enough – yes, ‘good enough’ will do – I was a practical, common-sense lawyer who had her feet on the ground.’

Butler-Sloss, whose innate modesty is whimsical and self-deprecating, might be teasing here – it’s hard to tell – but there’s no doubt that her no-nonsense pragmatism has served her well, as a woman in a man’s world. ‘Coming from a family of boys,’ she says, ‘I was never seen as a threat.’ When she later joined the Court of Appeal in 1988, she was told that her fellow justices (judges) were ‘very worried about me.’ They didn’t need to be. ‘I get on very well with men,’ she says. ‘Occasionally, when they were being absolutely outrageous about something, I’d say; “Look here, chaps, remember that I’m a woman,” and they’d look rather surprised.’ No wonder, perhaps: Butler-Sloss, having chaired the Cleveland child abuse inquiry in 1987 (a long aside here while she regales me with the niceties of anal and rectal abuse), was the very first woman to be appointed a Lord Justice of Appeal.

It was another natural elevation. The law had occupied all her attention throughout her career. ‘I did try politics in 1959 for the Conservatives, and was absolutely hopeless.’

‘It’s amazing what you can find in Croydon.’

It was also a hopeless seat. She reduced the sitting MP’s majority in a safe Labour seat, but she was pregnant with Frances, her first child, and not cut out for the Commons. There was a home for pregnant women in the constituency, but the unmarried mums who might have voted for her failed to turn out, and she went happily back to the twisting by-ways of English law.

Was she ever a feminist? ‘No – and I was tremendously criticized for it, especially by Brenda Hale’ (now the only woman judge on the Supreme Court). ‘Lawyers like Brenda and Mary Arden saw it as their duty to push the feminist line. But I saw it as my duty to make way so that it would be easier for others to follow. I saw myself as a pioneer. There was no need to challenge the men. I suppose,’ she concludes, with a nice insight, ‘it’s all to do with the fact that women always seem to want to strive more.’
Elizabeth has no difficulty about taking advice from the opposite sex. In 1970, when she was appointed a Registrar in the Family Division of the High Court, against her private wishes, it was her father who told her she had to take the job. ‘You are neglecting your family’ was his trenchant advice. She reports this with her own, rather disarming frankness. In 1979, she became only the fourth woman to be made a High Court Judge. This, she says, ‘was an example of positive discrimination. I got it because I was a woman.’

Anyway, never mind feminism. From 1958, she was a wife and mother. She had met her future husband, Joseph William Alexander Butler-Sloss, in 1957. ‘I met him through the law,’ she says, with another burst of candour. ‘I was sitting around in chambers one day with no work and nothing to do. He asked me out for coffee. So we went to this cafe in Fleet Street, and six weeks later we were engaged.’ It seems to have been a highly successful union, not least because Elizabeth seems to have treated it with her own, characteristic brand of Anglo-Saxon pragmatism. Today, with some satisfaction, she reports, ‘We’ve been married fifty-four years.’

What was the high point of her career? ‘Well, the most satisfying was being President of the Family Division (in the High Court), but the most enjoyable was being a Justice in the Court of Appeal’ (from 1988-1999). Typically, ‘enjoyment’ seems to have a higher premium in her vocabulary than ‘satisfaction.’

Elizabeth’s plain-spoken directness sometimes got her into hot water. Fathers For Justice, a slightly untethered, polemical pressure group, who came before her in the Court of Appeal, became particularly enraged. They padlocked the gates of her Devon home (her husband had to free her with bolt-cutters). Then they hired a small tank from a depot in Croydon – ‘It’s amazing what you can find in Croydon’ – and drove it down Fleet Street towards the Royal Courts of Justice. When that didn’t work, some of them dressed up as Batman and Robin and camped out on the roof of the court for a week.
'They’re still going,’ she says, with a twinkle, ‘but they’ve calmed down a lot. I think they went after me because I was a figurehead.’ If they could see Elizabeth repeating, with relish, the indignities heaped upon her by this campaign, these demonstrators might want to re-think their tactics. It is, no question, so much water off a duck’s back.

Elizabeth breaks off here, unprompted, to review her qualities as a lawyer in public life. ‘I suppose I’m seen as ‘sensible’ – such a dreary term – and ‘practical,’ with a knowledge of the real world. I do have a rather superficial mind, but I can pick up the main points and run with them. I’m quite authoritative (that’s an understatement), and I know how to manage a court. I never get cross in court, in fact I’ve only got cross about five or six times during my career. I think I’m quite good at getting on with people, and I do have a sense of humour.’

Every one of these qualities came into play when, in 2006 she was appointed as deputy coroner of the Queen’s Household, and assistant deputy coroner in Surrey, for the purposes of hearing the inquest into the death of Princess Diana. ‘I didn’t want to do it – in fact, I said ‘no’ but in the end I took it because Charlie Falconer asked me. He said, ‘I promise it won’t take very long.’

A year later, after a very difficult time with Michael Mansfield QC (acting for the Al Fayad family), she handed over her duties to Lord Justice Scott Baker with some relief. Elizabeth Butler-Sloss says, modestly, that her contribution to the ultimate verdict, with which she is in full accord, was that she ‘organized the IT.’ That’s another understatement. In fact, she created a virtual journey, from the Ritz to the fatal underpass on which every variable in the tragedy could be plotted.

On the basis of her time as coroner, Elizabeth herself is convinced that any conspiracy theory is ‘complete rubbish.’ Diana’s death was a tragic accident. ‘It was a terribly difficult drive. The poor driver was drunk. He should never have taken the job, but he couldn’t refuse his boss. No one was wearing seat belts. Diana and Dodi were probably urging him to go faster.’ The underpass itself is a death trap, she believes. ‘They were going too fast. It was very obvious when you drove it. The construction was so bad. We did it at 50, 60 and 70mph. Above 60mph, it became really dangerous.’

Back in 1997, none of these hazards were sign-posted. Never mind the infamous white Fiat, or the alleged involvement of the secret service, the fatal journey had a terrible inevitability. ‘Shoddy work. Typically French,’ Elizabeth concludes, very matter-of-fact. Corpus High Table has just landed a natural.
Professor David Ibbetson
(m1973)
by Philip Murray (m2007)

IN 1972 DAVID IBBETSON CAME TO CORPUS TO BE INTERVIEWED FOR A PLACE TO READ LAW. WHEN ASKED WHAT IN PARTICULAR ATTRACTED HIM TO THE LAW TRIPOS – A QUESTION NOW ASKED BY HIM TO EVERY PROSPECTIVE UNDERGRADUATE – HE REPLIED, UNBLINKINGLY, THAT HEwanted IN PARTICULAR TO STUDY ROMAN LAW. ‘IT WAS, I CONFESSION, SOMETHING MADE UP COMPLETELY ON THE SPOT’, HE TOLD ME, AS WE SAT DOWN ONE SUNNY DAY IN MAY, IN THE GARDENS OF LECKHAMPTON HOUSE, TO DISCUSS HIS CAREER. NONETHELESS, IT WAS A COMMENT WITH ENORMOUS PRESCIENCE.

David Ibbetson is now a world-leading legal historian and Roman lawyer. As the Regius Professor of Civil Law, he holds one of only eight Regius Chairs in the University. He has also been Chairman of the University’s Law Faculty and is the Warden of Leckhampton. At the end of this academic year he will leave Corpus to take up the Presidency of Clare Hall, one of the graduate Colleges in the University. In a year which has seen Corpus Old Members being appointed to the High Court (Sir Jeremy Stuart-Smith, m1974), the Supreme Court (Lord Patrick Hodge, m1972) Christopher Vajda (m1974) to the European Court of Justice and as Chancellor of the High Court (Sir Terence Etherton, m1969), David Ibbetson is further evidence of the prominence of the College’s lawyers across various sectors of public life.

To the fresh-faced, eighteen year old David Ibbetson who came up to Corpus in October 1973, the idea of scaling the heights of legal history and university administration was almost unforeseeable. His primary intention in reading law, he told me, was to practise as a tax solicitor in London. From his first year in sixth form, he realised that playing around with rules would be fun. He felt, however, that a lack of personal connections ruled out practice at the Bar, as did a certain discomfort with the idea of standing up in court. He was advised to apply to Corpus by his school. At his admissions interview he remembers being made most welcome by Albert Jaggar, the Head Porter. When the offer of a place to read law came through from the Senior Tutor, he was, he said, in no doubt that he should accept it.

When at Corpus, David excelled in the study of law, picking up a starred First in the second and third years of the Tripos. Teaching, he says, was very much the same as it is now. Studying was, however, quite different: without all the electronic resources enjoyed by present undergraduates, whereby decisions of courts can be found online at the click of a mouse, a lot of time was spent sitting in the Butler Library, getting the law out of printed law reports. In characteristic reflectiveness, David tells me that this change in the way law is studied has subtly altered the way in which undergraduates now think about law. Rather than thinking, as he and his contemporaries did, that law is ‘something to be found in books’, law is now perceived as something that is ‘out there in the world of the courts’: it is now much more grounded in the practice of the profession, and the demands of the ‘real world’.

During his three years as an undergraduate, the subjects he enjoyed the most were Roman law, legal history, and jurisprudence (the philosophy of law). With Roman law, he enjoyed digging around various strands of conceptual reasoning. With legal history, he enjoyed trying to make sense of what happened during the course of the law’s development. With jurisprudence, he enjoyed the opportunity of thinking in a more wide-ranging way. And all subsequent stages of his career have involved, to differing degrees, a combination of these subjects.

From his second year at Corpus, David says that he realised he had a deep and reflective interest in the concept of law: something which he began to feel the practice of tax law might not satisfy. And so he began to consider seriously studying for a PhD in the subject, while still being unsure what he would do afterwards. In considering his future, one man in particular had a big impact: Professor Sir John Baker (as he now is), one of the world experts in English legal history and a Fellow of St Catharine’s College. David and Sir John first met in 1975, at the end of David’s second year as an undergraduate. David was considering taking the legal history paper in the
third year of his BA, and wanted some advice from Sir John on what he should read as he stayed in Cambridge over the long vacation. David tells me that legal history was a subject he fell instantly in love with, and when he met again with Sir John in the Michaelmas term of his third year, it was decided that he would pursue doctoral studies into the sixteenth-century law of contract, under the supervision of Sir John. Medieval law, David felt, would be undesirable, given his unwillingness to become embedded in the mind-set and history of medieval society. And as a lot of important work was starting to be done on early-modern private law, a doctorate on the subject promised to be something that would be intellectually stimulating and academically fashionable.

Doctoral studies brought David to Leckhampton, the College’s graduate community in West Cambridge. Being a research student, he tells me, was ‘very different’ to being an undergraduate: the sense of academic freedom that doctoral research provided was something deeply refreshing to David, and something which made him begin to think seriously about a career in academia. Leckhampton was crucial to this. ‘At Leckhampton’, he says, ‘there was a real sense of it being a community with people researching rather than being taught’. And the sound of typewriters that could be heard during David’s frequent and very thoughtful walks around the gardens – something he often still does, when the weather is good – gave a ‘profound sense’ of it being a community at work.

Socially, too, the community was strong. ‘We’d meet up as a bunch of friends for dinner every night, have dinner, and then, who knows?’ – Communal dining was something that bound the community tightly together, and something which David has continued to emphasise during his time as Warden. With fondness he recalls the Leckhampton cook, Mrs Currington, who ‘relished the challenge of cooking hearty meals for lusty young men’: something which drove David, surprisingly, to playing squash in an attempt to burn off the many calories he consumed. David also recalls Mrs Currington’s husband, O J Currington: ‘he was a professional bank robber, and a jolly good person to have around’.

As well as his doctoral research, David was an enthusiastic supervisor in Roman law and personal property law for undergraduates from Corpus, Girton, and Jesus. He was, he says, as much interested in teaching as in research. Conscious of the narrowness of doctoral study, he says that teaching presented a good way of keeping his feet on the ground, as well as making him think about difficult areas of law in a clear and explicable way. For David, there is no real tension between being a good academic on the one hand, and a good teacher on the other: ‘When you’re teaching good students you have to be able to deal with difficult questions, so very often the two roles correlate’.

It was teaching that also pushed David into making the decision to pursue a career in academia. ‘It was a Saturday in June in the third year of my doctorate’, he recalls. ‘I had just finished supervising some undergraduates, and went into lunch in Hall thinking how much I had enjoyed it, and how much I enjoyed combining teaching and research.’ A position was soon after advertised at Magdalen College, Oxford. On the advice of Professor Peter Stein, the then Regius Professor of Civil Law in Cambridge, David applied for the job, without any expectation of getting it. To his great surprise, he was successful. He submitted his PhD in August 1980 and was examined on it in the October. On the afternoon after his viva voce examination, he caught the bus to Oxford, and was admitted as a Fellow of Magdalen that evening.

At Magdalen, David excelled both as a teacher and a researcher. The Oxford tutorial system, he recalls, had subtle differences: ‘At the first tutorial I gave, a student turned up wearing a tie; something that’d never happen in Cambridge’. After a year or so he felt settled in both the College and the University. He lived in College, and enjoyed a very sociable High Table most evenings. ‘I had a very hectic life’, he recalls: ‘It was a time of working very hard, but also of enjoying myself very hard’. Academically, his research was almost exclusively in legal history, highlights of his career including the publication, in 1999, of his ground-breaking Historical Introduction to the Law of Obligations. At Oxford, David moved away from the confines of his PhD, researching broadly in English and
continental legal history from the medieval period to modern developments. As the field developed and started to take a focussed approach on manuscript resources, it was an increasingly professionalised and dynamic field to work in.

In 2000, Cambridge’s Regius Chair in Civil Law became vacant. David had continued to develop an interest in Roman law throughout his time at Oxford: he had always taught Roman law at Oxford and it was something he was very enthusiastic about. ‘It was always part of the academic world I found myself in’, he tells me. While he had some reservations about moving away from Oxford after such a long time there, he applied for and was offered the Regius Chair, along with a Professorial Fellowship at Corpus. The transition was an easy one, and he settled back into a College that ‘had not really changed very much’ since he left in 1980, but for the admission of women: ‘Many of the Fellows were still there, and didn’t look a day older’. Being appointed as Regius Professor also led to a subtle change in his scholarship, his historical work being consciously re-orientated to take more of an account of comparative legal history and Roman law. ‘I became a rather eclectic legal historian’, he notes.

Throughout David’s academic career, College and University administration have gone hand-in-hand with his research and teaching. At Magdalen, he served as Dean of College and Senior Tutor. And after four years as a Fellow at Corpus, in 2004 he was elected Warden of Leckhampton, placing him at the centre of a community he had always held dear. As Warden, David succeeded in his aim of persuading the College to spend more money on Leckhampton, improving the quality of the buildings so as to attract the best graduate students. He also continued the work of his predecessor, Professor Christopher Howe (m1983), in raising the public profile of the Wardenship, and cemented the important community atmosphere by encouraging Fellows ‘to give up their swanky dinners in College and come and dine more regularly with graduate students’.

After nine years as Warden, David will step down in August before his move to Clare Hall. Asked if he has any words of advice for the next Warden, the Reverend James Buxton (who will also continue as Dean of Chapel), he comments that ‘every Warden does the job differently, and James will do it in his own way. It’s important, though, for the Warden to work with the whole graduate body’, he is keen to insist. He also makes a particular point of mentioning the usefulness of Michael Martin, the Leckhampton site manager, who he says he has greatly enjoyed working with.

For David, being Warden of Leckhampton was excellent preparation for becoming head of a graduate college like Clare Hall. He says he feels accustomed to the ways graduates live and work, and the pressures they are under, and he has been frequently involved in issues relating to graduate education. When asked what he will take from Leckhampton to Clare Hall as President, David remarks that it will be an appreciation of the ‘role of conscious informality in Cambridge’: while there is a great deal to be said for the traditional formality of a Cambridge College in providing a framework in which students, and especially undergraduates, can live and work, he feels that a different framework works better for graduate students. Graduate students, he says, benefit more from unscripted interactions, both with each other and with more senior academics, and he will work hard to foster this environment at Clare Hall.

As our interview draws to a close, I ask him what memories he will take away from his time at Corpus, and his time as Warden in particular. The development of Leckhampton’s new building (recently named the L S Kho Building, after the main benefactor’s mother) will be a particular memory, he recalls. As will be his involvement in Leckhampton pantomimes (usually in drag), the annual sense of excitement at the start of the academic year, and ‘sitting in the garden late into the night after dinner’. To end our interview, he recalls an afternoon in the gardens after a lunch held for the 1352 Society. An adult son of an Old Member, who worked at another university, looked around the gardens in amazement, turned to David and said, ‘Is this what you in Cambridge call ‘Halls of Residence’? For David, Leckhampton is clearly a very special place, and something he will remember with great fondness.

Philip Murray has just completed his PhD looking at the history of judicial review, and will be taking up a Fellowship at St John’s College, Cambridge, in September.
Sir Terence Etherton
(m1969)
by Dr Simon Heffer (m1979)

AS CHANCELLOR OF THE HIGH COURT AND HEAD OF THE CHANCERY DIVISION THE RT HON SIR TERENCE ETHERTON IS ONE OF THE MOST SENIOR JUDGES IN THE LAND. HIS RISE TO HIS PRESENT POSITION, AFTER LEAVING CAMBRIDGE, IS REMARKABLE AGAINST ANY YARDSTICK BUT ESPECIALLY SO FOR AN OPENLY GAY YOUNG BARRISTER WHO NEVER THOUGHT HE WOULD BE APPOINTED TO THE BENCH. IN 2006 HE ANNOUNCED HIS CIVIL PARTNERSHIP TO HIS PARTNER OF 28 YEARS IN THE TIMES. HIS DETERMINATION TO ‘GIVE SOMETHING BACK’ TO SOCIETY HAS LED HIM TO SERVE ON A NUMBER OF TRUSTS, INCLUDING BECOMING CHAIRMAN OF BROADMOOR. HE IS A HIGHLY PRINCIPLED MAN WHO TURNED DOWN A PLACE IN THE BRITISH OLYMPIC FENCING TEAM FOR THE MOSCOW OLYMPICS AFTER THE SOVIET INVASION OF AFGHANISTAN. AT THE TIME, HE SAYS, IT SEEMED TO BE ENTIRELY THE RIGHT THING TO DO. SIMON HEFFER MET HIM IN HIS ROOMS IN THE ROYAL COURTS OF JUSTICE.

On the noticeboard outside Sir Terence Etherton’s office is a list of the English judiciary in order of precedence, and his name – as Chancellor of the High Court and head of the Chancery Division – is at number five. Sir Terence came up to Corpus in 1969 to read history, changed to law for part II of the tripos, and also captained the university fencing team: he would reach Olympic standard with the sabre. His rise to so elevated a position in the law has, he says, surprised him, because even in his most successful years as a barrister and as a judge he never made any secret of the fact that he was gay. In his earlier years at the Bar that represented a serious barrier to promotion. He was the first High Court judge to have a civil partnership, in 2006.

‘I chose the law, specifically the Bar because at the end of my second year at Cambridge I had to think very seriously about my future,’ he tells me in his office at the new Rolls Building in Fetter Lane, behind the Royal Courts of Justice. ‘I’d thought very seriously about becoming an advocate when younger, but that had passed into the recesses of my mind. I loved history, and there was a tradition of studying history in my family – my great-uncle had been at Corpus between 1918 and 1921, reading the subject.’ When he came to consider a career towards the end of his second year, the Bar appealed to him because ‘it involved a certain amount of intellectual endeavour, it would be of benefit to the community, if I succeeded there would be some status involved in it and some leadership role, and it would bring a decent remuneration – these all seemed quite important. The Bar in particular was an area of life and career where true merit, combined with a bit of good fortune, could lead to an intellectually rewarding and socially rewarding career. So I changed to law.’

His first thought was to be a criminal advocate – ‘I was tempted by crime. But life at the Bar is often influenced by fortune rather than intent.’ He continues: ‘I’d intended to practise at the common law bar. At the first meeting of the Nicholas Bacon Society in, I think, 1971 I sat next to a very distinguished QC called Norman Tapp, who was in common law chambers in the Temple. He arranged a pupillage for me in his set, but suggested doing six months in Chancery to start with, because they liked pupils to have some experience in paperwork. Another distinguished Corpus barrister at the Chancery Bar, Martin Nourse QC – later a member of the Court of Appeal and now an Honorary Fellow – arranged that pupillage for me, in what had been Lord Wilberforce’s chambers. But when I was preparing to go back to the Temple after six months I was
offered the chance to complete my pupillage there. I had to make a risk assessment, effectively, and I decided to stay in the Chancery set. Later, they offered me a tenancy.’

This seems to have come as something of a surprise. ‘I never imagined being a Chancery QC. It would have been inconceivable to me when I began in practice to imagine myself a judge and ultimately head of the Chancery Division of the High Court. But I’ve enjoyed every minute of it.’

The intellectual challenge was what most motivated him. ‘I loved my time at the Bar. The work I did in Chancery changed over the course of my career in the most remarkable way. To start with it was mainly conveyancing, trusts, tax and estate planning. When I started there were just nine people in my chambers, and there were no QCs. But we began to develop a very wide-ranging litigation practice, which is now the norm. This also took me abroad – I appeared in the Cayman Islands and in Singapore – I had a really wide-ranging practice by the time I became a silk in 1990. It was highly intellectually stimulating. Above all I adored advocacy. And the more demanding the tribunal, the more exciting the challenge.’

I ask him whether he feels the reportedly large sums earned at the Chancery Bar do not deter bright young lawyers from going into other branches of the law, to the detriment of those areas of practice. ‘There are very few people who come to the Bar with the primary objective of making money. Even if you come to the Chancery Bar, you do so because you have a passion for the work. It’s a hazardous career, particularly hazardous in getting a pupillage or a tenancy. You actually have to love what you are doing. It’s a meritocracy. You’ll survive or fail according to your talents. People who want to do family law or crime are often driven by a sense of social justice. Others are driven by the intellectual demands of the job.’

‘It’s a hazardous career, particularly hazardous in getting a pupillage or a tenancy.’

He does, though, agree that there is a possibility of a difficulty if, as many criminal barristers put it, ‘crime doesn’t pay.’ ‘If you get to the stage where the pay is so low that it is a disincentive to those doing publicly funded work, then that is a problem.’

Did he always want to be a judge? ‘Nobody, but nobody I know has come to the Bar to be a judge. You want to be the top advocate and the top QC in your area of work.’ And, as he explains, his own route to the top was, at the time, hardly conventional. ‘I had a very unusual preamble to becoming a judge, because I never thought I’d become a judge. I was a successful junior and a successful silk, but I was an openly gay barrister. In those days openly gay barristers did not expect ever to be appointed to the Bench. Partly, that was because under Lord Hailsham there was a policy of not appointing gay barristers to be judges. That is documented. It formally changed under Lord McKay, but that wasn’t terribly well known to people like me.’

So Sir Terence looked for other ways to make a wider contribution. ‘I was very interested in public service. I wanted..."
to give something back. But I didn’t think I was going to become a judge, so I started to build up a portfolio of interests that were outside the Bar completely. I became a member of the council of Royal Holloway College, London University, and I also explored the possibility of serving the NHS in some way – quite separate from my work at the Bar – and I didn’t expect to be remunerated for it. I put myself forward to sit on an NHS Trust. Eventually I was appointed to sit on an NHS Mental Health Trust that covered Kensington and Chelsea, Fulham and part of Hammersmith, and I did that for 10 years. That ultimately led to my becoming chairman of Broadmoor.’

However, attitudes were changing in the judiciary: ‘After the Labour government came into power in 1997 they introduced the possibility of applying for judicial appointments. Before that it had always been the tap on the shoulder. I hadn’t been asked to sit as a deputy high court judge, which confirmed my view that that was effectively that for me. I was one of the first to apply – possibly the first from the Chancery Bar – and it was almost a protest application, to be honest. No-one could have been more astonished than I was when the telephone call came through to my clerk to say the Lord Chancellor would like to see me the following afternoon. So I went to see him, and he offered me the position.’

The problem was that he had taken on Broadmoor, which was then going through a period of transition of integrating it to an extent with local NHS services. ‘I was flattered, as well as astonished, to be asked by Derry Irvine to become a judge of the Chancery Division, but he expected an immediate answer – I didn’t need to think about it very much – if you want to do public service, what could possibly be better than something you’ve spent your whole professional life training for? So I said that I would do it, but that it was necessary to sort out my successor as chairman of Broadmoor. I took up my post in January 2001, but carried on my work at Broadmoor until about Easter, when we had found a new chairman. I had no prior interest in mental health, but it was interesting and important work. It was a fascinating period in my life. The non-executives on those boards really were quite something: they were excellent people all intent on doing their best.’

‘Every judge that I know has had a disappointment.’

After five years on the High Court Bench Sir Terence became, in 2006, chairman of the Law Commission. ‘It is the most wonderful institution. It was a tremendous privilege to be its chairman,’ he says. It is a body, independent of the Government, dedicated to law reform, and staffed by specialists. ‘Its objectives are to keep reform of the law under scrutiny and to enhance the law’s intelligibility, clarity and accessibility.’ He presided over extensive public consultations before embarking on three-year programmes to suggest reforms to the law.

‘Our first problem was whether our recommendations actually got to parliament. Departments fight each other for parliamentary time for new legislation. The minister responsible for the Law Commission is the Lord Chancellor. The old Lord Chancellor’s Office was a very small department but it had the clout of a very important constitutional figure – the Lord Chancellor, who was also head of the Judiciary and
Speaker of the House of Lords – backing you. It’s now changed out of all recognition to be the Ministry of Justice, whose vast remit includes courts, legal aid, even prisons. The Law Commission became an insignificant part of the Department’s budget, and its reports and recommendations of not much political importance.’

I ask him which of his achievements there he was proudest of. ‘I am most proud of the various reforms I put in place to resolve the difficulty of getting Law Commission projects enacted. They included a new procedure in the House of Lords for ‘uncontroversial’ Law Commission Bills and a new Law Commission Act which requires the Lord Chancellor to give a report each year to parliament about what he is doing in respect of Law Commission projects and stating whether the government supports them or not.’

He became a Lord Justice of Appeal in 2008. As for his present job title, he jokes that ‘it sounds incredibly grand. And for a period of a week after I was appointed, when I went down to breakfast I was greeted with a cry of ‘Good morning Chancellor.’ But that’s disappeared – I don’t quite know why. The title of the post used to be the Vice-Chancellor because historically the head of the division was the Lord Chancellor. But under the Constitutional Reform Act 2005 he ceased to be head of the judiciary, and so the head of the Chancery Division became Chancellor. It is a leadership position in the Division, and I have a whole range of functions of an executive and management nature I am part of the Judicial Executive Board, which technically advises the Chief Justice.

‘I also sit as well, but one is juggling one’s leadership role with one’s role as a judge. Thirty years ago the head of the division would have spent 90 per cent of his time on the bench.’ How much time does he spend there? He says he is still settling in to his job – he started in January – and having to put various new initiatives in place. Eventually, he says, ‘I would normally expect to sit about 50 per cent of my time.’

I ask whether he has noticed any sign of having had an effect on other lawyers as a result of his making no secret of his sexuality. He says that when he had his civil partnership ‘a lot of people came up to me who weren’t actually gay who were happy for me for what I’d done. I’m actually quite a private person – one’s sexuality is quite a private matter. But I thought it was important to show that one could be a happy and successful gay man within the legal profession, particularly as a judge. I particularly wanted to say that.’ His civil partnership was announced in The Times. ‘Nobody paid the blindest bit of attention at all,’ he says. ‘Not a single journalist noticed it.’

Does he feel that discrimination in his profession, on the grounds of sexuality, is a thing of the past now? ‘I’m completely satisfied that within the judiciary sexuality is absolutely no bar whatever to the top jobs. People who are from a minority cannot expect that just because they are
from a minority they will be placed in a position for that reason: but people who are of the right level of ability should be able to get there on a level playing field. Of course, you need a lot of good fortune in any field of life. You need to be in the right place at the right time. And often we don’t know who our competitors are. And people who are appointing you may take a different view of your abilities from yourself. Every judge that I know has had a disappointment.’ He is, though, concerned about the advancement of women in the profession – ‘there is real problem with the retention of women.’

Sir Terence has lectured on the role of religion in civil society, and I ask him about his faith. ‘My religion is important to me. Again, this is quite a private thing. It takes a lot of courage these days to say that one is a believer, but I am a believer. I am a reform Jew, I’m not an orthodox Jew, and of course there are some Jews who would say I’m not a Jew at all, for that reason. I do go to synagogue regularly on Saturday morning if I am in town, and I try to observe the dietary laws.’

But he feels very strongly that the way judges decide cases, whether civil or criminal, should not be affected by their religion, or by a sense of morality shaped by that religion. ‘That the same laws should be applied in the same way regardless of the identity of the parties or of the judge is a fundamental aspect of the rule of law. But religion affects my personal life and my personal well-being, and I hope it affects my relations with others. But it doesn’t affect my work as such.’

Finally, we return to his career as a fencer. He was selected for the British team at the 1980 Olympics, held in Moscow shortly after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, but he chose not to go. ‘Yes, it was a matter of principle. I was the first reserve for the sabre team and was invited to go to the Games. Of the others, all apart from one decided not to go. At the time, it seemed to me to be entirely the right thing to do. But you look back, with the benefit of hindsight, and see what’s happened in Afghanistan now, and you wonder, was it the right thing to do?’

There is a note of wistfulness in his voice when we discuss this. All other members of the team competed in either an earlier or a later Olympiad, but not Sir Terence. ‘That was my one bite of the cherry and I’m sad I didn’t go, but you can’t look back. I had no doubt about it at the time.’ The fullness of his life in all other respects does, however, seem more than to have made up for it.

‘It takes a lot of courage these days to say one is a believer, but I am a believer.’
IN FEBRUARY THIS YEAR IT WAS ANNOUNCED THAT LORD HODGE WOULD SUCCEED LORD HOPE AS A JUSTICE OF THE UK SUPREME COURT FROM OCTOBER 2013. THIS MAKES HIM ONE OF THE HIGHEST RANKING LAWYERS IN THE LAND. HERE, HE LOOKS BACK ON HIS PATH TO THE SUPREME COURT, STARTING WITH HIS FIRST INTRODUCTION TO CORPUS.

My first contact with Corpus was one of my school masters, John Barry, who had read history at Corpus. He was an excellent history master at Trinity College, Glenalmond, and a very kind man. It was he who nurtured my interest in history and encouraged me to apply to his old College.

When I came up to Cambridge (or should I say down?) from Perthshire for my interview, Christopher Andrew arranged for Stephen Lamport and Neil Westreich to show me round Cambridge before I returned North. I had three happy years in Cambridge between 1972 and 1975. History took up the bulk of my time but I also enjoyed rowing (rather badly) in the Corpus third boat in each of those years and the occasional and unskilled appearance on stage in very minor parts.

Christopher Andrew was an inspiring mentor and has remained a good friend. During my time, Sir Duncan Wilson was Master. He and his wife, Betty enjoyed meeting the younger members of the College. They were very hospitable and welcomed undergraduates, including me, to the Master’s Lodge on many occasions. They were my close friends for the rest of their lives.

After I graduated, I spent three years in the civil service, working on industrial policy, fishery protection and then the first attempt at devolution in the UK. I come from a legal family and had sought to branch out. But when working on fishery protection, I came into contact with the courts and was fascinated by the fact-finding process of adversarial advocacy. I therefore gave up my job, went to Edinburgh University and studied Scots law for two years. I wanted to practise at the Bar. In Scotland legal professional training is not separated from the outset as it is in England and Wales. I therefore trained in a solicitors’ firm before becoming a ‘devil’ (pupil) at the Faculty of Advocates in 1982.
‘I came from a legal family and had sought to branch out.’
I married in early 1983 shortly before I began practice as an advocate. This was not considered financially prudent, but Penny, my wife, and I did not care. We managed to keep our heads above water in the early years and still have three children. Nowadays, George, our oldest son, works for the UN in Armenia, Catriona is a barrister in London and William our youngest is studying pharmacology in Leeds.

I worked as an advocate for 22 years. Because Scotland is a much smaller jurisdiction than England and Wales, an advocate usually covers a much broader area of work than a barrister in London. Over time my practice concentrated on commercial and public law, but I also took part in several large planning inquiries. I worked as the standing junior counsel to the Inland Revenue in Scotland between 1991 and 1996, when I took silk.

‘Marriage was not considered financially prudent but Penny and I did not care.’

I combined practice with various part-time positions. Between 1997 and 2003 I worked as a part-time commissioner at the Scottish Law Commission and worked closely with my English colleagues at the Law Commission in London on proposals to reform company law and partnership law. The former became part of the Company Law Review but the latter have sadly not been implemented. Between 2003 and 2005 I also served as a judge on the Courts of Appeal in Jersey and Guernsey. This enabled me to travel each year for three or four weeks to the Channel Islands. I learned that if you volunteered for a wintry visit in January, the authorities would usually give you a very pleasant week in Guernsey in July, when the weather tends to be excellent. The judges and lawyers of the islands were very hospitable and I had a very happy time also meeting my colleagues who were distinguished members of the English or Northern Irish bars. One, an English QC, was a Welshman. Thus all the parts of the UK were represented on that bench. The laws of the islands were a fascinating combination of the pre-codification customary law of the Duchy of Normandy, the rest of which King John lost in 1204, and English commercial and criminal law.

My other part-time post was as Procurator (legal adviser) to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, which brought me into contact with ecclesiastical law. That post also led several years later to my nomination as the judicial chairman of a special commission on same-sex relationships and the ministry which was
appointed to help defuse a crisis in the Church of Scotland on that vexed issue. I did not foresee in 2000 when I agreed to be procurator that I would be given this hot potato nine years later.

In 2005 I was appointed as a judge of the Court of Session and High Court of Justiciary in Scotland, which is the equivalent of the High Court in London. I spent my first three years as a judge mainly presiding over criminal trials but I also handled civil cases including several significant medical negligence cases. In 2008 I became a judge in the commercial court and have worked there since then. I became senior commercial judge in 2011.

‘Penny and I will maintain our base in Edinburgh.’

In February this year I was appointed a Justice of the UK Supreme Court and will take up office on 1 October. Penny and I will maintain our base in Edinburgh and I will work in London from Monday to Thursday. I have been very lucky in being allowed to rent a small flat in the Middle Temple and so can walk to work, as I often do in Edinburgh.

My regular presence in London will also, I hope, enable me to visit Corpus more frequently than I have when I have been based in the North. I have been very fortunate in maintaining contact with a significant number of my year group. In the last twenty years up to fifteen of us have met regularly in different places in the UK to maintain the friendships that we formed in Corpus. Our wives, who have often come too, have learned to put up with us as a group and have also become good friends. At a recent dinner to remember Tim Richardson, who sadly died last year, a guest from another, much larger, college commented that it was probably very unusual for so many in a year group to keep in contact the way we have. He thought that having been in a small college made it possible. I greatly value that contact and hope it continues.

Further, the people to whom, after my parents, I owe the greatest debt of gratitude for encouraging me as a young student were or are all connected with Corpus: John Barry, Christopher Andrew, and Duncan and Betty Wilson.
ON 11 MAY THIS YEAR ONE OF SCIENCE’S MOST BRILLIANT, INCISIVE AND RESPECTED RESEARCHERS, AND HONORARY FELLOW OF CORPUS, JOE FARMAN, DIED. HERE, ROWENA BERMINGHAM LOOKS BACK AT HIS UNEXPECTED CAREER AND HOW SHEER DOGGED PERSISTENCE ENABLED HIM TO FINALLY PROVE WHAT OTHERS HAD IGNORED; THAT THE OZONE LAYER WAS BEING DESTROYED.

Joe Farman grew up in Hellesdon, in north Norwich, in a bungalow built by his father. His grandfather was a thatcher, his father a builder and his mother a primary school teacher. Born in August 1930 and spending his years camping and cycling around Norfolk landscapes, Farman could hardly have imagined the vast changes that would come about in his lifetime, the amazing scientific discoveries made in the next 80 years, nor his role in them.

Aged just nine when the second world war broke out, Farman was on a camping trip with the scouts when war was declared. They discovered this life-changing news by way of a crystal radio set packed by a scout leader. His father, who had seen active service in the first world war and had been a prisoner of war in Germany, was too old to join up. Instead he became part of the Home Guard, helping as a fire-fighter after the air raids. Norwich was badly hit during the blitz with the Baedeker Raids of April 1942 intended to completely destroy the city. The Luftwaffe dropped 185 bombs, weighing over 50 tons, in just one night.

Despite the war, Farman’s education was not affected. He had been very able at his primary school and had been taken out of ordinary lessons for advanced tuition by the headmaster. After leaving primary school, he started at King Edward VI’s Grammar School (now Norwich School) aged 11 as a day pupil and had mixed success. Although very bright, his mischievous nature meant he was frequently in detention. During one such detention the school was bombed by the Luftwaffe. Farman was instructed to take a sledgehammer to the unstable walls to help secure the school buildings. Despite some early bad behaviour at school, Farman was made a prefect of his school house and showed great prowess at mathematics. He was encouraged to apply to Cambridge and received a scholarship to study at Corpus. He would be following in the footsteps of his older sister who had come across to Cambridge in the early forties to train as a teacher at Homerton. After serving National Service with the Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers in Arborfield, Farman came up to Cambridge in 1950.
Although Farman had dreamed of being a physicist, he had been strongly advised at school not to take physics at university, but to study part II of the maths tripos instead. Having been away from education for 18 months on national service, Farman found the transition to university-level mathematics very difficult in his first year. The next year he chose to study physics as part of the natural science tripos. During his time studying at Cambridge, he was lectured by Sir Hermann Bondi, best known for developing the steady-state theory of the universe along with Sir Fred Hoyle and Thomas Gold. Farman used to go with friends to Trinity College to watch Bondi, Hoyle and Gold send a slinky down the College stairs over and over again as part of an attempt to calculate its motion.

Outside of lectures, Farman played basketball for the University. He also joined the Cambridge University Mountaineering Club (CUMC) when one of his friends pointed out he had a whole bookshelf of books on mountaineering, but had never set foot on a mountain. The experience he had with CUMC and the talks he went to listen to at the Scot Polar Research Institute would greatly shape his journey beyond Cambridge.

His first job after university was at de Havilland Propellers (DHP) in Hatfield, a major aircraft manufacturer. Farman’s work was on designing guided missiles, although he did not mention the specifics of his work to his parents, who had been staunch pacifists since the second world war. In 1956 Farman saw an advertisement in New Scientist to work in Antarctica as part of the Falklands Islands Dependency Survey. Spurred on by his remembrance of talks by the British North Greenland Expedition during his student years, he applied for the role. It took his parents by surprise, but he was sure that if he did not take the opportunity then he would never do it. Farman went on to spend many years researching near the south pole as part of the renamed British Antarctic Survey. In 1957 Farman took his Dobson meter to the Halley research station on the Brunt Ice Shelf and began measuring the ozone layer, not knowing the huge impact this decision would make. At this point scientists had already come to understand the strange duality of ozone: it was both a pollutant when in high concentrations near the ground and also a shield in the upper atmosphere, absorbing the sun’s most dangerous ultraviolet rays. However, nobody had consistently monitored it or had speculated about humanity’s impact on the ozone layer.

Farman left the Antarctic station in 1959, after ensuring that there were scientists who would continue measurements with the Dobson meter, to assume management duties for the survey back in Britain. In the same year he also met Paula Bowyer, an Oxford history graduate and teacher, and they married two years later. After work in the Falklands and Edinburgh, Farman returned to live in Cambridge in 1976, to work at the British Antarctic Survey’s laboratory headquarters.

It was finally proven in 1974 by American scientists Mario Molina and F Sherwood Rowland that chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), used in aerosol spray cans and refrigerators, could destroy the ozone in the upper atmosphere. After this, the United States began scrutinizing the ozone readings already being collected by NASA satellites, but found nothing untoward. Farman’s superiors questioned the necessity of the British Antarctic Survey making ground-level readings when NASA was making satellite readings. When Margaret Thatcher became prime minister in 1980, she demanded spending cuts in every government agency, including in scientific research. Farman was forced to defend his project repeatedly. Those seeking cuts pointed out that the records had not changed in nearly 25 years and that countries like the United States were regulating their use of CFCs more, controlling any potential ozone problem. Farman remained...
firm. He was dealt a great disappointment when Hermann Bondi, a lecturer from his Cambridge days, visited him in the role of head of the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) looking for cuts to make to the British Antarctic Survey. After hearing Farman’s explanation of the importance of his work and his insistence that the readings were valuable as they were the longest continuous record maintained anywhere, Bondi replied: “Oh, you’re making these measurements for posterity are you? Tell me – what has posterity done for you?” However, once the Falklands War started, Farman had a very powerful backer in Margaret Thatcher. Although the British Antarctic Survey had been threatened with reductions and closure, she saved the research establishment. As well as formerly being a chemist, it was also not lost on the prime minister that a research outpost in the Antarctic might have some strategic value for the Falklands war.

A year later, in October 1982 (during the Antarctic spring), Farman collected ozone readings so starkly different from anything seen before that he assumed that his 25-year-old Dobson meter had broken. Farman waited until the next year to check the results. The following October, the Dobson meter seemed to show that almost half the ozone layer had disappeared. These findings were not reflected by NASA, whose satellites had shown nothing unusual. Farman replaced his timeworn Dobson meter with a new one. However, in October 1984 the new Dobson meter was showing even more alarming measurements.

In May 1985 Farman went public with his findings, publishing a paper with Jonathan Shanklin and Brian Gardiner in Nature showing that ozone levels over Antarctica had fallen by around 40 percent between 1975 to 1984. The findings indicated that an ozone hole was not just a theoretical possibility, but a dangerous and life-threatening actuality. Farman explained the chemistry of what was happening, indicating that the hole was the result of reactions triggered by CFCs in the stratosphere. In 1985 a research plane flew through the ozone hole and detected the exact chemical reactions Farman had predicted were happening in the stratospheric clouds over the South Pole. NASA also reviewed its ozone measurements, finding that their satellites had recorded the same decline as Farman’s Dobson meter, but the software on the satellites had rejected these readings as anomalies. It subsequently emerged that NASA had a Dobson meter at the south pole, which had also been registering low ozone levels similar to Farman’s but had not been noticed.

The Environmental Protection Agency estimated that the increased exposure to ultraviolet radiation caused by the depletion of the ozone layer could be responsible for 40 million cases of skin cancer and 800,000 cancer deaths in the United States over the next ninety years. Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher lead the drive for something to be done about CFCs. On September 16 1987, 24 countries signed the Montreal protocol to phase out CFCs and other ozone-damaging chemicals. This agreement has since been ratified by all 197 UN countries. Former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan called the Montreal protocol ‘perhaps the single most successful international agreement to date.’

In 1990 Margaret Thatcher paid tribute to Farman for warning the world of the dangers from the ozone hole and in the same year he retired from the British Antarctic Survey. He had made regular trips to the Antarctic throughout his career, with his final visit in his last year with the Survey. He was traditional in his scientific method and was unimpressed by unnecessary luxuries. During one Antarctic research trip he was walking out to retrieve some instruments when he was taken aback by a helicopter landing nearby and offering him a lift – this sort of extravagance had been simply unthinkable on his first voyages to the Antarctic in the 1950s. At 60 he went on to become a consultant for the European Ozone Research Coordinating Unit, carrying out important meteorological research.

Farman was appointed CBE in the New Year’s honours list in 2000. He was also been honoured with the Polar medal, the Society of Chemical Industry’s Environment Medal, the Chree Medal and Prize, and membership of the United Nations Global 500 Roll of Honour. In 1989 he was elected an Honorary Fellow of Corpus.

Despite the importance of his findings and the honours he received, Farman remained a down-to-earth figure. Fond of pipe-smoking and growing vegetables, he could often be found tending his allotment in Cambridge. His quiet nature belied his passion and determination, so important in his early work, which was sustained throughout his career. His lasting legacy is the healing of the ozone layer. Ozone depletion levelled off in the early 2000s and computer modelling studies suggest full repair of the ozone layer is possible, although it is predicted to occur as late as 2080. Promisingly last year’s ozone levels were the highest seen in a decade. Without Farman’s stalwart determination in the face of bureaucrats, naysayers and budget-cutters, it could have been decades before we realised the impact CFCs were having on the ozone layer. Through his diligence and commitment to maintaining scientific records, Farman has undoubtedly helped save millions of lives and prevent catastrophic environmental damage.
Professors in Italy typically spent literally hundreds of hours lecturing a course, and hundreds more in viva examinations of individual students for each course. This meant that a lot of information could be exchanged, and there was ample time to learn. We did not have anything like Cambridge’s organised small group supervisions, and we assembled ourselves into study groups. The downside of the Italian education was that we were required to work more on standard proofs, and less on original problem solving. The course was physics, and it followed a traditional syllabus, rather than the broader and more open natural science system I discovered here in Cambridge.

When it was time to specialise and choose a research project in Italy, I was lucky to be taken in by a very talented duo of experimentalists, Marzio Giglio and his younger colleague Alberto Vailati. I learnt a lot from them about optics and fluids experiments, and this was key to securing a PhD studentship in Cambridge.

I arrived in the physics department (the Cavendish Laboratory) in January 2000, as only the second graduate student of Ian Hopkinson, and part of a larger group of researchers working on polymers and colloids. What hits a foreign student first is probably the spoken language: I found myself saying ‘yes’ to people, meaning that I had understood and translated in my head most of their words, and it took me a while to realise that the other person thought I had understood the physics as well. So began a gradual adaptation to the Cambridge system, learning to communicate and to operate in a state of the art and fast moving research environment. Since then I’ve moved my own lab between three buildings, and my office half a

I GREW UP IN MILAN, ITALY, THE CITY WHERE I ALSO WENT TO UNIVERSITY READING PHYSICS. I HAD GREATLY ENJOYED THE UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING THERE, WHICH I LATER DISCOVERED TO BE COMPLETELY OPPOSITE TO THE CAMBRIDGE WAY OF DOING THINGS.
dozen times... this just reflects the pressure on space, and the pace of restructuring and building new research facilities. The number of world class leaders who pass through Cambridge, for short or long periods, is amazing: you feel like you can stand on the bank of the river and today’s science leaders will stroll past you! Anyway, as a graduate student life was really good: I had a lot of freedom to plan experiments and decide what was interesting to me, coupled with a lot of experts on whom I could rely for advice. I had almost unlimited funding to attend the best conferences around the world. This gave me the confidence to study new systems, and a general sense of ambition which I think is very important in research.

The work I did during my PhD is on a topic called Soft Matter Physics; it deals with understanding soft materials, such as foams, emulsions, rubber, soap, pastes, paints and sand... it is not what many people would think of as core physics, and indeed it involves elements of chemistry and chemical engineering. However, a great French physicist, de Gennes, did win by himself the Nobel prize for Physics in 1991, for his significant insights into these apparently ‘messy’ materials. Another great pioneer, Sam Edwards, had developed the foundations of polymer physics and I was fortunate to see him still very active in the Cavendish. As a soft matter scientist, this was definitely one of the top places to be!

Personally, I studied the mechanics of liquid surfaces, and the properties of protein films such as would form on the interface between water and oil phases in many food systems. As a research field, Soft Matter Physics has now matured, and today a lot of the fundamental physics is well established and the subject of textbooks. However, biology also contains numerous interfaces, in the form of lipid membranes, which define the interior of cells from the outside, and also make up various sub-cellular structures. These interfaces are way more complex both in composition and structure compared to typical artificial ones. It felt natural to gravitate towards those more complex systems after my PhD, and so began my interest in the physics/biology interdisciplinary area.

I was very lucky in that during this last decade there was a great expansion and shift of the Soft Matter community towards biology, and there were jobs (post-docs and research fellowships) to keep me going: with the emphasis in biology ever more strongly on the genome, and then on post-genomic questions, physicists saw that many interesting aspects were not receiving much attention. For example, the way in which cells adhere to materials, and move; the mechanisms by which they sense forces, and respond by restructuring their architecture; how the uptake of objects is regulated by the cell membrane; how the DNA and proteins, which are polymer-like molecules, pack and assemble... These were the type of problems that the first wave of soft matter trained physicists thought they could tackle. There was some success, although the last decade has also taught us all how complicated even a single biological living cell is, and how many things we still don’t know. I think the current generation of physicists who get curious about biology are more aware of its great complexity, and generally they choose to work in collaboration with
biologists. Not least because the tools available to biologists are amazing, and completely complementary to the instruments and techniques one has from physics. Cell biologists too now realise they have challenges and datasets that are ready for a physics toolkit to be deployed, and many of them initiate collaborations with the physicists or other quantitative people.

Life as an academic in science is quite different from the romantic notion of a lone scientist working for years in the lab chasing a discovery, and equally quite different to the ultrafast discovery process often portrayed in popular TV shows. The reality is a complex web of interactions and contributions, with more experienced researchers (post-docs, and PhD students) mixing with final year or summer project students, visiting academics, collaborators who appear briefly but may share key insights or materials... many projects running in parallel, progressing and stalling, with each person having to account for their time by publishing reports and papers. The more experienced people don’t have time to work directly in the lab, and train the others in order to get things done. Outcome trained researchers help produce a stream of papers, each of which is sent to a peer-review journal of appropriate standing in the field. The whole process has quite significant cost implications: consumables and equipment are quite expensive, but the main costs are in personnel. My own group of a dozen people costs several hundred thousand pounds just in salary costs per year. All these funds need to be won, usually in competition with other dynamic colleagues. So, as well as timely and innovative scientific ideas and research skills, being a scientist today means managing the finance and planning the survival of a small business unit.

As a young academic you start with finding your first student, and the first research grant. This is like starting up a new company, looking for venture capital and defining the key products which can succeed in the market. Like a company, you also have to attract the right people internationally, make a healthy working environment, and keep all the stakeholders happy, every action taking place in a competitive environment where all the key resources are very limited. This certainly keeps us all busy, and as time goes on after the start-up phase the challenges of maintaining a research group change a bit, but certainly do not go away. I don’t know if this system I’m describing is the best to allocate funding in science research: it puts a lot of pressure on people (which is common in most jobs, and might be needed!) but a lot of time and effort which could be used otherwise are wasted in looking for funds, and it does not fit everyone’s attitude equally well, so that sometimes very talented people are driven away.

Even in this context of broad teamwork (my own area is one where the teams that focus on a particular project are fairly small, and experiments managed by two or three people - other sectors of science can require tens or hundreds of people to work together) the motivations and aims in research are...
probably the same as have always driven scientists: the buzz of discovery, the satisfaction of having understood something for the first time, the sensation of doing something useful to all and with long term value.

My students, post-docs and I are interested in a wide range of questions: the main themes are now biologically motivated, involving a physics toolset at both the experimental and analysis level. Some of our projects are led internally, for example we develop model systems to understand the synchronisation of motile cilia (these are essential to life, they move the fluids in our brains and airways), and we study the thermodynamics and mechanics of phospholipid membranes. Maybe one day we will make interesting new materials based on these lipids. Other projects are much more collaborative and closer to mainstream biology, and these include: studying the conformation of the bacterial DNA, and the role of its compaction in the global regulation of gene expression; imaging and quantifying host-pathogen interactions at the single cell level, particularly malaria and bacterial pathogens; automated imaging of cell culture, with segmentation and quantification of fluorescence in reporter cells; understanding how to grow single cell algae (these are possible biofuels) optimally. These projects bring together expertise in soft matter physics, with imaging, instrumentation development, microfluidics lab-on-chip design, and a systems biology approach. Take a look at our website if you are interested in knowing more. The biology questions are really hard to answer, and sometimes it’s even hard to pose the right question – but the relevance of these things to the quality of life of all of us is undeniable, as is the challenge to work on a difficult puzzle.

Being a College Fellow has helped me tremendously, at many levels. I joined Corpus about seven years ago, when I was appointed as a Lecturer in my department, and since then I have taken part in the College’s physics teaching, with Mark Warner and Michael Sutherland as invaluable colleagues. Teaching exceptionally gifted students is a great experience, and a challenge too to stay ahead and have something to say that they don’t know already! The results and feedback from recent years seem to imply that as a College we are doing a good job. I see a great atmosphere amongst the undergraduates, but I don’t know if they realise that the College is equally a place where the Fellows meet, become friends, and sometimes start off joint research projects. For example, we are working now with Alison Smith in Plant Sciences, and this kicked off by chance over cheese and biscuits after dinner. Especially when one’s research interests cross the boundaries of traditional disciplines, a community like we have in our College is a tremendous resource. Corpus is also the place where I can escape when I need a quiet hour to think or to write. There we are now, it’s time to send this off, take a look down at New Court and the Porters’ Lodge from my large window next to the Chapel, and find my gown – dinner in Hall today!
Dr Nicholas Chen
Microsoft Research Fellow

I moved to Cambridge in September 2012 to start as a post-doctoral researcher at Microsoft Research (MSR) after getting my PhD from the University of Maryland earlier in the year. In October I joined Corpus as the fourth Microsoft Research Fellow.

The Microsoft Research Fellowship is a unique partnership between Corpus and the Computer Mediated Living (CML) research group at Microsoft Research Cambridge. Under the arrangement, one of the post-doctoral researchers at MSR also serves as a Fellow at Corpus during the two year duration of the position. In this way, post-doctoral researchers can conduct their research with experts at Microsoft while also having the experience of being a member of a College.

My decision to work at MSR came about because I was undecided about whether I wanted to begin working in academic or industrial research. Academia has the allure of allowing one to pursue topics of personal interest and the opportunity of interacting with students, whereas industry offers significant resources for projects that would not otherwise be possible and a more direct path for an idea to make real impact as a product. MSR offers a mix between those two options. What many people do not realize is that Microsoft Research (MSR) is separate from the product research groups that work on new versions of Microsoft's products. With its focus on longer-range projects, the research environment at MSR is quite open. Therefore, in contrast to most other industry labs, researchers at MSR have considerable freedom to choose what they work on, can work with external collaborators, and are encouraged to publish. As a result, the culture is quite similar to that of research labs on a University campus.

MSR has labs around the world but picking the one in Cambridge was easy. The city made a fantastic first impression when I spent a summer here as an intern with MSR in 2008. I marveled at the beautiful architecture with its incredible history. I travelled and discovered the UK. Cycling to work in West Cambridge (where MSR was previously located before its recent move near Cambridge train station) every day got me into the best shape I've been in my life. I also recall the weather being warm and sunny the entire 3 months I was here (but the weather this year is leading me to question the accuracy of my memory).

More importantly, the (CML) research group at MSR Cambridge is, by far, the best aligned with my own research interests. The focus of my research is in creating devices that better support the reading and writing tasks in academic and work related settings. That I work on the future of reading and writing while being at a College holding some of the oldest manuscripts in the world is certainly an interesting coincidence.

This study of the interplay between computers and their users comprises an area of study in Computer Science known as Human-Computer Interaction (HCI). As computers have evolved from machines for performing arithmetic operations quickly into ubiquitous tools that are used for all sorts of tasks, the role of HCI in computing has increased. What makes CML a particularly compelling place to do HCI research is that it is one of the few places that has the broad expertise required to adopt a comprehensive approach to HCI. This approach starts from identifying existing problems in order to inform design, developing new technology in the form of hardware devices and software interfaces, and then evaluating and understanding the broader implications of this new technology. Creating solutions that support how people read and write, which are complex tasks that are deeply embedded in a variety of daily activities, exemplifies the need for this comprehensive approach.

For many years, improved computer technology has led to repeated predictions of the ‘paperless office’. But even today, where the majority of the documents used in the workplace are stored and transmitted electronically, it is still quite common for people to go through the trouble of printing these documents to read or edit them. Usually, when I describe this phenomenon, the people I tell this to will attribute their own propensity for printing to "being old-fashioned" instead of realizing that their choice stems from the inadequacies of the computer system.

The reason for this is that we are often conditioned to believe that new technology represents, by default, a better way of working. Dr Abigail Sellen and Dr Richard Harper, who are both researchers at MSR Cambridge (and both of whom I am excited to finally be working with in person), were the first to study paper use in detail. Their findings, presented in their book The Myth of the Paperless Office, explain that computer systems often fall short in their goal of replacing paper because designers of the technologies failed to consider all of the ways in which these technologies are used.
‘MSR has labs around the world but picking the one in Cambridge was easy.’
In the case of reading, there are several benefits of paper that computers have thus far not yet been able to match. These benefits include the fact that paper is thin and light, allowing a reader to easily grasp and reposition the paper document. Reading, it turns out, is a very physical activity and the added mobility greatly enhances engagement. Also, each sheet of paper behaves as an independent display, allowing the reader to look at several things at once and to flip quickly between different parts of a document. This rapid-fire navigation generally does not manifest itself when people read a novel for pleasure, but it becomes critical when analyzing literature or understanding a research article. Existing reading devices, which generally feature a single screen, cannot replicate that functionality. Finally, the ability to write on paper documents offers a fast and fluid way to record notes, and reading with a pen in hand also helps maintain focus. Once these problems became clear, I tested the hypothesis that multiple thin and light tablets that one could write on would improve the electronic reading experience. Graduate students working on their PhD theses who tested the devices validated this hypothesis.

Reading devices

My most recent project is focused on studying and supporting the review and revision process when people write collaboratively. The impetus to explore this area came from graduate students I worked with when developing the reading devices. The students suggested that the devices might be adapted to become a more efficient way to supply feedback to their collaborators’ writing. My interest in the area is also fueled by my own frustrations with commenting and change tracking tools in existing software when authoring papers with distant collaborators. To support these writing activities I am exploring ways for collaborators to more easily convey their intents and for authors to efficiently incorporate (or remove) edits. Since I am still gathering data points about how people write together, members of College may notice that I take a peculiar interest in the process with which they conduct their scholarly activities.

Although the majority of my time is spent at Microsoft, being a Fellow at Corpus is contributing a tremendous breadth to my Cambridge experience. The aspect of being a member of College that I appreciate most is the exposure I have to subjects that I would otherwise not encounter. I have always appreciated gaining a broader perspective about the world. When I was an undergraduate, I would find and attend interesting history classes as a diversion from the required computer science and electrical engineering coursework. I ended up doing this on a regular enough basis that I ended up with an unplanned degree in history. Thus, dining at the College has been particularly
rewarding. I can honestly say I have learned at least one compelling new nugget of knowledge from every single High Table I have attended.

Taking part in College activities has also been fascinating. The formality and tradition are things that I rarely get to experience in the US. I think these experiences will make for my best stories about my time in Cambridge. When I share photos from these events they are consistently the ones that evoke the loudest response from friends. I must admit that participating in these functions for the first time has also been a complex exercise in observation and emulation. Therefore, I am looking forward to the second time around for each activity, when things will hopefully feel more familiar.

One of the more eye-opening experiences I have had so far has been discovering the dissimilarities between the US and UK academic systems, both at Cambridge, which I knew was quite distinctive, but also at the secondary school level. I never realized how great the differences were until I volunteered to do admissions interviews and needed to get a crash course on the subject. I suppose the educational system was one of those topics where I never probed more deeply because I never suspected it could be that different. The thing that struck me most was how sure students were about the subjects they wanted to study in university. This attitude is in sharp contrast to that of students in the US, who see university as a time to find their calling. For instance, although I was reasonably sure that I wanted to pursue a degree in computer science when I entered, I still entertained thoughts of applying to law school until my final year. At the end of all of the interviews, I felt a sense of relief that I was not the one being interviewed; I suspect I would not have been as passionate about my intended subject as were these applicants.

One thing I have made a point of doing during my stay in Cambridge is to travel to as much of Europe as possible -- something I did not have a chance to do the last time I was here. For someone from California, where one can travel for hours and still remain in the same State, being in Europe is a revelatory experience. My wife and I visited Spain for some much needed sun last winter. We found it especially comical that the sun vanished the moment we crossed into Gibraltar, however, almost as if a cloud had been imported for the express purpose of creating a better facsimile of Britain. We travelled to France in May and we are currently making plans to visit Iceland and Italy.

My personal goal as a Fellow is to be an ambassador between the College and Microsoft. I find myself in the unique position of being at the intersection of these two groups and I believe there is an opportunity for me to help bring them closer. When I was an intern, the Microsoft Research Fellow at the time would bring some of us to the College so that we could see this exclusive aspect of the Cambridge experience. This is a practice I am eager to continue. Although I am less sure about how my research activities connect to the College, I envision making the technologies I work with accessible to those at the College in the form of a workshop or visit to my lab.

I attribute a considerable part of my decision to pursue a PhD to a trip I took to Vienna where I attended my first academic conference. I realized then that the thrills of traveling to an exotic locale, discovering new ideas, and meeting people from around the world were things that I wanted to keep experiencing. In traveling to Cambridge and becoming a Fellow at Corpus, I now get all three beyond my loftiest expectations. I cannot wait to see what the remainder of my Fellowship holds.
A View from the Plodge

by Henry Vane (m2009)

THE PORTERS MAY WELL BE THE FIRST FACES YOU SEE WHEN YOU FIRST ARRIVE AT CORPUS, AND THE LAST ONES TO WAVE YOU OFF WHEN YOU GRADUATE. HENRY VANE, A RECENT GRADUATE HIMSELF, TAKES A LOOK AT WHAT GOES ON IN THE PLODGE AND TALKS TO SOME OF THE PORTERS ABOUT WHAT THE JOB REALLY ENTAILS.
Among the Fellows, students and staff at Corpus is a wide range of interests and personalities. Each member of the College is there for a different reason and might stay for six months or sixty years. Despite this diversity and fluidity, Corpus remains strikingly cohesive. ‘Close-knit’ and ‘friendly’ are terms often used to describe the College. A pervasive ‘sense of community’ is a defining characteristic and major selling-point. Yet ‘community’ is a slippery abstraction unless grounded in identifiable people, places and values. In my experience, one group is particularly important in uniting the College’s diverse membership – the porters.

Unique among the various different subdivisions of College life, the porters have regular personal contact with almost everyone. What is more, they tend to stay in the job for a long time. Remarkably, this is the first year since 2004 (when Head Porter Rob Taylor started) that there have been new porters in College. A few have left and not been replaced but the longevity is mostly down to the loyalty and job satisfaction among the close-knit team of eight. This year, there were two new recruits, ex-policeman John Moran and, a mere thirty years after admitting the first female undergraduates, there is now a female porter, Kay Starling.

Literal and metaphorical gatekeepers, there are few areas of College life in which the porters are not somehow involved. Yet, though the porters can appear timeless, the job has changed in the last decade, says Rob. ‘The porter’s role used to be a security guard and miserable old sod. Now there is more of a customer focus. It’s about measuring people. There are people who like the solemn approach and the people who like a friendlier open manner.’

Deputy Head Porter, Graham Pink agrees: ‘You’re never quite sure who you’re dealing with so we try to be polite to everyone.’ Last year a Japanese gentleman and his wife came into the lodge, indistinguishable from the hordes that flock to the College. He turned out to be a top law professor from the University of Tokyo. Word made its way back that the professor was grateful for the assistance he received from the porters, oblivious to his position.

For some people, friendly assistance is not enough. It is more common than you might think for a sheepish-looking guest to return to the lodge with their suitcase, two hours after being handed a map and directed to Botolph.

Though Corpus was, according to Rob, built as a fortress to repel the peasants during the Peasants Revolt, it is actually a very open College. Founded by the townsfolk, the Fellowship feels that the outside world should continue to be welcomed. At one stage, against the porters’ advice, it was decreed there should be no restrictions on who was allowed in. This policy swiftly ended when the Master was unable to work on account of the noise. Going outside to ask the boisterous guests to keep it down he was roundly ignored. The moral of this story is, of course, the porters know best. Even though things have tightened up slightly, Corpus remains one of Cambridge’s most accessible Colleges. Unlike St Catharine’s across the road, for instance, where the gate is almost invariably shut, the main door of Corpus is open every day. Quantifying the benefits of this hospitality is impossible, but the risks, both in terms of security and general inconvenience, are a constant concern.

Inevitably, breaches occur. College silver was recently stolen from the chapel, though fortunately it was not the precious Parker silver. A few years before, a thief was let into the old Butler library after simply knocking on the door and proceeded to sweep up wallets and laptops when students headed for Hall. Exasperated, Rob asked why someone let him in in the first place. ‘He was really good looking’ replied a tearful girl, no longer in possession of her purse.

Happily, the College’s most valuable asset, the Parker Library, is now secure since the construction of the fireproof vault. The porters have more reason than most to be grateful for this. Previously, in a case of fire, the official directive was for them to rush into the inferno and save the books by throwing them out the window. Unhelpfully, the most valuable books were stored furthest away from the door. As porter Paul Lister observes drily, ‘that was never going to happen. Nobody in their right mind would do that.’

Faced with instructions like this, the porters could sometimes be forgiven for thinking they have a monopoly on common sense in an institution dominated by extravagant characters, arcane rituals and disparate interests. As individuals and collectively, they see us at our best, worst and most eccentric. The welcome sign in the main gate was recently severely bent after a student, presumably intoxicated, pretended to be a bull and charged at it wielding a chair above his head. A porter needs to be prepared for anything, from confiscating a longbow (‘taller than me’ Rob recalls) to helping wedding guests, to persuading a desperate student that not doing as well as she hoped in her finals was no reason to throw herself off the battlements. Ultimately, the most important job of a porter, Rob explains, is ‘to deal with a crisis without going to pieces.’

There have been numerous characters in the lodge over the years, such as Mr Cooper in the 1970s who claimed not to have slept a wink since the Second World War. What is more, he had no feeling in his body and would amuse students by stubbing out cigarettes on his hands.
Most famous of all though is Albert Jaggard, supposed model for Skullion in Tom Sharpe’s Porterhouse Blue.

‘There is an afterlife here, no doubt about it. How can a place with all this history not have one?’

Old Member Tom Utley recalls a dressing-down from Jaggard at 3.30 am, having stirred the great man from his bed in order to be let back into College (at civilized hours the two got on well). Ordinarily, Utley would have scaled the rooftops but a few nights earlier a friend had crashed through the Master’s conservatory narrowly avoiding serious injury in a shower of blood and glass. Utley’s nerve failed him and he decided to face the wrath of Jaggard, who had known and admired his father, also a Corpus man. ‘Do you know what your father was, sir?’ asked Jaggard. ‘He was a gentleman, sir. And do you know what you are, sir? You’re a prat, sir.’ ‘Prat’ may not have been the word that he used… In a subsequent telling-off, Jaggard drew on the same theme; ‘When your father was here, sir, I was his boot-boy, sir. And do you know, sir, I was always proud to polish your father’s boots, sir. As for you, sir, you’re not fit to kiss my boots, sir. I wouldn’t let you if you begged me, sir.’

It is not just the human members of College that need looking after. Corpus has become home to a brood of particularly demanding ducklings. Every year, they take up residence in the Master’s garden and need to be escorted by a porter out of the garden, down Free School Lane, into the Bursar’s Garden, through New Court and across Trumpington Street where the St Catharine’s porters and then the Queens’ porters take over the responsibility of getting them to the river. This job is taken very seriously, Rob explains: ‘One time the Catz weekend porter refused to open their main gate. So I went to have a go at Dom (the Catz head porter) and said “That’s not on Dom. They’ve got to do it, they’ve got to let them through.” Dom said “I’ll have a word” and from then on there was no trouble.’

There are members who even the porters cannot explain and control though. ‘Obviously the lads here take the mickey out of me but I’ve seen what I’ve seen’ says porter Lee Peters, resident ghost expert. ‘Things have happened here that are not explainable.’ He recalls locking up in Hall when an orb of light appeared, hovering at his shoulder. Something similar happened when locking up the Parker Library too. He has also heard reports of a ghost of an old lady in N staircase, Old Court. ‘There is an afterlife here, no doubt about it,’ says Lee. ‘How can a place with all this history not have one?’

‘Obviously the lads here take the mickey out of me but I’ve seen what I’ve seen.’

Two weeks into her job, Kay Starling, Corpus’ first female porter, has not yet come into contact with any of the College’s afterlife and seems to be doing well. She is completely unphased about being the first woman; ‘It’s stranger for other people than for me’ she shrugs. Formerly a gardener at Fitzwilliam College, she has had a baptism of (literal) fire after successfully dealing with some cereal boxes which caught alight after being left on a hob during her first few days. The highlight of her job so far...
has been being on duty when the Augustine Bible, dating back to 597 AD, was whisked away early one morning by the Master and Fellow Librarian in an armoured van for the Archbishop of Canterbury’s enthronement.

Kay’s appointment illustrates how the porters, seemingly unchanging, are quietly evolving from old-fashioned gatekeepers to twenty-first-century customer service professionals. The lodge serves many functions; reception, tourist information centre, police station, post office, shop, liquor store (you can buy College port there, but it is cheaper in the bar) and home to literally thousands of keys. The porters deserve our admiration for performing such varied roles with good humour, professionalism and most importantly, discretion. For all the many tales they recount, they have seen and heard far more than they would ever disclose. ‘I can’t know everything’ admits Rob, ‘but I now know how to find it out fairly quickly. Just give me time.’