

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE

Memorandum to : Members of Council.
Subject : Dispute in the Department of Commerce.

At the meeting of Council on 17 August, 1979, more than one member of Council commented on copies of letters received from Dr. M. E. Spautz, Senior Lecturer in Commerce. Others apparently had not received this correspondence, or a copy of my letter to Dr. Spautz on 13 August, 1979 which I had circulated by mail to members of Council. Since then, much more correspondence has been circulated by Dr. Spautz, and the Chancellor has sent a memorandum dated 19 September, 1979 to members of Council.

It is not proposed to attach to this memorandum copies of this voluminous correspondence. However to ensure that relevant information is available to members of Council, I list in attachment A the correspondence between Dr. Spautz and myself. There are other papers on file such as the documents circulated to members of Council by Dr. Spautz. Any member of Council is welcome to study this file before (or after) the meeting of Council on 19 October, 1979 - the file is in my office.

3. I direct attention to the fact that some correspondence on file is marked "personal and confidential". Now that the matter is before Council, however, it is my opinion that access to all relevant material should be available to members of Council who wish to see it, but on the above understanding of course.

HISTORY :

4. It is difficult to attempt a summary in a few pages only of a matter as complex and difficult as that presently before the Council, and which has occupied so many hours of staff time throughout 1979. However, from the information available to me I offer the following abridged version of events. = selective & biased

5. Dr. Spautz was appointed a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Commerce in August, 1973 from the U.S.A., (without interview).

Professor Williams was offered appointment to the Chair of Commerce by the Council at its meeting on 16 July, 1976 (Report of Selection Committee, paper C46:76) and took up duty in January, 1977. The Selection Committee met in March, 1975 but declined to make a recommendation - instead the Chair was re-advertised. Dr. Spautz was an applicant on the first occasion and was interviewed by the Committee. Professor Williams was an applicant on the second occasion and was interviewed by the Committee when it met again.

7. I am unaware of any difficulties between Dr. Spautz and Professor Williams during most of the first two years of Professor Williams' appointment to Newcastle. And there were none - until Sep. 78

8. On 21 November, 1978, Professor Jager, Head of the Department of Commerce, advised me of internal arrangements which had been made for his Department to function in two sections, with Professor Williams to head the Management Section and Professor Winsen and himself to jointly head the Accounting and Finance Section. Although Departmental statutes make no provision for "Sections" (and I pointed out to Professor Jager his residual responsibility to Council as Head of Department) the arrangements were not objected to and the usual financial delegations were given to Professor Williams by Council on 19 January, 1979 (paper FP.9:79).

Note oversight (?) of Section 23 proscription of sub-delegation!

* afterwards Jager said that I should not have admitted that one of my manuscripts had been rejected [by a top journal in America]!

Probably these are Williams' secret letters, some of which are so marked - which means that George was publishing false defamations as early as Oct 79

Actually, I first applied in 1974 (before George arrived) & finished second. The winner had to decline because his father had died & he had to stay in England for his mother's sake.

9. The relevance of the above information is that by 13 December, 1978, Dr. Spautz had written to Professor Williams demanding that if he didn't "immediately stand down as Head of the Management Section", he (Dr. Spautz) intended to call a meeting of other Section members "to present my case for a vote of no confidence in your leadership".

10. It transpired that ^{an aborted + slandering*} a meeting of the staff forming the Management Section had been held as early as 1 November, 1978. A handwritten file memorandum of that date, addressed to Professor Williams from staff in the Management Section, records that "this inaugural administration meeting of the management division (sic) of the Department of Commerce expresses its unreserved and enthusiastic support for its first head, Professor A. Williams and wishes him (well) in his endeavours in his first term. We offer our full co-operation to assist him in this task. In dissent - Dr. M. E. Spautz". (Dr. Spautz's initials appear against his name).

yes - that I couldn't accept illegitimate sub-delegations!

11. On 13 February, 1979, Dr. Spautz visited me (at his request) and my file notes of this discussion record his extremely strong views and his intentions in respect of Professor Williams' future role in the University. He sought a meeting of ~~Professor Jager~~, Professor Williams, himself and myself to which, of course, I agreed. The meeting was held in my office on 5 March, 1979 as soon as Professor Williams came out of hospital - Mr. E. Burke, Senior Lecturer in Commerce, was also present at Dr. Spautz's request.

this is a lie -- I did not request Jager's presence

not Burke!

12. By then, I had also received (2 March, 1979) a memorandum signed by five members of staff in the Management Section, directing my attention to the "personal and academic friction between Dr. M. Spautz and Professor A. Williams", re-confirming their unqualified support to Professor Williams", and requesting my assistance in overcoming "our problem which, over the past few months has shown no sign of dissipating". *even Dowling signed it!*

** see para 10 above*

13. At this stage, Dr. Spautz had criticised Professor Williams' Ph.D. thesis as "psuedo-scientific", with the empirical portion thereof "completely invalid, being based on spurious statistics and an inverted cause-effect model". He continued to dispute Professor Williams' role as Head of the Management Section and in addition, claimed in a letter on 5 March, 1979 that "on 1 November, 1978, in an obvious attempt to discredit and discourage me, Mr. Williams falsely and maliciously accused me of character assassination in the presence of seven colleagues." *(Williams' account is in a letter to George dated 8 Mar 79 - one of 2 letters of that date)*

This is a lie - I gave no such assurance!

14. On 6 March, 1979, the day after the meeting in my office, I wrote to Dr. Spautz confirming that Professor Williams had had certain administrative duties properly delegated to him by Professor Jager and stating "I was glad to have your assurance that you will carry out diligently those duties allocated to you by Professor Williams". Mention was also made of the fact that Professor Williams had received his Ph.D. from the University of Western Australia prior to joining this University and that, in my opinion, it would be "highly improper and very offensive for this University to question the academic judgment of the University of Western Australia".

15. Both in the discussion on 5 March, 1979 and in my letter of 6 March, 1979, I endeavoured to convey to Dr. Spautz the way in which differences of opinion on academic matters should be properly engaged and determined. To quote, "even if their resolution should not be possible, academic courtesies involve a willingness to agree to differ without disruption to the normal life of a Department". *who says?*

16. After the meeting on 5 March, 1979, Professor Williams wrote to me (8 March, 1979), with a copy of his exact statement to the first meeting of the Management Section of the Department on 1 November, 1978 and attached the unsolicited memorandum of support from the other members of staff in the Section (para.10 above).

In fact, it was a laundered account - the original diatribe being more scathing, & mentioning my name. Terrie later promised to testify in court, if necessary

*4 of whom were ignorant
2 " " got cold feet (Quilham & Dowling)
...3
1 " " (Smith) was furious because I was interfering with his GOOD THING he had going with Big Al!*

17. Professor Williams wrote to me again on 3 April, 1979 stating that Dr. Spautz refused to "accept the facts that I have been allocated specific duties as Head of Management Section and as MBA Course Co-ordinator, ... causing widespread disruption to staff and student work". Professor Williams also enclosed a copy of a document circulated by Dr. Spautz on 29 March, 1979 entitled "The Case Against A. J. Williams". Professor Williams stated "legal advice I have received indicates a suit for libel would certainly be successful, but I am not, at this time, interested in this course of action". *hooray!*

"This is called 'necessary before the fact' in part IX of the NSW Criminal Act."

Section 23 violator!

18. It was clear that there had been no improvement in the situation and discussions with an advisory group which I had formed (Professors Jager, Lindgren (Dean of the Faculty), Carter and Tweedie with Mr. Farrell, Assistant Secretary-Legal) persuaded me that stronger action should be attempted. Professor Jager gave me a statement of the situation in the Department as he saw it (4 April, 1979). In this letter, he stated "the situation is now such that Dr. Spautz' disruptive conduct has seriously and adversely affected the good name, student confidence in, and academic endeavours of the Department". *In a later letter Jager noted that George had asked him to write it! (see 13 Sep 79)*

19. A letter was sent to Dr. Spautz on 11 April, 1979, requiring an explanation of his alleged misconduct. He replied on 16 April, 1979, but in a way which did not lead the matter much further forward.

For example, to the allegation that he had - Persistently challenged Professor Williams' authority both with respect to the MBA Course and also the Management Section of the Department.

Dr. Spautz replied :

Note my reluctance to do in Jager & Lindgren

To the extent that challenging is sometimes constructive, even ethically mandatory (e.g. as established by the Nuremberg tribunal) perhaps some of my actions could be so construed. In the absence of specific instances being cited, I am in no position at this point to either admit or deny this claim.

Including abuse of the banks!

20. In addition, the following day, 17 April, 1979, Dr. Spautz wrote to me requesting me to investigate his charges of incompetence against Professor Williams, based on an article published by Professor Williams in the Real Estate Journal. His letter stated that his present intention was to use the material provided in his letter as the basis of a rebuttal article for publication in the Real Estate Journal. As I had made it clear to Dr. Spautz back in our March discussions that this was the proper way for matters of academic dispute to be resolved, I welcomed this evidence of his acceptance of such an approach, and took no other action (see paras. 25 & 26 below).

This is how George does his dirty under by-law 3.2.2: sub-delegate everything (contrary to Sec. 23)

21. However, his letter also stated that this would be "in addition to the direct campaign for justice which I have been waging". It was clear that relationships in the Department were still at an impasse and during further discussions with my advisory group (see para. 18 above), Professor Carter offered to attempt to mediate in the apparently intractable position which had been reached. Dr. Spautz was advised on 15 May, 1979 that I was asking Professor Carter to contact him "to explore in full the issues raised" and seeking his co-operation.

On 5 June, 1979, Professor Carter reported orally to a further meeting of the advisory group on his enquiries and his discussions with members of staff in the Section. It was concluded that his efforts had been unproductive and that we were no further forward.

to squelch me, not to solve the problem

23. On 3 July, 1979, I held a meeting with all the members of the Management section present, plus Professor Jager. The discussions were frank and canvassed options available, if not to resolve the dispute, at least to minimize the damage occurring. It was at this meeting that I offered to consider a different Department for Dr. Spautz, an offer which he subsequently declined in an interview in my office on 11 July, 1979.

Because it would not solve the problems of Wm's incompetence & plagiarism, & the illegal sub-delegations etc. - which he by then knew about (see para 24). ..4

- 24. On 10 July, 1979 Dr. Spautz wrote to me presenting what he described as "a serious new charge against A. J. Williams: plagiarism", and enclosing the first of his photocopied extracts from Professor Williams' Ph.D. thesis (No.1). This was the first occasion on which I had sighted such material. (It was not until Dr. Spautz sent me a copy of Professor Williams' thesis on 16 August, 1979 that I was able to check whether the cited reference appeared in the bibliography of the thesis). *So what? Also, how come this report fails to note the voluminous evidence I sent later?*
- 25. On 13 July, 1979, Dr. Spautz wrote to the Editor of the Real Estate Journal (para 20 above) and also to the Managing Editor of Rydges enquiring about the fate of manuscripts he had sent to these journals. On 30 July, Dr. Spautz sent me a copy of the reply from Rydges stating "in our judgment the material submitted by you is defamatory and therefore unusable". Further letters were then exchanged between Dr. Spautz and the Editor of Rydges. *Logwash!*

(Actually I meant the Grand Squad!)

- 26. On 2 August, 1979 the Editor of the Real Estate Journal wrote to Dr. Spautz returning his manuscript and stating "we think it unlikely that members of this Institute would recall the substance of the findings of A. J. Williams in the Journal in 1975 and in these circumstances feel it would be inappropriate to raise the subject again". In his reply to this Editor, Dr. Spautz concluded "I'm enclosing some background documents in the hope that you will change your mind and help me to expose this fraud. Otherwise I may be forced to bring these matters to the attention of the police".

"Casting pearls" - & he was too dense to realize it!

Then how come nothing happens?

- 27. With the approaching meeting of Council on 17 August, 1979, Dr. Spautz commenced his direct mailing to members of Council with the consequences outlined in para 1 above. The Chancellor wrote to Dr. Spautz on 7 September, 1979, explaining that I would be bringing to Council a paper concerning the material Dr. Spautz had placed before me. On 11 September, 1979 I wrote to Dr. Spautz and concluded my letter by assuring him that the Council would operate strictly under its By-laws in dealing with disciplinary matters.

- 28. ~~Despite~~ ^{Because of} this knowledge, on or about 25 September, 1979, Dr. Spautz apparently distributed widely around the campus the memorandum which is attached (Attachment B), thereby escalating the dispute to a near-public level. Various members of staff outside the Department of Commerce have mentioned the matter to me but as of the date of writing this report, I have not been approached by the media. One member of staff wrote to the Editor of University NEWS criticising Dr. Spautz, but the Editor obtained the writer's agreement not to press for publication, on being informed that the matter was on the Agenda of Council for 19 October, 1979.

Kirby refused to let me question them about this allegation

- 29. At various stages students have become involved in the dispute. On 19 September, 1979, Mr. F. Hawkins, Secretary to the Faculty of Economics & Commerce, wrote to Mr. P. Alexander expressing his concern about the effects the dispute was having on student problems, particularly in the MBA Degree course. To quote, "Over the past months a number of students have expressed concern about the activities of one member of staff, Dr. M. E. Spautz". Mr. Hawkins went on to name one student who had told him that it had become necessary to avoid Dr. Spautz because of embarrassment when he (Dr. Spautz) refers to his campaign against Professor Williams. Again "other (student) comments have referred to the introduction of the personal conflict into lectures given by Dr. Spautz".

indeed!

- 30. The above refers only to a small fraction of the correspondence which is on file and the events which have transpired. Nevertheless, I trust it is a useful and fair summary of the key events.

Logwash!

THE ISSUES :

- 31. The essential issue, as I see it, is that a break-down in the relationship between a Senior Lecturer and a Professor in an academic department has occurred in a way which has resulted in damage to all concerned - to student and staff morale and to the academic standing of the Department. Unless the break-down is repaired or other action emerges, there could ultimately be serious damage to the University.

Baloney - by this time Don George was into it up to his eyeballs, & had to get rid of me⁵ to protect himself & his cronies - - at all costs!

steph when a prof's reputation &/or power are at stake

for expressing plagiarism too?

32. The nature and purposes of a university are such that a constant conflict of opinion on any academic matter is valid and welcomed, if properly expressed and reasonably argued. The normal forum is the academic peer group, both within the university and, through the literature of the subject and attendance at conferences, etc., the academic community at large. In such forums, it is the quality of the ideas and arguments presented, and not the seniority of the author, which is, and should be, the persuasive factor. It is also possible for one person to be right and all others to be out of step, at least as new ideas surface for the first time.

like Big Al's secret libels?

33. Strongly-held differences of opinion should be able to be held, expressed and respected in a university without a break-down in human relationships or the development of personal animosities. In practice, this is too much to hope for. Many disputes simmer for years, a few end up in the law courts and some are never resolved or reconciled, prior to retirement or death of the participants. Colleagues and students inevitably are drawn into such disputes and regrettably are often "used" by the participants.

34. Nevertheless, the importance rightly placed on free and frank discourse makes a university a different environment from that of a factory or a business, where disruptive side effects, if present, can be rapidly dealt with. Universities facing this problem have occasionally attempted to produce "codes of conduct" but with little success or influence on those situations which may largely have got out of control.

horse biscuits

35. The "collegiate" nature of a university distinguishes it from a "hierarchically-organized" enterprise, but the difficulties in finding an organizational structure which accommodates this concept properly were exactly those facing the Council's Committee on University Government when it was carrying out its task in 1975-77. It should be noted, however, that in a Faculty Board, all members from Lecturer to Professor have an equal say and an equal vote, and that the Departmental statutes were designed to provide for a full and frank exchange of views on departmental issues.

36. From discussions with the Management Section of the Department of Commerce, from the record of the Faculty of Commerce Board meeting on 11 July, 1979 and from other evidence available to me, I am convinced that ~~Dr. Spautz~~ Williams has isolated ~~himself~~ ^{himself} from his colleagues. Attempts at mediation from various quarters and by people of goodwill have all failed. (It should not, of course, be overlooked that there are always a few members of staff who take pleasure (or at least a keen interest) in a "gladiatorial" struggle between a junior and a senior member of staff, and who sympathize with the junior person on principle).
yes: "RIGHT MAKES MIGHT"
Carter ?!

THE CHARGES :

37. The detailed charges made by Dr. Spautz are found in his various letters to me and in the memoranda forwarded by him to members of Council. A summary of them is found in his widely-circulated memorandum dated 4 September, 1979 (Attachment B). (Note that I didn't do in page re Lindgren)

38. The first five charges (sub-paragraphs 1 to 5) all relate to Professor Williams' doctoral thesis. The overwhelming academic opinion would be that Professor Williams' thesis was a matter for the University of Western Australia to judge and that it is not a matter for this University to question.

39. In respect of sub-paragraphs 1 to 3, I would not see myself as a person properly-informed to make a judgment. Sub-paragraph 4 must surely have been a matter for the University of Western Australia to consider in making its judgment. In respect of sub-paragraph 5, there may be room for debate as to the use made of reference material in the thesis, but the fact remains that the sources do appear in the Bibliography.

Big deal!

I haven't found anyone who believes Williams' story that he sent it to America & England to be examined by 24 academics!

40. As regards sub-paragraph 6, Professor Williams has provided me with an *abundant* answer to Dr. Spautz's charge of refusing to return his "confiscated" copy of the thesis. On 11 May, 1979 he wrote to Dr. Spautz re-iterating an earlier offer, and giving Dr. Spautz three options, "a refund of the \$30, another copy of the thesis, or to wait until your copy is returned from overseas". Dr. Spautz declined all these and wrote instead on a copy of the memorandum given back to Professor Williams a fourth option, "to have back your own profusely annotated copy immediately".

41. As to sub-paragraph 7, I cannot usefully comment. Sub-paragraph 8 is a statement of Dr. Spautz's position (see paras. 42-44 below) and, perhaps especially in the light of this memorandum to Council, I do not think it necessary to comment on sub-paragraphs 9, 10 and 11, other than to say I have sought over the months, to prevent escalation of this matter to the point where it would become a matter for Council to consider as a disciplinary issue.

meaning "cover up"

GENERAL COMMENTS :

42. Because of Dr. Spautz's accusation that Professor Williams obtained his "present high office" by fraudulent means, I have reviewed all aspects of the Selection Committee's procedures, including the advice received from referees, and am satisfied that the appointment was properly made. This is not to deny the possibility of a Selection Committee erring in its judgment despite the care taken. Whilst I am not persuaded that this is such a case, the procedures followed by Chair Selection Committees are a separate issue for Council to consider at any time.

there was no sub-selection committee for Selection Head

At no time did I ever raise any such issue at this!

43. It might be useful to members of Council to have the following quote from one professorial referee for Professor Williams: "Dr. Williams recently completed his Doctor of Philosophy degree in this Department. His thesis was in the area of Small Business Management, and was commended by his three examiners, two of whom were international academics. Undoubtedly, Dr. Williams is currently Australia's leading authority on the characteristics of small businesses".

But did this referee ever see the thesis? (Prof. Spautz?) then how come all doubt it?

44. The members of the Selection Committee, which, in addition to senior academics of this University, included Professors Gvnther of the University of Queensland and Professor Carrington of the University of New South Wales, could well take umbrage at Dr. Spautz's inference of incompetence on their part. *I made no such inference - my argument is with Williams.*

45. Charges and counter-charges of slander and libel are ultimately matters for civil court action if either party wishes to press them. They are probably only capable of resolution in this way, but I can understand the reluctance of anyone to go that far, particularly when the origin is a matter of academic opinion and judgment. *What about Williams' secret letters, etc?*

only?

46. If there were simple solutions available, no doubt they would already have succeeded. Various options for action will occur to members of Council and several have been canvassed in private conversation with me. Whilst none offers the certainty of the dispute being resolved, the next steps will clearly be most important to the final outcome.

RECOMMENDATIONS :

47. I believe that the University would welcome a statement by Council :

- (a) acknowledging the right for differing opinions to be held on academic matters and stating that Council recognizes and defends this right; and
- (b) emphasising it is important that academic debate should proceed in ways that do not damage the work of Departments, the interests of students, or the standing of the University in the eyes of the outside community.

Red Herring?

I recommend that Council so resolves.

Apparently the Don didn't think that railroading me was going to tarnish this Uni's reputation

..7 or Crimson Corp? or Purple Berch? or Orange Octopus etc

Several Councilors dissented or
abstained from this absurdity -- see the minutes

48. The potential damage to Professor Williams' reputation persuades me to recommend that Council should record "that nothing has come to Council's attention that would cause Council to question his work as a Professor in the Department of Commerce in the University". *note the cautious wording!*

49. I further recommend that Council direct that Dr. Spautz be informed :

- (i) of what is said in para. 47;
- (ii) of what is said in para. 48;
- (iii) that Council views with concern the action he (Dr. Spautz) has taken in publicising statements regarding Professor Williams and other colleagues; esp the Don!
- (iv) that Council seeks, as soon as possible, resolution of the problems that have arisen within the Department of Commerce and has asked a committee of three Professors (Carter, Curthoys and Lindgren) to use their good endeavours in discussion with you (Dr. Spautz) and other members of the Department to restore a position in which normal academic work can proceed in the Management Section of the Department of Commerce;
- (v) that Council will review the overall situation at its next meeting and wishes you (Dr. Spautz) to know that, failing satisfactory resolution of the situation in the meantime, Council may find it necessary to invoke disciplinary proceedings in terms of the relevant By-Laws.

Why one of
the Sec 23
culprits?

This threat does not appear in the meeting minutes or in the Resolutions recorded therein.

ADDENDUM :

My recommendation that Professors Carter, Curthoys and Lindgren should form a committee, stems from the essentially academic origins (or, at least, academic aspects) of the dispute and from my belief that, even now, there should be a further attempt at reconciliation at an academic level. I envisage that the committee will bring back to the next meeting of Council advice from this academic viewpoint.

J. W. George
D. W. George.
Vice-Chancellor.

Note how the Don cleverly suckered the Council into overlooking my challenge to the violation of Sec 23 - which he had endorsed?!

Also how he completely avoided my serious complaints about the abuse of psychological tests by Williams, + esp. by the banks!

These + other essential aspects of my "campaign" were raised over & over in letters that he merely lists on the Attachment A, but skips over in the body of the report!

8 October, 1979.

(a) Letters or Memoranda, Dr. Spautz to Vice-Chancellor :

5 March, 1979 (two)
6 March, 1979 (a) and (b)
21 March, 1979
29 March, 1979
4 April, 1979 (a)
9 April, 1979
16 April, 1979
17 April, 1979
19 April, 1979
11 May, 1979
17 May, 1979 and 17 May, 1979 (c)
18 May, 1979 (b) and (c)
22 May, 1979
29 May, 1979 (a) and (b)
7 June, 1979
3 July, 1979
10 July, 1979
8 August, 1979 (the first letter to be marked "copies
to members of Council")
15 August, 1979
16 August, 1979 (b)
31 August, 1979 (a)
3 September, 1979 (a) and (c)
11 September, 1979 (a)
13 September, 1979 and 13 September, 1979 (b)
14 September, 1979 (b)
17 September, 1979
24 September, 1979 (a)

(b) Letters, Vice-Chancellor to Dr. Spautz :

28 February, 1979
6 March, 1979
19 March, 1979
11 April, 1979
24 April, 1979
15 May, 1979
23 May, 1979
6 June, 1979 *
13 August, 1979 (with copies to members of Council)
11 September, 1979
14 September, 1979
27 September, 1979.

C O P Y

IN VITA VERITAS

4 September, 1979

Memorandum to : A. J. Williams.
 From : M. E. Spautz, Senior Lecturer.
 Subject : Request for your resignation.

Almost a year has now passed since I first learned (from 2 colleagues) about the phoniness of your doctoral thesis. During these twelve months the following facts have come to light :

1. The statistical part of your thesis is largely spurious;
2. Your cause-effect psychological model is backwards;
3. Therefore your thesis conclusions and implications are almost completely invalid and should never have been accepted;
4. The supervision of your thesis was apparently inadequate, and you admitted that you were allowed to nominate your own examiners!
5. You plagiarized numerous passages of the historical and theoretical chapters of your thesis, from a variety of sources.
6. You refused to return my confiscated copy of your thesis for 10 months, in the futile attempt to prevent your plagiarism from being detected and exposed.

During the past year, furthermore :

7. You slandered and libeled me, in order to scare me off, and even threatened me with a law suit for daring to expose you!
8. I accused you of obtaining your present high office by fraudulent means. *(With the help of George, Kjer, Lindgren, etc)* ^{Section Head}
9. The University administration has refused to investigate my charges, despite the overwhelming proof that I have supplied.

10. I have been advised by several people that the University administration is planning to obstruct justice by causing my dismissal on phony charges of misconduct, whilst suppressing the proof of your fraud, incompetence, and several proven instances of serious misconduct, on the false grounds that my charges are insubstantial!

A prophesy that came true!

11. I have warned the Administration that I have no intention of allowing myself to be railroaded in such an unscrupulous manner, and that I am prepared to fight this case "tooth and toenail" in the Court of Public Opinion, if necessary, to get justice. I simply cannot believe that the majority of Council members would allow such a transparent miscarriage of justice to be perpetrated, just to preserve the power of the professoriate. If they should be somehow induced to such a perfidious action, (e.g. through bribery, black-mail, veiled threats, false testimony from your boot lickers, etc.), I cannot believe that my colleagues, students, fellow Americans, and other responsible citizens, would tolerate it.

Beware!

So I was wrong!

(over)

Wannabet?

Now, I say to you: "Al, why don't you simply resign from your obviously ill-gotten position, and prevent a public scandal?"

Unless I get a satisfactory reply by 25 September, 1979 (the first anniversary of this sorry affair) I predict that copies of this memo will blanket the campus like snow. I say that the public has a right to know about corruption wherever it occurs, Universities not excepted.

M. E. Spautz (signed)
M. E. SPAUTZ

c.c. Members of Council and Selected Others.

RIGHT MAKES MIGHT 1

*I distributed this on 26 Sep 79,
since Big Al refused to even
discuss the matter with me*