

26 November, 1979

MEMORANDUM TO: Members of Council  
FROM: M.E.. Spautz, Senior Lecturer  
SUBJECT: Report on the Carter and Carter Committee Investigations  
into the Williams Fraud

---

Enclosed for your information and action are edited, selected and paraphrased accounts of the various meetings that I have attended with Prof. M.P. Carter and others, since 28 May, 1979 (excluding "off the record" contacts, the substance of which I am prepared to recount, on request, when the official investigation called for by C.R. 151/70 is conducted).

All participants were given a chance to comment on these notes; except for some earlier ones dated 8, 9, 12 and 14 Nov. from and to three staff members, all comments I've received so far are appended at the end. Note the reluctance of some to let me use these notes: why did they think I was taking them?!

As you know, Prof. Carter did not allow the conversations to be tape recorded or minutes to be taken, hence my initiative. I realise that neither this report nor Prof. Carter's (apparently to be prepared from notes taken by Prof. Lindgren) will have "official" status: only the report of the investigating committee dictated by C.R. 151/70 will have that honour.

I hereby request copies of Prof. Carter's reports (on both the May and November investigations), and permission to attend the next Council meeting at which it is to be discussed.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

*M. E. Spautz*  
M.E. SPAUTZ  
Senior Lecturer.

c.c. Professor K.E. Lindgren  
and To Whom It May Concern

Report on My Witnessed Conversations with  
Prof. M.P. Carter on 28th and 30th May, 1979

by M.E. Spautz, Senior Lecturer

Some selected, paraphrased statements, witnessed by Ted Burke

M.C.: My purpose is to find out if you and Prof. Williams can work together amicably. My involvement in this started on 11th April. [Note that this is the date of Prof. George's letter to me alleging that Prof. Jager complained about me! It is also more than a month before Prof. George's letter to me notifying me that he had asked Prof. Carter to contact me. M.S.]

M.S.: I've decided not to tape record, but am taking notes instead.

M.C.: I've spoken with several members of the Management Section and with Profs. Jager and Williams, to get background, to explore in full the issues raised.

Three crucial questions:

- (1) Are you prepared to accept the role of Prof. Williams?  
[What role? Fraud? M.S.]
- (2) Do you see yourself as having a duty to single-mindedly point out deficiencies in Prof. Williams' achievements?  
[Note the gratuitously insulting term "single-mindedly", and the gross understatement: "deficiencies"! M.S.]
- (3) To what extent are students suffering as a consequence of the situation in the Department. [My thought here: Lord knows how much poor Fred Gullhaus, Ph.D. student under Williams [!], must be suffering ever since he blew the whistle on Williams' phony thesis in September, 1978! M.S.]

The weight of the evidence is that:

- (a) the relation between you and Prof. Williams has an unfortunate effect on both of you as well as on others, individually and collectively, in the Department, and on students and the community. [At this point I don't think Prof. Carter knew that our M.B.A. program is in low repute at A.G.S.M., where Williams' phony thesis is well known! M.S.]
- (b) It is you, Dr. Spautz, that is mainly concerned with keeping this going.

M.S.: No - I've been trying to resolve it, not continue it! [But the resolution must be an ethical one! M.S.]

T.B.: [Summarised the events leading up to Williams' confiscation of my copy of his thesis - including Gullhaus' role. M.S.]

M.C.: Whether Prof. Williams' thesis is good or bad is beside the point. [! M.S.] Other people who are equally qualified [who are they? I'm not convinced that they are equally qualified, as long as their identity is kept secret! M.S.] do not see such faults. Since the examiners accepted it, your criticisms don't mean that the whole damn thing is a load of rubbish!

[Note that at this point Prof. Carter had not, to my knowledge, had the opportunity to evaluate the thesis.]

To persist in such criticisms is tantamount to a wish to persecute Prof. Williams - which is offensive and an inappropriate standard of behaviour for a University. [Note the term "by others" - does this mean that Prof. Carter exempts himself from such a view? If not, is this slanderous material?! M.S.]

You are seen [again, by others?! M.S.] as being obsessed. They're afraid that antagonism and conflict will be built into the Department's workings by you, that you work for the persistence of it. [How about the constructive effects of conflict, ref. L. Coser's work? M.S.]

T.B.: What disruption? Two or three sycophants "back the strength" and believe that 99% of the time they'll be right! [Ah - but what about that 1%?! M.S.] Prof. Williams said he O.K.'d publication of Michael's rebuttal in Rydge's - they phoned him about it. [Then how come they refused to publish it, for fear of a defamation suit?! M.S.] Maybe he should write a Departmental Monograph.

M.C.: Your letters seem obsessive and lemming-like. Others report that they are anguished - so is Prof. Williams, and so am I. [Me too - but justice sometimes requires it! M.S.]

There's concern on their part to comprehend the situation - the weight of opinion is that you (Dr. Spautz) are keeping it going.

M.S.: I'm writing a case study in organisational power politicking! And I'm asking Al to give me a copy of his written complaint [which formed the basis of Prof. George's letter of 11 April, 1979. M.S.].

M.C.: You seem to be devoting your life to denigrating Prof. Williams! Please stop writing so many letters!

M.S.: No - I'm using the principle of merciful justice! [The whole history of my correspondence and prior behaviour going back to September 28 demonstrates this principle. It's similar to the Tsedek principle in Jewish ethics - Prof. Lindgren and I talked about it in a meeting last year. M.S.]

[We agreed to meet again on the 30th, and left. M.S.]

[Now, 30 May, 1979, again in the presence of Ted Burke.]

M.C.: There's no point in continuing these discussions - I'm going to make my report to the Vice-Chancellor on the basis of Monday's meeting. [He then referred to my last three letters, written in the interim, as "frivolous". M.S.]

T.B.: It's hard to suddenly stop writing memos when there's so much momentum built up.

M.S.: What did you mean by "personal denigration" [referring to his earlier remark. M.S.]

M.C.: I don't have to be specific. You're involved in systematic denigration of a colleague.

T.B.: I don't see it that way, and there's been no disruption.

M.S.: Could I have a copy of your forthcoming report to the Vice-Chancellor, on the grounds of natural justice?

M.C.: "Natural justice is a cliché!" [exact quote. M.S.] In my estimation you are doing a lot of damage to yourself, Prof. Williams and your colleagues. Your explanation of what you're doing and how doesn't agree with what you're actually doing: you're conducting a witch hunt!

M.S.: No, I'm writing a book on corruption in Australian Universities - my second book. The first one is on ethicology. That's why I'm taking these notes!

[As Prof. Carter obviously did not want to continue, we then left. M.S.]



(4)

Report on the Carter Committee Conversations with  
Al Williams and Mike Spautz

30th October, 1979, 9.00 to 11.00 a.m.

by M.E. Spautz, Senior Lecturer

Some selected, paraphrased statements.

- M.S.: Am I allowed to have the safeguards listed in my letter of 22 Oct. 79(a)? And a transcript of this meeting?
- M.C.: We would prefer not. [Then he proceeded to explain the purpose of the Committee and this meeting. M.S.]
- K.L.: [Explained briefly what he meant by "without prejudice" and "qualified privilege, in terms that I did not fully understand. M.S.] These provisions apply today, although later meetings may follow different rules.
- A.W.: Certain paraphrased statements in his [M.S.?] letters have turned up in other correspondence and used for his own purposes. Therefore I intend to make few and guarded remarks today.
- M.S.: Me too!
- M.C.: [Asked G.C. to summarise my allegations, as in my previous correspondence. M.S.]
- G.C.: Here's a generalised summary of Dr. Spautz's charges: plagiarism of passages in Williams' thesis; invalid thesis conclusion; incompetent and/or lenient examiners (one supposedly being a Professor at this Uni); Vice Chancellor is covering up, to protect examiners' reputations; Williams not qualified to be Section Head; conspiracy to obstruct justice; Uni is therefore a corrupt organisation; The Secretary has joined the conspiracy; the publishing scene in Australia is equally corrupt as this Uni.
- M.C.: This is the ambit of the dispute - I want to get your view as to whether this is a reasonable exposition.
- M.S.: "This is only "broad-brush"? We can later expand or contract, add or subtract therefrom?
- G.C.: Yes.
- M.S.: Just a minute! In your [Prof. Carter's] letter dated 25 October, 1979, you promised that today we would only be discussing procedures; now you're trying to talk content.
- M.C.: Sorry, I forgot about that.
- M.S.: I'm not prepared to endorse Prof. Curthoy's summary, as it includes extraneous matters (e.g. re Alexander). I don't want to get side-tracked from the main issue, which is the illegitimacy of Williams' presence.
- I'm going to write to Council today [which I did - ref. 29 October, 1979 (b) which I had prepared the day before - M.S.] to argue that we appear to be at step 4 of Council Resolution 151/70. Now, I'd like to have Al's view.
- A.W.: As for the above-mentioned "ambit": I'm alarmed and disgusted about so much attention being given to Dr. Spautz's correspondence. I've never had the opportunity to comment. His unprofessional conduct should be included! [The Committee members later agreed on this. M.S.]
- M.S.: I disagree.

M.C.: Council would not accept your view that your charges constitute the sole substance of the dispute.

[M.S.: My thought: Williams had better be ready to prove that I've engaged in unprofessional conduct - otherwise he'll be facing another slander charge!]

M.C.: Your interpretation concerning Council Resolution 151/70 is wrong - this is no part of your requested investigation!

M.S.: I predict that at the December meeting Council will set up the requested investigation.

M.C.: Not necessarily! In fact, it's possible that they could call for an investigation of you!

[M.S.: My thoughts: would they dare to risk a public scandal over this? The V.C. and maybe Carter, will probably lose their jobs too, if they try to railroad me! Crumbs!]

M.C.: Another purpose of this Committee is to try to restore normality in the Department of Commerce.

M.S.: I accept that you don't agree with my interpretation.

I'd like to have transcripts of all other conversations with other Department members, in case I need to subpoena them later.

K.L.: You'll be told in advance of any changes in procedure in future meetings.

M.S.: I'd like to see what those procedures will be, in writing.

M.C.: [Ignoring my request: M.S.] - we'll use those specified in my letter.

K.L.:) We Agree.

G.C.:)

M.S.: I'll issue my own set; I don't think anyone should dictate, but we should get agreement.

G.C.: How about it if notes are taken during future meetings, and we all sign? [Silence from the others. M.S.]

M.S.: Is Prof. Curthoys my representative on Council?

G.C.: No - Council decided some time ago that I don't "represent" staff, I'm just a member of Council elected by staff. Please don't approach me directly during this investigation. [I'm not sure he used this word. M.S.]

M.S.: Then who is my representative on Council or don't I have any? Prof. Curthoys is obviously in a conflict of interest situation.

M.C.: I'll be your contact with Council during these conversations.

M.S.: But you're also obviously in a conflict of interest situation!

M.C.: Dr. Spautz, surely from your knowledge of social psychology, you know that a person can keep his different roles separate.

M.S.: No, I don't know any such thing. [to myself: at least in your case I'm not convinced of it! M.S.]

Would you put that in writing?

M.C.: No.

M.S.: Would it be a violation of the "qualified privilege" or "without prejudice" provisions if I published these notes?

K.L. It would be contrary to their spirit.

(6)

M.S.: Could I have a copy of the document you read out of earlier, defining those terms?

K.L.: I'll give you one this afternoon. [Later, he sent me half of a page of some document, which I didn't find very enlightening. M.S.]

M.S.: Prof. Carter, why haven't you responded to some of my letters? [e.g. 23 Oct 1979 (b) and 29 Oct 1979(b) -- M.S.]; this doesn't look very co-operative.

M.C.: If anyone's being unco-operative, Dr. Spautz, its you!

How about 2.30 this Thursday for our next meeting?

M.S.: I'd like to have it in writing. In general, I'd like to have Al attend all meetings with me, and vice versa. Is that O.K.?

A.W.: No, not all meetings.

What specific preparation is needed for the Thursday meeting?

M.C.: Whatever documentation you want to bring.

M.S.: Will we both get the same documentation?

M.C.: I can't guarantee that.

[Then the meeting broke up. M.S.]

Report on the Carter Committee Conversation  
with Prof. J. Winsen

8th November, 1979, 10:45 to 11:00 a.m.

by M.E. Spautz  
Senior Lecturer

Some selected, paraphrased statements:

J.W.: My concern is that this [dispute] has been going on too long; its having an unfavourable, if not devastating affect on the Department -- both Sections -- maybe the whole Faculty or even the Uni. I can't afford to spend any time on this -- I've been trying to examine a thesis since April, and am starting to get urgent telegrams! The Committee should try to resolve it as soon as possible.

M.C.: This Committee has no power -- it can only report back to Council.

J.W.: I'm concerned that Council will only appoint another committee to study your report!

G.C.: Any other disruption?

J.W.: Why no action on Prof. Jager's complaint? Im concerned that this will undermine my authority when I take my turn as Head of the Dept. The Head apparently receives no support from the Administration in exercising his authority; I'm worried about a precedent being set.

G.C.: Any other disruption?

J.W.: I can't comment on that or on the substance (or lack thereof) of the dispute. I'm concerned about this Committee, as I explained yesterday in Senate.

About his office door: the second party [A.W.? M.S.] seems to have been put in a position of having to defend himself against allegations. I'm afraid of a precedent here too.

G.C.: Does it appear so?

J.W.: Yes -- others in the Dept. say so.

M.C.: [reading the Committee's terms of reference -- M.S.]

J.W.: I've covered the main points.

K.L.: Has photocopying by Dr. Spautz caused you any inconvenience?

J.W.: No, just a shortage of paper of one size. I'd like to stress the importance of an early resolution -- the Uni. Administration should snow resolve to settle it; I'm worried about a scandal outside the Uni. The recommendation of this Committee should reflect this.

G.C.: What would you see as a resolution?

J.W.: One party wants an [official, M.S.] investigation of his charges; I haven't thought about it much, but if the research [thesis? M.S.] has been reviewed, maybe those who were responsible for the degree and appointment should be held accountable.

[J.W. then left, there being no more questions. M.S.]

Report On The Carter Committee Conversations  
With Mark Tippett And Russell Craig

8 Nov., 79, 11:00 to 11:30a.m.

by M.E. Spautz  
Senior Lecturer

Some selected, paraphrased statements:

- M.T.: Russell and I have reservations about Dr. Spautz's psychological warfare and his campaign: he twice claimed to be using voodoo against Professor Williams!
- K.L.: Please explain.
- M.T.: I asked Dr. Spautz whether he has been carrying on a psychological campaign, and he said he was using voodoo.
- M.C.: Please explain.
- M.T.: For example, for several days he had displayed on his desk a book entitled "The Hoax of the Twentieth Century", obviously referring to Professor Williams' alleged spurious statistics. He is questioning the English system. I believe we have no right to question the judgment of the UWA!

Russell and I are also concerned that proper procedures [my thought: Council Resolution 151/70? - M.E.S.] have not been followed for over a year - this case has not been properly handled by the Administration!

On several previous jobs Dr. Spautz has been confronted by what he considered to be ethical problems. [I agree! - M.E.S.].

I don't agree with a statement by Dr. Spautz that I agreed with him that Professor Williams' thesis statistics are invalid; I consider his letter to be a threat. [Apparently M.T. was referring to my letter to him dated 1 June, 1979, with reminder note dated 4 September, 1979, both of which I sent only to him; see attachment - M.E.S.].

- R.C.: This case has been mishandled - the Administration has tried to sweep it aside - this Committee is a charade - more decisive action was required much earlier. Only Dr. Spautz's departure would settle it - if Professor Williams left, what guarantee would there be that Dr. Spautz wouldn't attack his successor? [Comment by M.E.S. - I hereby guarantee that I would do so if, and only if, I thought he deserved it, and could prove it, as I've done with Williams!]

Dr. Spautz has been disabowling a fine man. Maybe he's just jealous - I don't know his motivation.

Dr. Spautz can play guerilla warfare and win!

- M.T.: The document I referred to earlier is #87 in Professor Williams' file [handing it to Professor Carter - M.E.S.].
- M.C.: [Reading therefrom]: "If you decide not to grant me this request ... [etc.]". - M.E.S.]. [Indeed, this is from my letter dated 1 June, 1979].



R.C.: This has been going on too long - it's a brawl between two guys.

M.T.: I agree. Dr. Spautz has been quite co-operative in providing me with information. I don't know about his motives.

I randomly checked one of his charges in the 18 May Critique, in regard to statistics in Professor Williams' thesis, pages 358 and 542. I asked Dr. Spautz whether he had tested the hypothesis that the sampling distribution in question is bimodal. He rebutted that even Professor Williams admitted that it was bimodal - but in doing so, he was inconsistent. [Apparently M.T. thinks I can't logically reject Williams' spurious statistics and at the same time accept his view that some of the data were bimodally distributed! - M.E.S.]. I asked him about running a t-test, which assumes homogeneity of variances - which he admitted was hypothetical. I offered to show him how to use the computer to do a non-parametric test, but he wasn't interested.

M.C.: Are you saying that Dr. Spautz's criticisms are ill-based because he didn't do the proper statistical tests?

M.T.: No, this concerns only this one randomly chosen problem, not all his criticisms.

M.C.: Is this a case of "the pot calling the kettle black"?

M.T.: No, I don't have time to test all of his criticisms. Dr. Spautz hasn't been forceful enough. If this indicates his level of rigor, maybe he too is pseudo-scientific, "hoist by his own petard".

M.C.: Do you think Dr. Spautz is competent in statistics?

M.T.: Yes, his knowledge of statistics is quite admirable - but in this instance he's not rigorous enough, causing me to doubt his motives. [Comment: I say that Williams' errors are too obvious to warrant a rigorous rebuttal - but I'll do it if necessary - M.E.S.].

[Also note that M.T. is not rejecting my charge - only that I haven't been rigorous enough! - M.E.S.].

M.C.: Please explain.

M.T.: No, you can make a logical inference.

K.L.: Anything else?

R.C.: Yes - yesterday we ran out of duplicating paper of one size - it's costly; our work is being hampered.

G.C.: In what way has the work of students been affected?

R.C.: MBA students are talking about it, otherwise little effect.

M.T.: My students are aware.

M.C.: Are they being manipulated?

R.C.: I've heard that students have been phoned at home, but can't substantiate it.

M.T.: I agree.

G.C.: Has Professor Williams used his position to get support?

M.T. } No. [My thought: in this system, a Professor automatically gets  
R.C. } support - or else? - M.E.S.]

R.C.: Most of the information we get is from Dr. Spautz - nothing from the other side. This is incredible - Mike is quite open.

M.T.: You can get info by walking into Professor Williams' office.

R.C.: Why did Council opt to set up this unofficial committee, the easy route?

Can you recommend to Council that they set up an official one?

M.C.: If we conclude that a quick resolution is necessary, we could do so.

R.C.: As I see it, we have six possible strategies. [Naming them; M.E.S.] The only one that would guarantee a solution would be to encourage Dr. Spautz to leave - or other action to cause it.

M.T.: Signals from the Department are quite clear - including a letter from Economics to the Chancellor. [Dunlop's? - M.E.S.]

I can't understand why due procedures haven't been followed. [151/70? - M.E.S.]

M.C.: Anything else?

R.C.: No - you have any more questions?

Others: No.

[M.T. and R.C. left at @ 11:30 - M.E.S.]

November 14, 1979

## Report on the Carter Committee Conversation with Mr. Ron Gibbins

8th November, 1979, 11:30 to 11:45 a.m.

by M.E. Spautz  
Senior Lecturer

R.G.: I've tried to be friendly with Mike for over a year. [Actually, it's more like six years! M.S.]

Three points:

- (1) We have a duty to students, to provide the best education we can .... To do this, we need harmonious relations with colleagues. [etc. -- details omitted by M.S.]
- (2) We have a duty to students to show that this is a community of scholars; it's not good to have placards about minor [! M.S.] developments. E.g. re marking: is it right to put letters on the door concerning arguments over marking -- it gives a bad impression to students. [Apparently Ron is here referring to my unsuccessful campaign to get the A. & F. Section to protect the privacy of students by not displaying their names along with their exam marks (term tests, etc.) on the bulletin board. No one seconded my motion at a recent A. & F. Section meeting! M.S.]

K.L.: Any specifics as to #1 above?

R.G.: It happened at another institution, but the present situation here could lead that way; not now.

- (3) The basic principle at stake: degrees granted, whether BA or Ph.D level, are granted on balance. [Then Ron told an anecdote involving Auchmuty and knock-back of a master's thesis which was interdisciplinary, but not quite expert enough on either side for acceptance. M.S.] No problem with 9/10 of such cases. [Apparently, he means that Williams' thesis falls into the 1/10 category! M.S.] But, if a degree can later be questioned, this is a potential threat to later students and staff; e.g. I [R.G.] could be accused of something! Of course, this argument excludes fraud. [I agree with, and emphasize this last statement! M.S.] It would be a pity to re-open a closed case like this. [I say it would be a pity to allow a fraud like this to go unchallenged! M.S.]

M.C.: Would you please explain your friendship remark?

R.G.: I still offer him friendship. [I accept! M.S.]

M.C.: Are you saying that Dr. Spautz has been in need of a friend over the past year?

R.G.: No, it would be wrong to say more.

G.C.: Is this dispute disrupting the Department?

R.G.: Yes - I should imagine so, in the other Section. [Notice the word "Imagine", and the expression "in the other Section"! M.S.]

G.C.: Any views on a possible resolution?

R.G.: Yes: Dr. Spautz should be firmly told: "This must cease completely forthwith!"

[There being no more questions, he then left forthwith. M.S.]

8th November, 1979, 11:45 to 12:00 a.m.

by M.E. Spautz  
Senior Lecturer

Some selected, paraphrased statements:

B.O.: One main reason for my appearance is to show interest and concern - I don't have much to contribute toward a solution. I've noticed a substantial difference in staff attitudes since coming back from leave.

On the dispute: it involves an example of "tunnel thinking" by Dr. Spautz - he's homed in on a particular person. Concentration has led to distortion; e.g. yesterday he wrote that several people preferred to have him present [at these conversations: M.S.], but I didn't say that. His attitude there and his aggressive approach leads to a tendency [for others? M.S.] to view the dispute from the wrong end, i.e. an examination of Professor Williams instead of Dr. Spautz. His pseudo-issues are not the real issues -- i.e., examining of the thesis, plagiarism accusations, etc. I feel the appropriate forum [for such charges; M.S.] is not here, but U.W.A. Another issue is the procedure for appointment of Professors in the Uni in general.

Two real issues: (1) the method of attack by M.S. on A.W.; the degree of innuendo amounts in the long run to character assassination. E.g. yesterday's letter concerning compromising of the O.B. exam, the innuendo that Prof. Williams was to blame; however, there are alternative interpretations. [I agree -- there are those in the Uni. Administration who are more likely culprits, since Williams appears to be paralyzed. M.S.]

(2) Involvement of students: they have no need to get involved -- it harms their education. [Several comments: (a) Some students knew about the thesis invalidity before I did! (b) Williams involved students in one of his own M.B.A. classes by stating that someone on the staff had criticized his thesis unfairly; (c) as this is supposedly a community of scholars, students need to know about important events like this -- and I predict that even more of them will find out about it unless it's settled soon; and (d) I disagree that finding out the facts harms their education; in fact, I say it's good education! M.S.]

My conclusion: I feel that in the long run both A.W. and M.S. can't continue to work in the same Department; but I can't say how this could be done. We've had 12 months of substantial interruption [note that B.O. was on leave for much of that time -- M.S.], and another 12 months would be disastrous! Please settle it by the start of next year. [Jan. 1980? I agree! M.S.]

G.C.: You agree that there's disruption, and that it's flowed over into the A. & F. Section!

B.O.: Yes, the dispute emerged 2 years ago when Prof. Jager went on leave -- I wonder why it didn't emerge earlier, when Prof. Williams was first appointed. [Two comments: (a) The "dispute" started not two years ago, but on 25 Sept. 1978, when I first pointed out to Williams how his thesis was almost completely invalid, hence pseudo-scientific; (b) If I had known this when he was first appointed, the dispute would have emerged then. M.S.]



(12)

K.L.: Concerning student involvement -- would you please elaborate?

B.O.: Two aspects: (1) Hearsay -- needs to be confirmed. Students in class have been involved in the dispute [by Williams! M.S.] but this is not a major element.

K.L.: By Dr. Spautz?

B.O.: Yes - but one would have to speak with students [to verify it -- M.S.; I say, try Williams' own students in first semester 1979 subjects.] Once literature is publicized by being displayed in the main corridor, students get involved. [I'd like to point out that someone, perhaps several others, did put up some of my "literature" on bulletin boards -- I use only my own "Chinese Wall"; M.S.] They form opinions on ill-informed grounds, and respect for various members of the Department would be affected. [Unfairly? M.S.]

G.C.: Has Prof. Williams used his position to demand or solicit allegiance from you?

B.O.: No, not in any way. [Does he need to, in such an authoritarian atmosphere as this, where boot-licking is the traditional way of life, for some people? M.S.] I've made it clear to Prof. Williams that he must sort out the personal aspect with Michael -- but there's a public aspect that I reserve judgment on -- the behaviour of both parties.

[B.O. then left, there being no more questions. M.S.]

Report on the Carter Committee Conversations with  
Ellen Braye and Don Stokes

8th November, 1979 12:05 to 12:30 p.m.

Some selected, paraphrased statements:

E.B.: We have only opinions, we know few facts; does "qualified privilege" cover opinions too?

K.L.: [Legalistic reply that I couldn't understand. M.S.]

M.C.: What do you have to say?

E.B.: About that letter circulated by Dunlop: I signed because I agreed. [I later heard from Ron Gibbins that the subject letter, which he signed, included a request that Council resolve the dispute soon, out of fairness to Williams. I've not been able to get a copy, to see what else was said! M.S.]

I can't see how this [dispute?] came about. Given the incorrectness of the Ph.D. examination and the appointment - that's past tense, and we have to live with it, as I don't think past events should be investigated - it's O.K. to question his [A.W.'s? M.S.] behaviour since then. [Trouble is: what about the element of fraud in Williams' parlaying his ill-gotten doctorate into a professorship: aren't all crimes "past tense"?! M.S.]

Dr. Spautz has been appealing to Natural Justice - but does that justify investigation of the accuser? [Apparently E.B. perceived that the purpose of this Carter Committee is to investigate me, not my charges! M.S.]

I don't know if Dr. Spautz' motives should be investigated, e.g. did he apply for the job? [Reply: Yes, in 1974 and 1975, without success, but also without regret, as I doubted my own qualifications, as Prof. Jager could testify. However, I did not apply in 1976, hence did not contest Williams for the job. I must admit that I later became disillusioned with Williams qualifications, but only after finding out about the phoniness of his thesis, lack of other publications, etc., in September., 1978. M.S.]

Dr. Spautz is experienced in psychological methods, and should be aware of bad effects on Prof. Williams [ref. Mark Tippett's testimony re my use of voodoo! M.S.] I'm a nurse, with experience in psychiatry, and my husband is a medical doctor - so maybe I'm qualified to judge, to give an opinion. Maybe his intentions are not highly honourable - he wears Prof. Williams and others down by swamping them with letters [this is my famous "confetti barrage" technique, which is designed to negate bureaucratic secrecy, on which it thrives, and to tie the bureaucrats up in their own red tape! M.S.]

Maybe Dr. Spautz has been using psychological blackmail to force an investigation - I'm worried about bad publicity outside. [Whitemail would be more like it! M.S.]

What guarantee do we have that if Dr. Spautz gets rid of Prof. Williams, that he won't attack the next professor, or others who cross him in the future? [Reply: no such guarantee - I'll do it again, if necessary to get justice for all concerned, including the culprit, who must pay the penalty for his crimes, or there is no justice! M.S.]

I'm afraid that we might say something to our own detriment - that's why some others aren't coming [to these meetings. M.S.] [So that's why the boot-lickers are staying away in droves! M.S.]

Some good members of the Department are planning to leave [having compromised their own integrity? M.S.] - this case should be finished soon! [I agree! M.S.]

M.C.: You've had psychiatric experience: do you suggest that Dr. Spautz is psychologically unbalanced? [Prof. Carter: Beware! This question could come back to haunt you! M.S.]

E.B.: No - my remark was concerning his use of psychological knowledge - it's in his favour! [I gather that her remark was meant as a compliment, not a put-down, as Carter apparently tried to make it look like. M.S.] The effects of stress are not only psychological but also physical [rather, physiological. M.S.] In this situation Prof. Williams is suffering from stress - perhaps by design. [Voodoo?! M.S.]

G.C.: Has Prof. Williams demanded or solicited your support?

E.B.:) No. [Again: boot-licking is obviously an automatic reaction in this organisation. I understand that this is an integral feature of what is commonly known as "The British System". M.S.]

D.S.: Prof. Williams hasn't been around much, apparently he can't stand the stress - but he's in the other Section. I didn't sign the [Dunlop? M.S.] document that went over because I don't know the facts.

Dr. Spautz is personally attacking Prof. Williams, with bad effects on him; his participation is limited because of a deleterious environment. Every academic has a right to be protected. [Me too - from those who are siding with Williams against me, despite their acknowledged ignorance of the facts! M.S.] Criticisms of the thesis should not take the form of a personal attack [even if fraud, in the form of plagiarism, is obviously involved?! M.S.] The fault is with the selection committee [i.e., when Williams was appointed to the chair, on such flimsy qualifications! M.S.] - Prof. Williams shouldn't be blamed for that. [But what about the plagiarism! M.S.]

I'm concerned about my own future career too - being [known to be] from such a Department could be a problem.

The production of these materials [by M.S.?], esp. photocopies, is questionable - has Dr. Spautz arranged to reimburse the Department for his personal use of scarce resources? [Reply: (a) it's professional use, as I'm doing research, for publication, on corruption in Australian Universities; (b) can anyone prove I've wasted any such materials? (c) No, I've not arranged to pay back, but as soon as I get a written request to do so, I intend to make a photocopy of that request and tape it on my door. M.S.]

D.S.: How do you see things are going? When can we expect a resolution? The Management Section problems [threaten to?] spill over into the A. & F. Section.

M.C.: Council will determine that; if the weight of evidence supports it, they'll probably move fast. [But note: Council Resolution 151/70 requires that Williams be given at least 28 days notice before a proper hearing can be scheduled - meaning late Jan. 1980, at the earliest. Unless he "goes on leave" before that! M.S.]

G.C.: How would you [D.S.] see this resolved?

D.S.: Dr. Spautz has provided evidence - I'm not qualified on the facts. But why go back and re-evaluate anyone's appointment, which is in the past? [Reply: how about the fraudulence involved in getting a chair, based on a phony, invalid, plagiarised pseudo-scientific thesis? Is a Professor above the law? Should he be immune from criticism for past transgressions? Do you honestly believe that he would escape punishment if he were only a Tutor?! M.S.]

G.C.: How would you [E.B.] see this resolved?

E.B.: I'd like to see Dr. Spautz refrain from passing out more literature and putting it up where students can see it. He should promise to stop it. I don't want either M.S. or A.W. to leave, but if this isn't solved soon, one should leave.



K.L.: Did you state that Dr. Spautz applied for the position of Head of the Management Section?

E.B.: No, for the Chair. [As I explained above, there's a good deal of misunderstanding about this, which I'll be happy to clear up when a proper investigation of my charges is called, in accordance with C.R. 151/70. M.S.]

K.L.: Would you please explain what you meant by "blackmail" and "a political blow up"?

E.B.: The length of time allowed to go by, by the Administration; they should have acted firmly long ago. [I agree! M.S.]

K.L.: Has the university been blackmailed?

M.S.: [My thought at this point: Yes, at least implicitly - by Williams! Seemy "Shame!" memo dated 29 Oct. 79(a).]

E.B.: No, not directly by Dr. Spautz.

D.S.: The fact that so much time has gone by is a main concern - e.g. info on his [M.S.] door can cause a misinformed blowup. It's hard for the Dept. to instigate action - we hope you can do something.

K.L.: Has Dr. Spautz hampered your use of the photocopy machine?

E.B.: No - maybe now. [We've almost run out of paper! M.S.]

M.C.: Concerning the question of psychological disorder: is he [M.S.? A.W.?] emotionally trammelled? [Again: beware of defamatory questions: the slander laws protect whistle-blowers too (or do they?! M.S.)]

E.B.: Possibly - a psychiatrist would have to say. Dr. Spautz might be making the suggested concerted effort [to emotionally trammel A.? M.S.] But conversations in the hall make me think that it's others who are angry, etc: Dr. Spautz is extra-ordinarily calm, collected and controlled in this situation.

M.C.: You mean, where in such situations as this most people would respond in one way [emotionally? M.S.], he [M.S.] responds differently [rationally? M.S.]?

E.B.: Yes. [Thanks, Ellen! M.S.]

M.C.: I take your point! [Thank goodness! M.S.]

[There being no more questions, E.B. & D.S. then left. M.S.]

[M.S.: Interesting concept, this "emotionally trammelled" - esp. coming from a sociologist. How about this one: "ethically trammelled"? Prof. Carter & Al Williams: does this describe you? M.S.]



Report on the Carter Committee Conversation with Bruce Taylor

8th November, 1979, 3:05 to 3:20

By M. E. Spautz, Senior Lecturer

Some selected, paraphrased statements:

B.T.: I don't have much to say -- I've tried to stay out of it -- it hasn't directly affected my work. I'm showing up so people won't think I condone the dispute.

My biggest concern is the failure to resolve it after so much time. I'm not concerned about the thesis charges -- the matter rests with the UWA examiners' acceptance.

I don't envy your job!

I'm not happy at all with the way things are going. I said early on that I didn't want to get correspondence -- which Dr. Spautz has honoured until recently, but this correspondence [re the Carter Committee? M.S.] is a different matter.

G.C.: Any effects on students in your Section?

B.T.: No evidence.

K.L.: Any problems getting to the photocopy machine?

B.T.: I can't rightly say -- I can see into the office and wait -- I can't blame Dr. Spautz.

K.L.: Any effects on others in the Department, e.g. interference with their research?

B.T.: Yes - some in the other Section seem to think so. [More hearsay! How come they didn't show up at these Conversations to say so?! M.S.]

K.L.: Have you directly observed any disruption?

B.T.: No.

G.C.: How have you been affected?

B.T.: Only some early correspondence.

G.C.: They [letters; M.S.] stopped coming?

B.T.: Yes

M.C.: I understand that you have a fair amount of contact with others off campus.

B.T.: Yes - e.g. the recent Town and Gown affair.

M.C.: To what extent is the reputation of the University being affected?

B.T.: I don't know - can't say it happened at the Town and Gown meeting.

[There being no more questions, he then left. M.S.]

M.C.: [To the other committee members and me: M.S.]  
Maybe we'll have more meetings next week, not necessarily on Monday. No plans at all. [I guess that means that no members of the Management Section came forth to testify! M.S.]