

Experience of Human Resource Mis-Management at Linnæus University

I have been accused of corruption, racism and slander by two colleagues, X and Y in 2011. The staff department of the university (SD) started immediately inquiries concerning the accusations. Today two of these inquiries are still in process. I have experienced the dark side of Swedish society, where the perpetrator have the rights, the care and the attention, while the victim is left with the disgrace of being accused for terrible crimes.

Corruption: In September 2011 Y reported me for corruption to the university and to the Swedish Parliamentary Ombudsman. What I did was to rank Y's dissertation second, after another person's dissertation for potential research funding. The other person's supervisor was my former supervisor 1990. The university decided to start an inquiry. Y demanded, and was given, according to the constitutional law, the right to inspect all my e-mails concerning the ranking made from the university server. Y filed a complaint to the Administrative Court and to the Administrative Court of Appeal. Both courts rejected the complaint. 9 October, a private law firm found no corruption but made the recommendation that Y should be given a warning for misconduct. 11 October, the Ombudsman found no corruption. 11 November the university decided that there was no reasons for action. I asked the university to not make any action against Y since I thought that Y's action were a symptom of 'post-defence stress reaction'. SD thanked me for that opinion. They did not, however, inform me that Y's behaviour probably not due to any stress, but that it was rather normal for Y, having a history of reports against this and that.

Racism: 10 October 2011 I reported X, in a document containing 30 pages of evidence, for handing in a travelling expenses account that contained false statements and that represented an effort of receiving money without any ground. 13 October X reported me for the SD, and according to SDs interpretation, it was an accusation of racism. The university decided to start an inquiry. X also send out an e-mail to all employees at the business school where he claimed that my behaviour were indication of racism. 2 February I sent an e-mail to all employees telling them my story since I felt a need to fight for my honour. 10 February the SD told me that my report about X's false expense account was closed without any action since they and the Dean could not find any irregularities in the account. 9 March I was interrogated by a private HRM firm about my actions and behaviour. 3 April I was interrogated by two lawyers. 31 May, the private firm could not find my action motivated by racism.

Slander: 24 February I was informed by SD that Y has reported me for slander and that SD's started an inquiry. The action Y referred to were a text I wrote in an e-mail to X about Y's dissertation, that I would not have passed that dissertation and with my arguments for my judgement.

Today, 13 of June, I am still subject to at least two inquiries by the university concerning racism and slander. I have been exposed for the accusation of being a racist in 247 days and for making slander in 110 days. It is X and Y and SD and the Dean of the Business School that are responsible for this. For me, it represent grave misconduct by X and Y, and mismanagement by SD and the Dean.

I find it unacceptable to be subject of accusations of this magnitude. For me, for my political opinion, and for my professional honour, it is a disgrace that people, and more important, a university finds reasons to expose me for accusations of these magnitudes. A rational

organization, taking care of their employees and their reputation, would make an inquiry within one week, finding out that the accusations were absurd, unfounded and false. And then one more week to find out the proper actions against Y and X. Due to their repetitious misconduct and to the bad working environment their behaviour creates, they should be asked to leave the organization.

Today I am more informed, knowing that both X and Y has a tradition of making accusations. And the management of the school and SD has a long tradition of not performing any action against their misconduct. Once one Dean tried to perform action against X, but failed, and as the story goes, due to the Rector refusing to take action since he was afraid of accusations of racism. The Dean left the assignment.

I am writing X and Y, because in this absurd system, my name can be put in public as a racist and corrupted and performing slander. But those that make accusations have the right of anonymity. I have no right to present their names here. They, the perpetrators of false accusations, have the right of anonymity! If they believed in their actions, they should be proud of their actions and they should demand to be mentioned by their names. I am proud of my actions, of the ranking and the report about the false expense account. I do not mind of being mentioned since I think that my actions are morally correct. It is even so absurd that I do not have the right to present the public documents at my webb that shows all the correspondence and all documents in this story. Every citizen has the right to ask for the documents at the university, but I have not the right to present them at my webb.

It is absurd that I, that have ranked two persons, found false statement in an expense report, and that motivated my ranking judgement, should be exposed to these Kafka processes, while the perpetrators and the managers that cannot manage these processes can sit comfortable on their chairs. It is my name, my professional name that is at risk. And the university does not care. They care about the perpetrators of false accusations. This is Sweden as its worst.

Finally, I have to stress that I do not mind debate. I do not want to create a silent organization. On the contrary. I am the one in these processes that make the most public statements and try to debate publicly the issue. But from X and especially from Y I get 'recommendations' to be silent. I do not mind a debate. But it should be based on respect and not false accusations about absurdities such as corruption, slander and racism. That is not debate. That is misconduct. Grave misconduct.

Öllsjö 13 of June 2012

Sven-Olof Collin