



*The University of Western Australia*

Vice-Chancellor  
Professor R. Street, FAA

Office of the Vice-Chancellor  
Nedlands, Western Australia 6009  
Telegrams Uniwest Perth, Telex AA92992  
Telephone (09) 380 2801

Our ref: 701998/4

11 February, 1981.

Dr. M.E. Spautz,  
31 Scott Street, Flat 16,  
NEWCASTLE, N.S.W. 2300.

*(Received 16 Feb)*

Dear Dr. Spautz,

*11 Feb '81*

Thank you for your letters of 21 December, 1980 and 25 January, 1981.

I have reviewed the matter you raised. In doing so I note that the thesis presented by A.J. Williams was independently examined by three respected examiners external to this University, who were appointed by the Ph.D. Committee, and I accept the judgement and integrity of the examiners and committee concerned.

*(Received 16 Feb)*

Yours sincerely,

*R. Street*

R. STREET

16 February, 1981(a)

Prof. R. Street, Vice-Chancellor  
University of Western Australia  
Nedlands, W.A. 6009

CERTIFIED MAIL

Dear Prof. Street,

Your letter of 11 Feb (the body of which is appended below for the benefit of other readers) arrived yesterday. From its cautiously evasive wording I gather that you have left open the possibility of a proper investigation of my charges that Williams appeared to have violated several of your University's General Regulations and Statutes in preparing his thesis. Therefore, I am enclosing for your further information a copy of each of the following:

1. Evidence of extensive plagiarism (concerning which Don George himself admitted that "there may be room for debate"--see para 39 of doc. C.109:79);
2. A critique of the thesis, dated 18 May 79 (concerning which the Carter committee admitted that I "may have a serious contribution to make"--see p.3 of doc. C.128:79; also supported by the testimony of Prof. W. O'Neil and Dr. M. Tippett during the Kirby hearings);
3. An essay, dated 1 Feb 81(a), entitled "How I Got Railroaded ... (etc.)" (which I prepared especially for international circulation);
4. A collection of newsclippings in re my alleged dismissal, which prove that justice has not been seen to be done.

I suspect that your failure to call for a proper investigation of my charges will be seen by the world academic community as in effect an endorsement of the following questionable propositions:

- a. That the judgment of thesis examiners and committees is beyond question.
- b. That the integrity of thesis examiners and committees is beyond question.
- c. That a V-C's "acceptance" of their judgment & integrity is reasonable and sufficient grounds for evading his responsibilities (which in this case are both legal and ethical).
- d. That a person (or is it only a Professor?) who manages to get a fraudulent thesis past his examiners is henceforth immune to criticism, prosecution, and adverse repercussions.
- e. That anyone who dares to press for a proper investigation of such charges, even if there is a solid prima facie case, deserves to be dismissed;
- f. That you have little regard for the traditional academic values, which surely include academic freedom, freedom of expression, search for truth & justice, personal and intellectual integrity, and the obligation to expose and oppose incompetence and corruption in the interest of public welfare;
- g. That you subscribe to the professorial "close ranks" pseudo-ethic, irrespective of the particular merits and of the evidence offered in support of the charges;
- h. That you at least tolerate, if not actively support, a form of totalitarianism, in which individual rights and the rule of law are practically meaningless ideals (at least when the interests of powerful people like yourself are threatened).

Would it be expecting too much to ask you to take a firm stand on these matters, by letting me know definitely, one way or another, whether you intend to call for a proper investigation of my proven allegations?

cc: Bill Grayden, Don George, Al Williams, Selected  
Media Editors, & Selected Others

Yours truly,  
*M. E. Spautz*  
M.E. Spautz, Ph.D., Senior Lecturer  
in Management Studies

*rel over*