

Lois Price-Spratlen (with Steven G Olswang)

Case studies address repugnant moral and ethical behavior encountered in US universities during many years as a corporate CEO and professor.

Mark A Emmert, President, University of Washington (UW), by executive order¹ claims to provide the highest quality, client-focused services for conflict prevention and resolution among students, staff, and faculty through mediation. That order governed the contract with Lois Price-Spratlen when the Senate Executive Committee confirmed her appointment as UW Ombudsman (1988). The executive order required Price-Spratlen to assist in the protection of the rights and interests of students, faculty members, and staff against arbitrary or capricious action, dereliction, and harassment by university administrators: a function that she has neglected to perform for two decades.

Since first publication of this article, Emmert has evidently "kicked Price-Spratlen upstairs" to "University Ombudsman Emeritus, Ombudsman Emeritus for Sexual Harassment" although she retains her faculty position. King County Board of Ethics should consider performing a similar lateral arabesque by removing her as chair and appointing her to another position with a longer title and less visibility.

As a neutral third party, the mandate specifically precluded Price-Spratlen from advocating for the university or either party in a dispute. It stated that she must hold an informal process that achieved a fair and reasonable settlement through mediation within existing policies and procedures. However, she consistently used her position to benefit the university in a *quid pro quo* that guaranteed self-aggrandizement and personal advancement.

Price-Spratlen also agreed to abide by state ombudsman mandates; however, she blatantly ignored them. Those laws required her to: act as a source of information and assistance to all members of the university community on university-related academic and non-academic rules, regulations, and procedures; receive complaints from students, faculty members, and staff about alleged inequities; obviate retaliation for using mediation services; and seek to resolve difficulties between aggrieved parties.

Instead, political correctness and silence practiced by Price-Spratlen and risk management used by Olswang contributed to a bizarre escalation of malfeasance and collusion among administrators at Rensselaer (a private institution) and University of Washington (a public institution). Moreover, Olswang duped officials at State of Washington, American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), American Association of University Professors (AAUP), and US Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) to ignore legitimate complaints. Information obtained during an investigation and documents from other sources show a distinct pattern or practice of perjury, misconduct and malfeasance at both universities.

In Washington state, state actors who commit perjury by signing false or misleading declarations commit a class B felony. That offense carries a maximum punishment of ten years in a correctional institution, and/or a \$20,000 fine, on each count. If administrators at UW get their just deserts, then Walla Walla penitentiary will need a new wing to house them and a corner cell with a view over the Columbia River in which McCormick and Emmert can commiserate. *[Institutionalized Fraud]*

Equal Opportunity Misconduct

Lois Price-Spratlen, an African-American female ombudsman, used all three pernicious routes to preferred employment (academic inbreeding, double-dipping, and nepotism) to obtain the ombudsman job. In addition to a string of unlawful or unethical practices, she used affirmative action for personal racial preference.

Price-Spratlen consistently extended ombudsman services to members of her own race and gender and denied services to others - a discriminatory act in itself. Her racist disingenuousness worked to the detriment of members of other races and gender through prejudiced acts in violation of UN Declaration of Human Rights and university regulations that emanate from that protocol.

Instead of investigating complaints, reporting findings, and mediating fair settlements, Price-Spratlen worked directly for Olswang. In a direct conflict of interest, she passed documents she received in confidence from complainants to Olswang for risk management without permission from her client.

Instead of maintaining an unbiased, confidential relationship with people who sought mediation, Price-Spratlen sold them down the river (with eminent familiarity) which compromised their complaints. When questioned about the lack of confidentiality, Olswang brazenly replied: "She works for me".

Reverse Discrimination

Price-Spratlen spent much of her time lecturing white male professors about "sensitivity" in race and gender discrimination issues. She used the same unlawful, politically correct techniques that she criticized in her lectures to treat her captive audience as "honkeys" - oxymoronic for an ombudsman committed to mediation and fairness.

Black militants within Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), a political organization formed in 1960 by black college students in the United States, borrowed the term "honkey" to use as a pejorative in 1967. Dedicated to overturning segregation in the South and giving young blacks a stronger voice in the civil rights movement, SNCC sought a rebuttal for the term "nigger". "Honkey" disparages white people, especially Americans of Slavic or Hungarian descent.

Price-Spratlen's audiences did not respond to her perceived racism for fear of politically correct retaliation by the administration. They sat quietly then discussed it among themselves afterwards which reignited latent racism that faculty members probably addressed and overcame many years ago. [*Institutionalized Racism*]

In the context of university admissions procedures, the term "discrimination" defines prejudice by members of dominant social or racial groups against other groups through misuse of affirmative action to benefit themselves. The term also refers to the exclusion of a member of a class not commonly discriminated against to mitigate historic discrimination against a member of another class. [*Bigoted Ombudsmen*] [*Xenophobia and Bigotry*]

Discriminatory practice allows allocation of positions traditionally held by members of a preferred group to the exclusion of other candidates without regard for merit, education, expertise, or temperament. University of Washington has used illegal quota systems for at least two decades by disguising them as affirmative action. Those systems violate the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, United States Constitution and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, 1964. [*Civil Rights*]

The misnomer "reverse discrimination" lacks definition. Discrimination can apply to anyone regardless of race, religion or other arbitrary classification so the term "reverse" becomes redundant. Discrimination describes policies or acts that benefit one group at the expense of any other group based upon arbitrary membership or predetermined quotas.

The legally precise terms "race preference", "gender preference", or "preferential treatment" generally contained and defined within existing civil rights law better describe behavior that violates the Civil Rights Act. The term "affirmative action" differs from "race preference" in that it describes permissible socioeconomic or anti-discriminatory action as opposed to preferential treatment afforded individuals solely based upon membership in a special interest group.

[*University of California Regents v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978)*]

Racist Appointments

R Byron Pipes, President, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (RPI) and his Provost, Gary Judd, by their silence, condoned or actively promoted dereliction by Alan S Meltzer, Ombudsman who allegedly obtained his job because of his Jewish heritage. The current RPI president, Shirley A Jackson, continues their *laissez faire* policies. Similarly, Richard L McCormick, President, University of Washington (UW) and his Provost, Lee L Huntsman, by their silence, condoned or actively promoted dereliction by Lois Price-Spratlen, Ombudsman who allegedly obtained her job because of her Black heritage. The current UW president, Mark A Emmert continues their *laissez faire* policies.

Both McCormick and Emmert condoned practices by Lois Price-Spratlen who helped administrators cover-up malfeasance. Although bound by law to do so, they neglected to take ameliorative action and colluded with perpetrators who released confidential information to help cover up transgressions and protect themselves against indictment.

At RPI, Meltzer neglected to initiate arbitration proceedings by non-interested, non-involved third parties: an action mandated by Rensselaer judicial codes. This pattern or practice points to an urgent need for criminal indictment of implicated individuals for the massive public and academic fraud that they perpetrated.

Considered in retrospect, a despicable comment by a LL&C professor should have aroused suspicion of trouble ahead. The comment: "If you want a doctorate from H&SS then you had better behave like a nigger applying for membership in a Jewish country club" caused this former civil rights worker, with a partly Jewish heritage, concern. Unfortunately, the record over two decades has proved that ethnic analogy correct. To put the statement in perspective, one must consider the source. That professor slept with an LL&C/RPI easy rider doctoral student. [*Easy Riders*][*Soul Department*]

Due Process of Law

Lawyers and administrators at both Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (RPI) and University of Washington (UW), including their respective ombudsmen, denied due process of law. Instead, they conspired in a vicious vilification and blackmail campaign in retaliation for reporting misconduct at RPI and malfeasance at UW. Administrators blackballed and stonewalled by recording myriad false reports and accepted false and misleading statements made to them at face value for political expedience. Collusive ombudsmen provided no recourse or mediation whatsoever.

Aberrant behavior by ombudsmen at both universities not only condoned but also encouraged the bizarre situation which has seriously affected the careers of PhD candidates. Comparison of regulations governing faculty evaluation and student grading in several universities exposed a pattern of ambiguous and arbitrary rules. Those rules neither provided due process of law nor protected untenured faculty and students from abuse. Moreover, the lack of adequate, enforced grievance procedures allowed tenured faculty members and administrators to run amok at both institutions.

Investigation revealed the extent of public and academic fraud extant at both RPI and UW which successive presidents have not addressed. Documented accounts of almost twenty years of retaliation, blackballing, and career destruction now number several thousand. The paper trail started with document withholding by S. Michael Halloran, Merrill D Whitburn, Gary Judd, and Sharon Kunkel at RPI. They suppressed first-party documents that supported allegations of academic fraud and forgery by faculty members which allowed faculty members and administrators to cover up many illegal and unethical activities.

Courts have found that a "pattern or practice" exists when facts establish that discriminatory actions relate to regular practice, rather than isolated instances. This does not mean that a complainant has to prove that defendants always discriminate or that their actions always affect a number of people. By that, administrators who have a policy of discriminating even if they do not always follow that policy suffices to indict them.

Both RPI and UW have policies that discriminate against faculty members and students. Administrators have at least a two-decade history of denial of civil and human rights also due process of law - a pattern of intentional violation of rights granted by the Civil Rights Act evidenced by regular and repeated conduct.

Legal Representation

In the real world, if one becomes involved in an automobile accident then one does not trust the other driver's lawyer to investigate objectively. Similarly, one does not trust university lawyers or attorneys general to investigate illegal practices by university employees. They do not investigate complaints with a view to due process of law. Instead, they use risk management techniques designed to protect the university from lawsuits and to deny due process.

In many instances, risk management techniques require the cooperation of the ombudsman to cover up misconduct by administrators who hold academic positions. This creates a dangerous conflict of interest. Price-Spratlen falls into that category with a conflict of interest that serves no other purpose than to increase her pension income and provide her with a convenient academic bolt-hole.

Olswang conspired with state attorneys general to deny access to public records that would expose harassment by university administrators. He colluded with Price-Spratlen who denied a requested mediation and ignored grievance procedures mandated by the legislature. That malfeasance allowed Olswang to replace due process of law with kangaroo courts - courts that characterize dishonesty and act in violation of established legal procedure.

Propaganda

University of Washington granted Price-Spratlen a PhD degree in Urban Planning (1976) for which she wrote a dissertation on hypertension-screening of inner-city adolescents. Although a full professor, she teaches only one course and allegedly has no current research studies. She remains unpublished except for an article in *Journal of School Health* (1982) based on her PhD dissertation. She claims to have published a book; however, commercial, academic, and library databases do not reference it.

Price-Spratlen arguably claims that: UW Ombudsman's office averages more than 500 cases each year, with more than 95 percent being resolved. About 30 percent of all cases go through mediation, although help is available to anyone who deals with the university - staff, faculty and

students. Issues addressed range from quality of instruction and grades to merit review and harassment.

Price-Spratlen has made a hypocritical farce out of mediation ethics defined by organizations to which she belongs and which govern her professional behavior. In a published statement she claimed that she: “promotes respect for the rights and privileges of others, understanding and appreciation of human differences and the constructive expression of ideas” - a disingenuous statement that classifies as nothing more than a propagandist travesty.

Hypocritically, Price-Spratlen says that she expects students to: practice high standards of academic and professional honesty and integrity; respect the rights privileges and property of other members of the academic community and visitors to the campus; refrain from any conduct that would interfere with the university functions or endanger the health, welfare, or safety of other persons; and comply with the rules, regulations, procedures, policies, standards of conduct, and orders of the university and its schools, colleges and departments; then she does not apply those admirable attributes herself. Moreover, she has the audacity to threaten students that if they violate her code they will become subject to disciplinary action, including suspension or permanent dismissal from the university.

1. Executive Order No. 18 of the President, June 1, 1972; revised February 21, 1978; February 24, 1986; February 13, 1988; February 13, 2006.

Mandate and Complaint
University of Washington
and
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Mark A Emmert, President
University of Washington

Under Executive Order 18 of the President, University of Washington claimed to provide “the highest quality, client-focused services for preventing, managing and resolving conflict among students, staff, and faculty through active participation in the mediation process”.

The order instructed the Ombudsman to assist in the protection of the rights and interests of individual members of the student body, the faculty and the staff against arbitrary or capricious action or lack of appropriate action by University agencies, the student body, the faculty, or the staff.

Appointed by the President in consultation with student, staff, and faculty representatives, the appointment position requires confirmation by the Senate Executive Committee.

A neutral third party, the University Ombudsman must not advocate for the University or for either party in a dispute. The appointment calls for an informal process that achieves a fair and reasonable settlement through mediation within existing policies and procedures.

According to University policy, the Ombudsman is expected to:

Act as a source of information and assistance to all members of the University community concerning University-related academic and non-academic rules, regulations, and procedures.

Receive complaints from students and members of the faculty and staff with regard to alleged inequities.

(No employee shall suffer loss of pay for reasonable time spent in bringing a complaint to the Ombudsman. No individual shall be retaliated against for using the services of the Ombudsman.)

Bring the complaint to the attention of the appropriate University official, if it has not already been heard.

Seek to resolve the difficulty between the aggrieved individual and the University official involved.

Make recommendations to the President and appropriate authorities about desired or necessary changes in University rules, regulations, and procedures.

*Lois Price Spratlen, Ombudsman
University of Washington*

On March 14, 1991, I requested that you consider two complaints in your capacity as University Ombudsman, University of Washington.

You incorrectly stated that you could not make available your services to me because "you presently [at the time of the filing of the complaint] are not a registered student."

I say incorrectly, because I was a student at the time the offenses occurred and the complaint itself related to failure to complete the registration process. By your decision, you denied me due process and eventual arbitration proceedings.

Perhaps, your dereliction may now have become moot as the university subsequently registered me as a graduate student. However, it later compounded the original problems by continuing to deny to me the opportunity to complete my doctor of philosophy degree: the reason for which I relocated to Washington in the first place.

In brief, neither you nor the university have addressed the complaints that I filed with you three years ago. You will remember that you divulged the content of the files relating to my case to Vice Provost Stephen Olswang.

In the process, you created a flagrant conflict of interest. Since then he has stonewalled in a cover-up of malfeasance to protect the malefactors.

At the time I felt that the procedures did not conform to accepted practice. I, therefore, asked Olswang about your participation in the investigation of my complaints. He said that "she [Price-Spratlen] works for me [Olswang]" which leaves me in doubt about your personal and professional integrity.

My experience leads me to believe that you do not act as an independent official (in the traditional way of the ombudsman). Apparently, you act only upon politically non-sensitive cases and do not independently investigate complaints.

Your office adopts a totalitarian policy that calls for equal treatment for all non-traditional and minority students, but treats some more equally than others. Consequently, the ombudsman exists as a tool of political expediency.

Olswang's statement about you, and your own inaction, support allegations of mutual conflict of interest in condoning malfeasance, also the cover-up of criminal activity.

I have attempted to conciliate the matter of my PhD study through established appeals processes. Consequently, I have suffered another three years of stonewalling and cover-up.

I, therefore, insist that you immediately initiate independent investigations and student judicial proceedings: the conduct of such investigations to come under the auspices of uninformed, non-UW investigators.

Moreover, the discriminatory practices, the malfeasance, and the subsequent cover-up in the College of Education and the Graduate School, University of Washington, must become the subject of a report to state and federal authorities so that they may consider judicial action.

If I do not hear from you within ten days from the date of this letter, then I can only construe that you, as ombudsman, have chosen to become an accessory to the cover-up of criminal activity. I attach a copy of the complaints as an appendix.

[Price-Spratlen did not respond.]

Appendix

Complaint 1

Against the University of Washington; the School of Education, University of Washington; and the Graduate Program Coordinator, School of Education, University of Washington; under Executive Order #17 of the President, June 1, 1972; revised February 21, 1978, July 14, 1980. The complainant has suffered:

1. Vitiating of rights and interests as an individual member of the student body.
2. Arbitrary and capricious action, and also lack of appropriate action.
3. Deprivation of livelihood for a period of almost five years.

Complaint 2

Against the University of Washington; the School of Education, University of Washington; and the Graduate Program Coordinator, School of Education, University of Washington; under Human Rights Procedures approved by the Provost by authority of Executive Order #4, Operations Manual, University of Washington, Rev. June 1987. The complainant has been discriminated against in that he has been denied admission to the PhD Program, School of Education, University of Washington on the basis of:

1. Age - in that his credentials have been classified according to current criteria and not within the time frame of the original achievements.
2. National Origin - in that his foreign equivalent baccalaureate and masters degrees have been classified as unacceptable, and that his US masters degree has not received consideration, even though the requirements for admission to the PhD Program, College of Education, require a "master's degree or equivalent".

Lois Price-Spratlen - Salary

The university employed Lois Price-Spratlen, University Ombudsman to investigate complaints, report findings, and mediate fair settlements. Unlawfully, she worked directly for Olswang. Instead of employing his own staff, and willfully blind to the McCormick/Olswang scam, Emmert inherited Price Spratlen and increased her salary from \$86,400.00/pa to \$111,984.00 an increase of \$25,584.00 (29.61%/4 years).

*Alan S. Meltzer, Ombudsman
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute*

Take notice that the following complaints have not received attention by either you or members of your office. Therefore, I request that you take immediate action to initiate arbitration proceedings by non-interested, non-involved third parties: action required by your mandate as Ombudsman and in accordance with Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute student judicial procedures.

Complaints against: R. Byron Pipes, S. Michael Halloran, Gary Judd, Sharon Kunkel, C. Lee Odell, Thomas Phelan, Merrill D. Whitburn, et al, (the Administrators) and Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, by Paul Trummel (Doctoral Student).

Doctoral Student complains:

1. That the Administrators have denied doctoral student re-registration rights to Doctoral Student, a non-traditional student in the department of Language, Literature, and Communication (LL&C) working on a PhD prerequisite for him to continue employment as a professor.

Doctoral Student has 47 years industrial and academic experience in technical communication, has held, among other appointments, positions as: corporate chief executive officer of publishing companies; associate professor of communication at a California university; lecturer at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (RPI), and associate editor of an academic journal.

Doctoral Student also holds elected fellowships in two international institutions.

2. That until 1985, Doctoral Student's employment as a professor depended upon his accredited European, terminal masters degree equivalency. Doctoral Student held that qualification for many years.

During the early 1980s, United States university policies changed and required a PhD even from non-traditional faculty members who already held academic positions. Consequently, an MS degree remained terminal in Doctoral Students profession but became inadequate for him to continue his employment as a professor.

Administrators offered Doctoral Student the opportunity to obtain a PhD degree in the Doctoral Student's discipline.

Doctoral Student paid tuition and entered the Defendant's doctoral program in the fall of 1985 in order to preserve his academic employment status as a professor. Subsequently, RPI appointed Doctoral Student lecturer in the graduate program.

Since that time Administrators have stonewalled Doctoral Student from forming a doctoral committee and precluded him from defending his dissertation. Concurrently, the

Administrators have willfully caused Doctoral Student to lose his position as an associate professor at San Jose State University, California.

Doctoral Student, as a direct result of this action by the Administrators, also lost his tenure appointment and retirement benefits. Additionally, the Administrators have refused to supply information about Doctoral Student's academic progress to some universities and disseminated false information to others thereby causing the removal of the Doctoral Student's name from professorial candidate lists.

The foregoing actions by the Administrators have caused Doctoral Student to remain unemployed for a period in excess of nine years. Subsequently, the Administrators have altered Doctoral Student's academic transcripts and falsified other academic files in attempts to cover-up their actions.

3. That the Doctoral Student earned an additional MS degree (Communication and Rhetoric from RPI) on during January, 1992, as part of his doctoral degree program. He continued his work toward his doctoral degree and completed a draft dissertation.

October 14, 1992, his former advisor at RPI provided a statement of satisfactory progress to meet changed criteria for ongoing doctoral study.

December 9, 1992, the Administrators informed the Doctoral Student that they were requesting a progress statement from Doctoral Student's advisor to which the Doctoral Student responded on December 15, 1992.

December 16, 1992, the Administrators refused to re-register the Doctoral Student stating that he had "not made satisfactory progress toward your [his] degree".

December 22, 1992, the Administrators arbitrarily dismissed Doctoral Student from the graduate school on the grounds that he had "not made satisfactory progress".

December 29, 1992, the Doctoral Student wrote to the Administrators to request a review of the dismissal and to arrange an appointment to discuss the matter.

January 7, 1993, the Doctoral Student's academic advisor at University of Washington provided an additional statement of satisfactory progress to the Administrators.

January 13, 1993, the Doctoral Student arrived in Troy from Seattle, Washington, where he now resides, to discuss his dismissal from the graduate school. Administrators arbitrarily and maliciously arranged for restriction of Doctoral Student's movements by RPI police for a period of four days.

Administrators violated the Student Bill of Rights by failing to: give a warning of dismissal; define the term "satisfactory progress;" provide the names of the "graduate committee" responsible for the dismissal; provide a copy of the minutes of the meeting; or give a satisfactory reason for dismissal from the graduate school.

4. Administrators wrongfully denied re-registration in the Doctoral program, Department of Language, Literature, and Communication (LL&C), Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (the Institute) and have discriminated against the Doctoral Student on account of his age and professional and academic experience.

5. Administrators retaliated against Doctoral Student by expelling him on two occasions for bringing to the attention of the Institute the criminal practices extant in LL&C. Doctoral

Student has made documented representations that include forgery, manipulation of federal and state funds, and cover-up of other criminal activity.

6. Administrators denied Doctoral Student re-registration and dismissed him from the graduate school without cause. Administrators supported their contentions through the following actions:

a. Changed the criteria for re-registration to preclude the Doctoral Student from re-registering in abrogation of a doctoral student contract entered into during 1985.

b. Refused to acknowledge the Doctoral Student's compliance with the changed criteria and made false representations to coerce the Registrar into ignoring the positive progress reports of two academic advisors.

c. Refused the Doctoral Student all Institute student appeal procedures and have arbitrarily prevented the Doctoral Student from proper representation.

d. Restricted the Doctoral Student's movements on Campus to prevent him interviewing Institute personnel in his attempts to conciliate and mitigate damage. The Administrators have falsely informed the Campus Police that the Doctoral Student has a violent disposition. This information caused the Campus police to place the Doctoral Student under "campus arrest" for a period of four days while they investigated. The Campus Police found that the charges had no foundation.

e. Forged the Doctoral Student's transcripts and files over a period of nine years to support their contentions.

7. Administrators supplied false information to potential employers at RPI to prevent Doctoral Student from gaining Institute employment. Administrators have discriminated against Doctoral Student by appointing less-qualified and less-experienced individuals to Institute positions by re-advertising after the closure dates for appointment. As a result, Doctoral Student, the prime contender on three occasions, could not gain employment with the Institute.

8. Continued discrimination against the Doctoral Student, now 60 years of age, by Administrators prevented the Doctoral Student from defending his dissertation, completing his PhD, and obtaining gainful employment. Doctoral Student completed all the course work, written dissertations, and completed all other requirements for a PhD at both Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and the University of Washington. Doctoral Student has obtained doctoral cumulative grade averages of 3.85 and 4.0 respectively. Malicious actions by Administrators prevented Doctoral Student from completing a PhD at either university.

9. Doctoral Student has taken all reasonable steps to effect reregistration and to continue progress toward his doctoral degree and to mitigate the damage occasioned to him both professionally and academically by Administrators. Administrators have consistently blocked Doctoral Student from achieving the degree essential to his employment.

Doctoral Student requests that the Ombudsman restrain Administrators from any other actions that will preclude Doctoral Student from defending his dissertation or gaining employment either within the Institute or elsewhere. All arrangements to be made under the auspices of independent arbitrators.

Doctoral Student calls for a response from the Ombudsman within ten days of this memorandum.

[Alan S Meltzer responded with a General Denial - arbitrary dismissal of the complaint without considering the evidence submitted or even recording it.]

Contra Cabal Foundation

Contra Cabal web sites have achieved an extraordinary readership. If Paul Trummel dies before he completes his work, then trustees have authority to continue publication as an educational project through the newly formed *Contra Cabal Foundation*, London which will own all publication rights. The Foundation will publish *Contra Cabal* in perpetuity in the way that Sonia Orwell posthumously published the collected works of George Orwell.

Foundation trustees and directors (professional people, lawyers, and academicians in UK and US connected directly and indirectly with the International Federation of Journalists) will supervise editorial and design functions using young investigative reporters and graphic designers who wish to further their education in journalism. They will receive trade union freelance rates of payment for their work.

The Foundation will respect former trustee the late William D Winn's last admonition "Go get 'em!" by continuing to report academic malfeasance and exposure of morally repugnant academicians and public officials.

Readers should consider the articles and case studies as a work in progress. More information about academic or government fraud and deceit frequently surfaces after victims or their associates read *Contra Cabal*. That information becomes part of a relevant case study after verification and validation. Students and current faculty members write letters to the editor on politically sensitive issues. Some correspondents request name withholding to avoid retaliation.

Contra Cabal electronic magazine contains exposé and satire. Probably one of the first to appear on the web, it has now published since 1992. The hits/month range between 100,000 and 150,000 with more than 1.5 million hits by about 60,000 unique visitors during the past twelve months. The "New Releases" menu lists new, updated, or revised articles on the four *Contra Cabal* sites.

[*Site Navigation Plan*] [*Letters to the Editor*]

© Copyright 2008 by Paul Trummel
All Rights Reserved: 22 Jan 08/14:52 GMT
Edition: #610-26-03/08-0218-1442
Feedback: Webspinner@ContraCabal.org