



A PUBLICLY SUPPORTED
COMMUNITY COLLEGE
1800 E. McLOUGHLIN BLVD.
VANCOUVER, WA 98663-3598
TELEPHONE (360) 992-2000



June 18, 1997

Prof. Dennis Watson
Mathematics

Dear Prof. Watson:

I hope that the following addresses the issues that we discussed in the presence of Ms. Leslie Homer on April 30 at a Stage I grievance meeting.

Prof. Craven's offensive e-mails directed at you, and clearly meant to malign your reputation across campus, represent his own skewed vision of your recent legal action. The administration of Clark College is satisfied that the agreements that concluded the legal action marked an end to the issues. I personally have every confidence in you as a faculty member and colleague.

As you know, maintaining a reasonable level of civility on the e-mail system is problematic under the current policies. We continue to discuss possible guidelines with the AHE and other entities, and I hope that eventually we will be able to eliminate the kind of demeaning personal attacks that have marked recent attempts at discussion of important issues on campus.

Thank you for your patience. If you wish to meet with me again on this or related issues, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Richard D. Fulton
Dean of Faculty

c Personnel File
Leslie Homer

✓ *RLS* 7/7/97



-----Original Message-----

From: Dennis Watson [<mailto:dwatson@xxxxxxxx>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 2:11 PM

To: Fulkerson, Toni; Davis, Susan; Campus Master List

Subject: RE: Discussion on Master List Usage

Watson: I am concerned not with Clark's policy, but with usage of State email that is considered illegal. Could not the school or individuals be breaking Washington State Law by using State owned email for political messages? Unless the laws have been changed, expressing political views on campus has been illegal since before email. I don't think any local policy can override State law and I believe we are in violation of state law when we use email for ANY message that is not business related. THIS email MAY be against state law!! I was told by a state attorney that sending a message to folks about getting together for lunch was illegal so I am led to believe much of the frivolous messaging going on the Master list, or any other state owned list, is illegal.

Dennis Watson

--

If success is A, then A equals X plus Y plus Z, where X equals "work", Y equals "play", and Z equals "keep your mouth shut."
Albert Einstein

Mr . Watson wrote (May 13, 1997)

Nothing quite as cozy as losing \$100,000 in money and wages, I am glad I wasn't reprimanded!!! I have stipulated to nothing more than you have done.

I KNOW it is illegal for a state employer to try to get support for any legislative action, even if it does benefit the college! That is a DIRECT ethics violation. Whereas I didn't knowingly use school resources for my own benefit. Most people on campus agree. It is the vocal few that are keeping Clark in the spotlight and hence I decided to end the unnecessary publicity that is hurting the college and get on with life.

Response Craven: On November 13, 1996 The Columbian reported:

"Last November, A Washington State Patrol detective examined 200 disks containing 11,592 files, according to court records. Of those, the detective discovered 1,771 files containing sexually explicit materials.

In addition, a second detective discovered 'several thousand adult pornographic pictures' in other Watson computer files, according to a WSP investigative report. Among the images, reported detective Glen Hobbes were depictions of heterosexual and homosexual acts, as well as sex acts between people and animals.

Also seized were several undated e-mail messages between Watson's college e-mail address and others.

Said one, 'Hi sexy, I was busy on the phone with a new 'friend' in Canada. Can't call her very often, though to[sic] expensive!... By the way, have any sexy photos? He He...If so, send them to Dennis Watson (Or take some new polaroids...he he)."

Further response Craven: 1) Either "The Columbian" is misquoting Det. Hobbes or, Det Hobbes is lying or, Prof. Watson is lying; 2) If "The Columbian" misquoted Det Hobbes, they run the danger of losing further access to a source on future stories (as I noted in a previous missive, the fundamental capitalist-based imperatives of the media demand attention to maintaining good relations with present and potential future sources); 3) If Det Hobbes were misquoted, I know him and Sgt Haw of the WSP (both very intelligent, professional, hard-working and honorable police officers) and Det Hobbes would have demanded a retraction or correction on his statements--he did not; 4)

If Det. Hobbes had lied, he would have risked and would be risking exposure and possible litigation for slander or libel as well as loss of his job through statements that could potentially be proved as lies--Det Hobbes is far too intelligent to leave himself exposed in such a way; 5) That leaves what possibility? 6) According to these press accounts, Prof. Watson was not only engaging in the collection of commercial porn, he was engaging in predatory behavior viz a viz private individuals and soliciting private (polaroid) pictures (the exact charge in the original complaint that led to the investigation).

Further Craven : the "Notice of [Ethics] Board Action dated March 20, 1997 on page 2 (point 3) states:

"I acknowledge that I acted inappropriately when I used the College computers to download pornography from the Internet sites and to transmit personal electronic messages of a sexual nature. Although the Instructor Computer User's Committee (ICUC) did ask me at one time to determine how to access pornographic websites in order to determine how to limit student's access to those sites, I exceeded that authority when I downloaded, collected, and stored pornography in my computer in my office. In short, the downloading, collecting, and maintaining of pornography in my faculty office was not related to my official duties, and I should not have done it."

http://ethics.wa.gov/ENFORCEMENT/Results_of_Enforcement/96-15WatsonStipulationandOrder.pdf

Which is it? Is Prof Watson lying in this statement about being guilty of the abovementioned offenses (when in fact he has done nothing that "I" haven't done and is in reality "innocent") or is he lying about not being guilty of "unprofessional conduct", "ethics violations" and "misuse of State resources"?

Further from Craven: Why the reference to the ICUC [Instructional Computer User's Committee to which Watson was appointed AFTER discovery of the porn in his computer] when most of the porn collected was from a time period well

before the ICUC was set up even and when the demonstration for which he "volunteered" (was he setting up a cover as the ethics complaint against him had already been filed well before the ICUC was even set up or this exercise occurred?) was on a one time basis. Phile Sheehan wrote:

"...I asked for a volunteer from the committee with experience using the www to conduct the demonstration. Dennis Watson agreed to conduct the demonstration...

With the exception of the aforementioned demonstration, Prof. Watson was not asked or directed to continue the exploring and cataloging sexually explicit sites on the Internet by me or, to my knowledge, any other Clark College administrator. Dr. Johnson neither attended or sanctioned the demonstration."

Response Craven: So why the reference to the ICUC in his statement to the Ethics Board when the ICUC one-time demonstration clearly had nothing to do with the offenses for which Watson was charged? Who gave Dr. Larry Easter the impression that Watson was working at the behest of the ICUC to "research pornography"? Does this irrelevant reference to the ICUC one-time demonstration (with no reference to the fact that he "volunteered") not suggest that he "volunteered" for this assignment to give himself a potential cover for charges that had already been filed and about which the Administration had knowledge? (I alerted the WSP at the time that a potential cover was possibly being constructed and that short of a outright conviction, he would be returned to Clark because of his tight relationship with the Administration--one WSP Detective later said to me "You called it --that he would return--and I just didn't want to believe it.")

The fact is, that several individuals have been dismissed from employment (denial of tenure or outright dismissal) for far less than Prof Watson has admitted to having done and with a lot less due process than Watson has been given. The fact that he continues to tell outright and provable lies about his own case and that of my wife shows why he has been returned to Clark, it shows the need for comprehensive and fairly applied standards of due process at Clark

(available to those who are not compliant sycophants of the powers-that-be) and the imperative to end all cover-ups and built proper foundations at Clark,.

More to follow.

Jim Craven

* James Craven * " For those who have fought for it, *

* Dept of Economics * freedom has a taste the protected *

* Clark College * will never know." *

* 1800 E. McLoughlin Blvd. * Otto von Bismark *

* Vancouver, Wa. 98663 * *

* (360) 992-2283 * *

* jcraven@xxxxxxxx * *

* MY EMPLOYER HAS NO ASSOCIATION WITH MY PRIVATE/PROTECTED
OPINION *

FW: Speaking of liars Response

From: **Craven, Jim** (JCraven@clark.edu)
Sent: Mon 5/25/09 4:34 PM
To: omahkohkiaayo@hotmail.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Craven, Jim
Sent: Monday, October 08, 2007 11:16 AM
To: Kotsakis, Ted
Subject: FW: Speaking of liars Response

From: "James Michael Craven" <CRAVJM@ooi.clark.edu>
Organization: Clark College, Vancouver WA, USA
To: "CLARK COLLEGE MASTER LIST -- DISTRIBUTION LIST"
supervisor@cs.clark.edu>
Date: Thu, 24 Apr 1997 13:04:22 PST8PDT
Subject: Didn't do it
Priority: normal

It was just brought to my attention that some people are under the impression that I was the one who published the "dialogue" between

myself and the person using the pseudonym "A.E. Newman" on the master list. It was that person, not I, who published this "dialogue."

I would never publish a private dialogue on the campus master list.

Jim Craven

Watson: I deleted your large .sig.

If this is indeed true, why did you respond to my private email to the whole campus???? You didn't even have the courtesy to restrict your email to the faculty list, but sent it to WSU, et al. I realize your agenda is to punish Clark and, in particular, the administration and the hiring committee, with me at the top of your list, for not hiring your ex-wife. Get over it! Since, like most fanatics, it is impossible to reason with you, I will NEVER respond to you again. I think it is time for you to look to some other college where you will be happy, if that is at all possible. I feel sorry for you.

dww

This is just my opinion, protected by the first amendment.

Response Craven:

- 1) The message sent to me was unsolicited and was certainly not a "dialogue;
- 2) The message was sent to a "suppressed list" not to me alone;
- 3) Prior to that message, I had clearly indicated that I did not desire ANY private communication from this person;
- 4) There are fundamental issues and ongoing lies/cover-ups that need to be exposed and are relevant for ALL at Clark College (I personally consider everyone at Clark--Faculty, Staff, Students and Administrators to be equal in terms of having the right to information and access to providing input);
- 5) This dww has revealed himself to be a pathological liar, unable to take personal responsibility and has even widened the invective to include recent suggestions that Dr. Smith and I conspired to plant child pornography in his computer;
- 6) dww was not even on the witness list nor deposed in my ex- wife's case; we considered/consider him to be peripheral in the case; further, the original ethics complaint went to the Auditor's Officer before there was a case; further, Dr. Smith knew nothing about my complaint to the Auditor until the day he had been summoned by the Washington State Patrol;
- 7) If there was a conspiracy to frame Prof. Watson (child porn was indeed found in his computer with many photos that were of such quality that ages were difficult to establish to the degree of certainty required for legal conviction, so seven photos were identified that two independent Pediatricians could testify to being of children), then members of the Washington State Patrol, the Washington State Auditor's Office, the Clark County Prosecutor, the Grand Jury that indicted would have all had to have been in on it;
- 8) The statements in the Columbian as to what was allegedly found in Watson's computer (homosexual, heterosexual, animal sexual acts plus children engaged in explicit sexual activities--not just at nudist

camps--were drawn from court records sworn under penalty of perjury; if these statements are not true, then WSP officers should be charged with perjury and/or "The Columbian" charged with libel;

9) Prof Watson is unfamiliar with even the basic facts of my wife's case and is challenging facts that even the Clark Administration have already stipulated to in mediation; if he wants to be an effective sycophant for those who returned him to this campus despite the damage he has caused and despite his having admitted to "Ethics violations", "unprofessional conduct" and "misuse of State resources" (which he then denies in another polemic which caused me to asked which of the fundamentally contradictory claims is a lie?), he should get it straight at least what has been stipulated and what remains contested;

10) It is very easy to "reason" with me; liars and toadies have a problem with me because I will resolutely and uncompromisingly expose their lies and toadyism as I have done and am doing in the case of Prof Watson;

11) Faustian bargains, once made, go on and on. One lie requires others to cover-up the previous lies, with each Faustian Bargain, each participant acquires enough dirt on the others to forge new Faustian Bargains (the "I go-down-you-go-down syndrome"); for example, Drs. Johnson, Cushwa and Kibota (who knew nothing about the merits of the charges against Prof Watson other than his representations) were going around office to office collecting money for his legal defense. This is their right, but it also reveals how quid pro quos, crony networks and payback/concern for tenure can transcend principle;

12) Prof Watson's fundamental inability to accept personal responsibility and the types of fundamental character flaws that led him to collect the sick and twisted types of porn he has even stipulated to have collected, lead him to attack and slander even innocent police officers who were just doing their jobs (police officers who have repeatedly risked their lives to protect others); he writes: "...The columbian[sic] has local law enforcement around its little finger. This case would NOT have gone as far as it did except that the columbian was involved. Just ask the local prosecutor's office."

For those who are really interested in testing the level of Prof Watson's integrity and honesty, call the Clark County Deputy Prosecutor whose name is Kim Farr and run this statement by him and see what he says about it. Then you will know who is who and what is what.

13) Even collecting commercial porn is one thing (child pornography is simply illegal) but soliciting private polaroids from private individuals (signed with "clark.edu") is simply predatory and reflects directly on the character and fitness to teach of an individual who does it; The statements in the Columbian as to the content of the e-mails found in Watson's computer, asserted as lies by Prof. Watson, were from court records, sworn under penalty of perjury by Washington State Patrol Officers--what statements has Prof. Watson made under penalty of perjury?

Jim Craven

* James Craven * " For those who have fought for it, *
* Dept of Economics * freedom has a taste the protected *

* Clark College * will never know." *
* 1800 E. McLoughlin Blvd. * Otto von Bismark *
* Vancouver, Wa. 98663 * *
* (360) 992-2283 * *
* jcraven@clark.edu * *
* MY EMPLOYER HAS NO ASSOCIATION WITH MY PRIVATE/PROTECTED OPINION *

Dear President Johnson and Dean Fulton:

I am forwarding this to you as I have repeatedly requested not to be on Prof. Watson's "Suppressed List".

I will not respond further to these provocations directly. Normally, I deal with liars by exposing their lies with irrefutable evidence. This was the basis of my last exchange. Although I reserve the right to discuss the Kibota case in response to provable lies about my wife, her background and how her case was handled, I will pursue other avenues and channels of redress.

Both of you ought to be very concerned about where Watson's pathological and provable lies and obvious ongoing harassment will lead. For example, by denying the content of sworn depositions of WSP Detectives he has in effect called them liars and perjurers; I don't think they will be very happy about that and may take their own forms of redress. Further, he has made the statement that he was returned to the campus with no letter of reprimand (yet my personnel file is full of paper) and I'm sure Mr. McClain's attorney will want to contrast how Watson was treated in contrast to how Mr. McClain's dismissal has been handled with far less serious charges having been made against Mr. McClain.

Further, it is obvious that Prof. Watson is not in command of even the basic facts related to my wife's case and of course he threatens to open up and continue an investigation that \$165,000 of public money was paid to head off. With every missive, he calls into question not only the decision to allow him to return to Clark, he calls into question the motives and character of those who allowed him to return while others such as Lynn Yoshihara, Mr. McClain, Ann Gardiner and others have suffered denial of tenure and/or dismissal with far less due process and consideration than Prof Watson has received. Further, as he continues to mouth lies about my wife's case, he points further to the possibility that he is being used as an agent of harassment of me and that his return as possibly a quid pro quo for assuming this role--or vice versa, that his harassment of me is a quid pro quo for being allowed to return after having caused so much damage to this institution.

So I will forward all of this to the appropriate authorities-- including the Clark Board of Trustees--who should see clearly the calibre of this individual who was returned to Clark--and the characters of those who lobbied in backrooms for his return.

Eventually we will be getting to the point of a thorough examination-- from many conceptual angles and involving many different agencies--of several serious issues and chains of causality of which the Watson case will be only one. It will be like a "Pandora's box" and who knows where

it will lead and how far back in time it will lead.

Again, please communicate to Prof. Watson that I do not wish to have any form of communication from him and that I will regard any form of communication at any level as further evidence of ongoing harassment with him being used as an instrument of such harassment. Having a background in intelligence, I know about "social systems engineering" (calculated provocations, pressures, covert operations etc designed to destabilize and/or cause predictable responses that further destabilize or feed the caricatures/propaganda against the target) and this campaign of harassment is being watched by outside parties who know full well what is going on here. Here we have Watson claiming to be innocent on the one hand after having signed a statement with the Ethics Board admitting to that which he now repudiates. He is not only revealing himself to be a pathological liar and/or in deep denial, he is calling into question not only his own character and fitness to teach or be around young adults and of course, calling into question the characters and fitness to remain in their present positions, those who sought to return him to Clark without even a reprimand (if his claims are to be believed) and who treated him much differently than others, charged with far less than he has admitted to, have been treated.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. Copies of this missive will be forwarded to: Washington State Auditor, Washington State Governor's Office, Washington State Patrol, FBI, Clark College Board of Trustees.

Sincerely,

James M. Craven
Professor, Economics

----- Forwarded Message Follows -----

Received: from MAILQUEUE by OOI (Mercury 1.21); 15 May 97 00:06:45 +800
Return-path: <dwwrnk@teleport.com>
Received: from kim.teleport.com by ooi.clark.edu (Mercury 1.21);
15 May 97 00:06:39 +800
Received: from [206.163.121.222] (ip-vanc11-14.teleport.com
[206.163.121.175]) by kim.teleport.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with ESMTTP id
AAA03155 for <CRAVJM@ooi.clark.edu>; Thu, 15 May 1997 00:06:31 -0700 (P

X-Sender: dwwrnk@192.108.254.26
Message-Id: <v03007804afa05b564110@[206.163.121.222]>
In-Reply-To: <BD3A839020B@ooi.clark.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Thu, 15 May 1997 00:06:24 -0700
To: Recipient List Suppressed;;
From: dww <dwwrnk@teleport.com>
Subject: Re: Lies and Liars II

hmmmm very interesting:

Parts I and II

To the Campus Community,

In response to another provocative e-mail sent by dwm saying that "the truth is hard to refute isn't it?", some lies and liars need to be exposed for what they are. Climates of fear, intimidation, cover-up, cronyism, discrimination can only compromise the integrity, credibility and effectiveness of CLark College as an Institution.

Mr Watson wrote:

Why is it that Clark faculty had such a good relationship with its administration before your wife wasn't hired? You know Jim, had I know she had applied, I would have tried to get her an interview, out of professional courtesy, even though, when the AG showed me her app., she didn't have the main thrust we needed.

Response to your response:

0) I notice you didn't respond to my first question.

Response: 1) In mediation, Dr. Johnson said in front of witnesses, that my wife was well qualified to teach any of the Biology courses available;

response to 1)

1) You only read what you want to read! Sort of tunnel vision. I will restate my truth: I never saw your wife's app. until the AG showed it to me. I would have tried to get her an interview had I known she applied and had I know she was your wife. Not being a biologist, it appeared to ME that she WASN'T qualified. All I had to go on was her file and the fact that I was told we were looking for someone in environmental biology.

2) In his sworn deposition, Dr. Daniel Luchtel, professor of zoology and environmental health at the University of Washington (who did not know my wife and reviewed the files for no charge wrote:

"As stated previously, Mr. Kibota's score was lowered considerably because he had yet to obtain his doctoral degree. I also understand that Clark College listed as a requirement that applicants have at least a master's degree with additional coursework preferred. Given this requirement, I do not believe that Mr. Kibota should have even been considered for the position. It has been my experience and practice in the academic field to not consider a candidate for a position requiring a degree until they have actually obtained the degree; Mr. Kibota only stated that he expected to receive his doctorate in July 1994. This simply does not meet the requirement.

Mr. Kibota's lack of degree also raises another serious issue. The transcripts provided by Mr. Kibota only show that he was registered in classes at the University of Oregon until Spring quarter of 1993. His transcript was produced on September 2, 1993.

Since his application was submitted in March of 1994, he should have submitted a transcript showing that he was enrolled for the Summer, Autumn and Winter Quarters of 1993-94. In reviewing his transcripts, it appears that Mr. Kibota was not even a registered student during these time periods. The enrollment question is important because a student cannot obtain a degree if they are not registered. Thus, it appears that he was either unlikely or unable to obtain his doctoral degree in July 1994. [his PhD was finally obtained just before being granted tenure in 1997]

Response to 2: We are able to judge whether the person has the equivalence of a master's degree and aren't bound by the strict rules of the university. I believe he applied for and received a master's degree before he got his PhD, but in your rush to judgement you didn't even check that out. It appears you are not a researcher but a missive generator.

3) I have a copy of a check for \$165,000 on my wall; Clark College settled five days before going to trial and as they were using State money, were in a much better position to go to trial. Why didn't they want to go to trial after their motion for summary dismissal of the case was rejected? They knew what was waiting for them at trial (clear and compelling evidence of perjury, destruction of public records, material alterations of public records, contrived job descriptions and discriminatory hiring practices and subornation and/or willful blindness to all of the above.

surely you jest. I have always assumed it was the cheaper of two evils.

4) Federal Judge Robert Bryan, who had reviewed every piece of evidence and representations of all sides prior to dismissing Clark College's petition for summary dismissal of the case wrote: "She [Dr. Thomas] has offered sufficient evidence to show her application was not fairly evaluated, that she was qualified for the position and that she was entitled to participate in the next step."

Watson: If she was not fairly evaluated, it wasn't on purpose. The rating system is hard to deal with even in one's own subject. But we must have some way to discern between candidates, and not having any obvious environmental coursework worked against her. Even though the description stated, as a secondary or tertiary need, I don't remember which, we were NOT looking for another anatomist. We have plenty. We may be trying too hard to be a nursing school, when we are a community college.

5) Prof Kibota was only given one out of three possible points for "environmental awareness" and "environmental awareness" points constituted only 3 out of 36 possible screening points thus refuting the later constructed contrived job description and assertion of looking for an "environmental biologist."

6) Prof. Kibota's teaching assignments (e.g. Bioethics, attempted linked classes not in the primary areas for which it was claimed he had special qualifications;

7) Prof Kibota was ranked 8 out of 11 telephone interviewees; he was placed in an unusual sixth finalist position over Dr. Barbara Rose

who had a completed PhD and Masters degree and had received 37 points to Prof Kibota's 34 points on the telephone interview and was ranked number seven of the 11 interviewees; this was done on May 5 1994 after my e-mail to Dr. Johnson expressing concern over the hiring processes;

Watson: Out of all the scoring sheets, which particular one are you looking at. It is impossible to state he received 1 out of 3 points because some scoring sheets rated him higher. Also in the interview, some rated him above Dr. Rose. So you are telling the truth, but not the whole truth!

8) It was claimed that of the 11 telephone interviewees, only Prof Kibota's interview was not taped (We obtained portions of the tape that two individuals swore under penalty of perjury did not exist and later I obtained the whole tape) and that only Prof Kibota's final presentation was not taped of the six finalists--no need to cover-up what is clean, only what is dirty.

Watson: Can't speak to that as I don't know. I do know that I had a tape or two, which I found in my mess and returned. They may have not realized the tape(s) existed and answered to the best of their ability. Of course the Great Professor doesn't research this, he only blathers on with his own paranoid ravings.

9) Prof Kibota claimed in his sworn deposition and letter of application that as he had been a "T.A." in a vertebrate dissection course (dissecting a pig and a shark) he was "fully qualified" to teach Human Anatomy and would be glad to "teach Anatomy and Physiology AGAIN" [emphasis added]; Prof Kibota has not been assigned to teach a full Anatomy and Physiology course despite a demonstrated need and his assertions of being fully qualified to teach it {he has no record of having taken any formal coursework in HUMAN Anatomy and Physiology};

10) Dr James Kohler, full professor of Zoology at the University of Washington wrote:

" I have also reviewed Mr. Kibota's credentials regarding his expertise in environmental biology. While Mr. Kibota does appear to have some ecological background, I certainly would not characterize him as an environmental biologist. He is, by his own admission, a 'microbial genetecist.'

Watson: Well, folks at Clark debated this also. The majority believed that ecological course work, for what they wanted him to teach, qualified as environment. Can't have one without the other?

Response: I could go on and on. The Federal Judge who reviewed all the evidence and could have rejected the settlement, saw that the so-called "environmental biology" focus was a pretext constructed post facto to cover-up discrimination and faulty hiring practices.

Watson: Discrimination?????? How did we discriminate? She wasn't in the pool long enough for us to discriminate!

Response: It is so sad to see these lies and cover-ups being

perpetuated. This does show me and other something about why Prof Watson was returned to duty at Clark despite having stipulated to "ethics violations", "misuse of State resources" and "unprofessional conduct": he is still doing "lap dog" duty for those who participated in a clearly discriminatory hiring process and who continue the cover-ups and lies even today--in my opinion and in the opinion of so many others.

Watson: It is so sad to see THESE lies when you know Dr. G. Smith was your lap-dog when he spent days in my office asking my mac questions, I would have my back to him, he would "examine" my disks. His last 'visit' was just before the Auditors came. He claimed he was just stopping by to visit, but we know that by that time you two had hatched a marvelous plot to get the one whom you thought was chair of the committee. Did he plant evidence? I know he goes skinny-dipping in the summer, did he take those pictures? Or did you have them from some of your DEA activities?

More to follow.

Jim Craven

Mr Watson wrote:

Nothing quite as cozy as losing \$100,000 in money and wages, I am glad I wasn't reprimanded!!! I have stipulated to nothing more than you have done.

I KNOW it is illegal for a state employer to try to get support for any legislative action, even if it does benefit the college! That is a DIRECT ethics violation. Whereas I didn't knowingly use school resources for my own benefit. Most people on campus agree. It is the vocal few that are keeping Clark in the spotlight and hence I decided to end the unnecessary publicity that is hurting the college and get on with life.

Response: On November 13, 1996 The Columbian reported:

"Last November, A Washington State Patrol detective examined 200 disks containing 11,592 files, according to court records. Of those, the detective discovered 1,771 files containing sexually explicit materials.

In addition, a second detective discovered 'several thousand adult pornographic pictures' in other Watson computer files, according to a WSP investigative report. Among the images, reported detective Glen Hobbes were depictions of heterosexual and homosexual acts, as well as sex acts between people and animals. Also seized were several undated e-mail messages between Watson's college e-mail address and others. Said one, 'Hi sexy, I was busy on the phone with a new 'friend' in Canada. Can't call her very often, though to[sic] expensive!... By the way, have any sexy photos? He He...If so, send them to Dennis Watson (Or take some new poloroids...he he)."

Watson: I fail to see your point. That looks to me like an example of 'using state computers for personal gain.' Had it occurred to me that I was gaining something, I wouldn't have done it. Speaking of 1,771

explicit files, did you know you can download that many in one day at 26400 baud? Did you further know that can be automatically downloaded and decoded from ascii to binary with a program called Newswatcher? Did you know that while process is going on, you nothing until you take personal time, say after 5pm or on weekends, to use another program to view them?

Further response: 1) Either "The Columbian" is misquoting Det. Hobbes or, Det Hobbes is lying or, Prof. Watson is lying;

Watson: It is interesting that the columbian is so forthright and honest here, but in a recent 'missive' (Please, they aren't missives, they are e-mail) you claimed they were biased. Which is it?

Response: 2) If "The Columbian" misquoted Det Hobbes, they run the danger of losing further access to a source on future stories (as I noted in a previous missive, the fundamental capitalist-based imperatives of the media demand attention to maintaining good relations with present and potential future sources);

Watson: No they don't. The columbian has local law enforcement around its little finger. This case would NOT have gone as far as it did except that the columbian was involved. Just ask the local prosecutor's office.

Response: 3) If Det Hobbes were misquoted, I know him and Sgt Haw of the WSP (both very intelligent, professional, hard-working and honorable police officers) and Det Hobbes would have demanded a retraction or correction on his statements--he did not;

4) If Det. Hobbes had lied, he would have risked and would be risking exposure and possible litigation for slander or libel as well as loss of his job through statements that could potentially be proved as lies--Det Hobbes is far too intelligent to leave himself exposed in such a way; 5) That leaves what possibility? 6) According to these press accounts, Prof. Watson was not only engaging in the collection of commercial porn, he was engaging in predatory behavior viz a viz private individuals and soliciting private (polaroid) pictures (the exact charge in the original complaint that led to the investigation).

Watson: So, if a friend of yours, a female friend I presume, were to send you asking for polaroids, that would be predatory behaviour???? There you go, doing what you do best, jumping to conclusions.

Response: Further: the "Notice of [Ethics] Board Action dated March 20, 1997 on page 2 (point 3) states:

"I acknowledge that I acted inappropriately when I used the College computers to download pornography from the Internet sites and to transmit personal electronic messages of a sexual nature. Although the Instructor Computer User's Committee (ICUC) did ask me at one time to determine how to access pornographic websites in order to determine how to limit student's access to those sites, I exceeded that authority when I downloaded, collected, and stored pornography in my computer in my office. In short, the downloading, collecting, and maintaining of pornography in my faculty office was not related to my official duties, and I should not have done it."

Response: Which is it? Is Prof Watson lying in this statement about being guilty of the abovementioned offenses (when in fact he has done nothing that "I" haven't done and is in reality "innocent") or is he lying about not being guilty of "unprofessional conduct", "ethics violations" and "misuse of State resources"?

Watson: How many times must you be told, child. I am innocent of the indecent child porn. charges. I can only assume how they got there, since "I" had never seen these pictures until my lawyer showed them to me. But you seem to know all about them. Coincidence?

Response: Further: Why the reference to the ICUC when most of the porn collected was from a time period well before the ICUC was set up even and when the demonstration for which he "volunteered" (was he setting up a cover as the ethics complaint against him had already been filed well before the ICUC was even set up or this exercise occurred?) was on a one time basis. Phile Sheehan wrote:

"...I asked for a volunteer from the committee with experience using the www to conduct the demonstration. Dennis Watson agreed to conduct the demonstration...With the exception of the aforementioned demonstration, Prof. Watson was not asked or directed to continue the exploring and cataloging sexually explicit sites on the Internet by me or, to my knowledge, any other Clark College administrator. Dr. Johnson neither attended or sanctioned the demonstration."

Response: So why the reference to the ICUC in his statement to the Ethics Board when the ICUC one-time demonstration clearly had nothing to do with the offenses for which Watson was charged? Who gave Dr. Larry Easter the impression that Watson was working at the behest of the ICUC to "research pornography"? Does this irrelevant reference to the ICUC one-time demonstration (with no reference to the fact that he "volunteered") not suggest that he "volunteered" for this assignment to give himself a potential cover for charges that had already been filed and about which the Administration had knowledge? (I alerted the WSP at the time that a potential cover was possibly being constructed and that short of a outright conviction, he would be returned to Clark because of his tight relationship with the Administration--one WSP Detective later said to me "You called it (that he would return) and I just didn't want to believe it.")

Watson: I wanted that statement in there because, unlike you, I want to tell the WHOLE truth.

Response: The fact is, that several individuals have been dismissed from employment (denial of tenure or outright dismissal) for far less than Prof Watson has admitted to having done and with a lot less due process than Watson has been given.

Watson: And you, af course, show no facts or evidence to back this statement.

Response: The fact that he continues to tell outright and provable lies

about his own case and that of my wife shows why he has been returned to Clark, it shows the need for comprehensive and fairly applied standards of due process at Clark (available to those who are not compliant sycophants of the powers-that-be) and the imperative to end all cover-ups and built proper foundations at Clark,.

Watson: Bravo, Jim, another set of paranoid ravings. I am PROUD of you!

More to follow.

Watson: Gee, I bet the campus can hardly wait!

Jim Craven

```
*-----*
* James Craven * " For those who have fought for it freedom has a taste
the protected *
>* Clark College * will never know." *
>* 1800 E. McLoughlin Blvd. * Otto von Bismark
```

Watson: Boy, you can say that again! *

```
* Vancouver, Wa. 98663 * *
* (360) 992-2283 * *
* jcraven@clark.edu * *
* MY EMPLOYER HAS NO ASSOCIATION WITH MY PRIVATE/PROTECTED OPINION *
```

Watson: still wasting space I see. I think it is impossible to teach the old dog new tricks! Courteous .sigs are 4 lines long or LESS, not NINE!

```
*-----*
* James Craven * " For those who have fought for it, *
* Dept of Economics * freedom has a taste the protected *
* Clark College * will never know." *
* 1800 E. McLoughlin Blvd. * Otto von Bismark *
* Vancouver, Wa. 98663 * *
* (360) 992-2283 * *
* jcraven@clark.edu * *
* MY EMPLOYER HAS NO ASSOCIATION WITH MY PRIVATE/PROTECTED OPINION *
```


DATED this 6 day of March, 1997

Richard A. McCartan
RICHARD A. McARTAN
Assistant Attorney General

Dennis Watson 3/4/97
DENNIS WATSON

II. ORDER

Having reviewed the Complaint and the Stipulation, WE, THE STATE OF WASHINGTON EXECUTIVE ETHICS BOARD, HEREBY ORDER That pursuant to WAC 292-100-090 the above stipulation is:

Accepted in its entirety and becomes the Order of the Board by incorporation by reference.

Accepted and becomes the Order of the Board by incorporation by reference with the following modification(s):

I () accept / () do not accept the proposed modification.

DENNIS WATSON

Rejected in its entirety.

DATED this 6 day of March, 1997


RICHARD A. McARTAN
Assistant Attorney General

 3/4/97
DENNIS WATSON

II. ORDER

Having reviewed the Complaint and the Stipulation, WE, THE STATE OF WASHINGTON EXECUTIVE ETHICS BOARD, HEREBY ORDER That pursuant to WAC 292-100-090 the above stipulation is:

Accepted in its entirety and becomes the Order of the Board by incorporation by reference.

Accepted and becomes the Order of the Board by incorporation by reference with the following modification(s):

I () accept / () do not accept the proposed modification.

DENNIS WATSON

Rejected in its entirety.

DATED this 14th day of March, 1997.

Thomas L. Purce, Chair

Paul Gillie

Paul Gillie, Vice Chair

Gwen Foyd

Gwen Foyd, Board Member

Janet Lin

Janet Lin, Board Member

Cheryl L. Rohrer

Rev. Cheryl L. Rohrer

3. In response to the Complaint, Mr. Watson admits as follows:

I acknowledge that I acted inappropriately when I used the College computers to download pornography from the Internet sites and to transmit personal electronic messages of a sexual nature. Although the Instructor Computer User's Committee (ICUC) did ask me at one time to determine how to access pornographic websites in order to determine how to limit students' access to those sites, I exceeded that authority when I downloaded, collected, and stored pornography in my computer and in my office. In short, the downloading, collecting, and maintaining of pornography in my faculty office was not related to my official duties, and I should not have done it.

4. The College Board of Trustees is in agreement with this Stipulation as the appropriate penalty for Mr. Watson.¹

B. STIPULATED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Board has jurisdiction to consider this Stipulation, and to enter the Order below pursuant to RCW 42.52.160(1), 42.52.360, and WAC 292-100-090.

2. Mr. Watson's admitted conduct violates RCW 42.52.160(1), which states as follows:

No state... employee may... use any... property under the ... employee's official control... for the private benefit or gain of the... employee.

3. Pursuant to WAC 292-100-090, the Board may accept this Stipulation, propose a modification to this Stipulation, or reject

¹ There is no stipulation on the truth of the allegation that Mr. Watson used college equipment to receive a photograph of a naked 14 or 15-year old girl. Mr. Watson denies the allegation. Criminal charges filed against Mr. Watson in Clark County Superior Court for Unlawful Possession of Depiction of Minor Engaged in Sexually Explicit Conduct were dismissed based on a finding that the State Auditor illegally searched Mr. Watson's Office.

this Stipulation. If the Board proposes a modification, Mr. Watson must accept the modification for it to become the Order of the Board. If the Board rejects the Stipulation or proposes modification that Mr. Watson does not accept, the case will be heard in accordance with procedures in Chapter 42.52 RCW and Chapter 292-100 RCW, in which case this Stipulation is null and void and is inadmissible in subsequent proceedings.

4. If the Board accepts this Stipulation or modifies this Stipulation in a manner that is acceptable to Mr. Watson, he is deemed released and discharged from any and all further proceedings under Chapter 42.52 RCW related to the matters alleged in the Complaint.

C. STIPULATED PENALTY

As a penalty for violating RCW 42.52.160(1), as described above, Mr. Watson shall:

1. Pay to the Board a civil penalty of \$2,500.00 pursuant to RCW 42.52.480(1)(b) within one (1) year of the date of entry of this Order.

2. Accept suspension without pay for the remainder of the 1996-97 academic year, effective retroactively to February 15, 1997 (resulting in lost wages of approximately \$23,000.00);

3. Not serve as Division Chair;

4. Not have access to the Internet through the College during the 1997-98 school year; and

5. Issue a letter of apology to the College President.

-----Original Message-----

From: Craven, Jim

Sent: Monday, October 04, 1999 7:47 PM

To: Hasart, Tana; Jackson, Yvette; Craven, Jim

Cc: Farley, Janelle

Subject: FW: Response II to Mr. Watson -- Please delete if you have no interest.

Dear Dr. Hasart:

I'm not planning to respond to this on the master list but I will be referring to this matter again in another venue.

If you define "collegiality" as a willingness to say black is white and white is black, and a willingness to ratify, cover-up or spread outright lies, then I will never be "collegial". If being "collegial" means testifying under oath that someone who was interviewed for a position was not tape recorded (while my voice is on the tape telling that person he is being taped), or if being "collegial" means destroying and altering public records associated with a hire that is the subject of litigation in a Federal Title VII case, then I will never be "collegial". If being "collegial" means turning away from or even participating in job rigging for insiders or using public resources for personal empire building of a few--taking away needed resources for the central missions and mandates of this institution--I will never be collegial.

But I don't just blame Watson for continuing to tell lies that he knows are lies. He has been given plenty of green-lights by others that telling outright lies at Clark is business as usual. By the marginalization, demonization and ostracization of me that has gone on at Clark for many years, he has been given a green light to continue his harassment. A simple example: this collector of child pornography sits on a tenure committee while I have never served on one in my time--seven years-- here. Marginalization, demonization and ostracization are all forms of harassment, intimidation that cause tangible damages and represent violations--federal offenses-- of Title VII under the USC. They not only tacitly and explicitly call into question my credibility, stature and credentials as a professor, they signal to the Watson types that it is open season on me and the Administration will do nothing about it--as has been the case in the past when I have complained about harassment from Watson and nothing was done. According to Watson, he wasn't even given a letter of reprimand in his personnel file as a result of the findings--to which he stipulated--of the Ethnic Commission; contrast that with how I have been treated at Clark.

He now says that I "bilked" the College in my ex-wife's settlement. Really?. Why did a conservative Federal Judge, Robert Bryan, in denying Clark College's motion for summary dismissal of the case on procedural grounds, write: "She [Dr. Thomas] has offered sufficient evidence to show her application was not fairly evaluated, that she was qualified for the position and that she was entitled to participate in the next step." ? Why did Clark College demand, as a condition of settlement, that my ex-wife not seek to have prosecuted, any crimes that "may have" been committed by Clark

College personnel? Why did Clark College settle four days before going to a Federal Court and go from \$30,000 to \$50,000 plus part-time with retirement contributions, to \$90,000 to \$125,000 to \$162,500 to \$165,000 (with the stipulation that Aleyamma never apply for any position at Clark). Further, because of all of the obstruction of discovery, misuse of discovery, perjury, destruction of public records, material alterations of public records, obstruction of justice and subornation of the previously-mentioned that took place in that case, Aleyamma could have filed for legal fees in a separate judgment but was so burned out and beaten down she wanted nothing more to do with this cesspool. Further, the College also tried to demand that I (not even a co-litigant) also waive the right to sue for the damages I suffered from that case? Why in nine separate presentations to the Clark Board and a separate meeting with AGs, was I given no answer or rebuttal to my allegations and specific physical evidence of perjury and alterations of public materials/records? Why do I have a copy of a check for \$165,000? Why did Dr. Johnson and Vice-President Burch sneak out like whipped dogs forgoing the usual "shaking of hands" after a settlement? Why do I have a copy of a tape, released under discovery, in which all but a portion of Kibota's interview was redacted--all but the part where he states his name and is told that the interview is being recorded-- and yet have a full copy of his whole interview (that two illustrious faculty members swore under penalty of perjury was never made) released later under RCW 41.17.250? Why have the Clark Board and AGs not commented on this matter after having been provided copies of both tapes?

Watson now claims that no child pornography was in his computer and then claims simultaneously any child pornography in his computer was planted by myself and/or Gerry Smith. According to the Columbian article on the matter, based on court records of sworn testimony of the Washington State Patrol detectives, they not only found some 1700 pornographic files, but those files included materials that involved "homosexual, heterosexual, animal sex acts plus children engaged in explicit sex acts"? Has Watson filed charges against those detectives for perjury and swearing false oaths and/or filed a lawsuit for libel against the Columbian (which does have money to go after)? Why did the "Independent" article on the Watson case mention an e-mail written from Watson's account mentioning being on the telephone with a new "little friend" in Canada and soliciting pornographic polaroids? And as for this nonsense that these Washington State Patrol detectives engaged in any form of duplicity or "playing-one-off-against-another" or engaged in anything less than highly professional police work is pure slander and/or libel--and I will inform them of this bogus allegation.

I could go on and on with very specific and concrete evidence revealing that Mr. Watson's lies have only begat more lies. "Oh what a tangled web we weave, when we practice to deceive". Those involved in my ex-wife's case, writing even more ugly and harmful lies in print in the Independent, were not sanctioned but rather encouraged and supported by the previous failed-President and Dean, and now find themselves in your administration promoted and ratified in their own minds.

I will never submit to a definition of "collegiality" that involves ratifying--by silence and acquiescence--naked and provable lies and cover-ups. Since logic and reason and evidence seems not to work around this place, perhaps a Federal Court, with very specific rules of evidence/hearsay, protocols and prohibitions against piling on contrived and irrelevant pseudo-evidence, will be necessary for me to practice some real

"effective citizenship" and seek redress for my grievances. I am sick and tired of posturing pretenders, thinking they are some kind of royalty, trashing and hijacking the institution at which I work, ratifying/covering-up old lies and allowing new ones.

If Watson dares to repeat his harassment and lies one more time, this letter goes out on the master list and we go full-court-press with my attorney Mr. Zoretic--and all of you in the Admin and the Clark Board will be named personally with the exception of Dr. Jackson--and we'll let discovery and the Court process (there will be no settlement with public monies at the last moment) sort out who is who and what is what; who is lying and who is telling the truth. This is not a threat, this is merely a statement to mitigate potential damages; it is a statement of my intent to lawfully pursue my legal and civil and Constitutional rights, and is intended as a statement of the agony and damages to which I have been subject and that have been exacerbated by Clark Administration failure to act, double-standards and insider versus outsider treatment--in my protected opinion that is shared by my attorney Mr. Zoretic who has written and protested the denial of due process I have suffered at Clark many times with no response.

Sincerely,

James M. Craven
Professor, Economics

-----Original Message-----

From: Dennis Watson [<mailto:dwatson@xxxxxxxxx>]
Sent: Sunday, October 03, 1999 2:15 PM
To: Craven, Jim; Campus Master List
Subject: RE: Response II to Mr. Watson -- Please delete if you have no interest.

Jim, you state:

I agree here that debate is impossible if one or more parties feels free to tell lies at will with no qualms. So anyone wanting to know who lies and who doesn't can request the following from the Washington State Ethics Commission: "Notice of Board Action", March 20, 1997, of the State of Washington Executive Ethics Board.

One should read the ENTIRE document, not just the quoted passages.

The charges were not specifically Collecting Child Pornography (note the press accounts quoting the Washington State Patrol Detectives who reviewed all materials in Watson's computer indicated--in sworn testimony-- not only collecting/disseminating child pornography--children engaged in sexual acts with adults-- but also predatory behavior in requesting privately-made pornographic "poloroids" of "little friends" be sent using Clark.edu as the originating address; have those sources been sued for slander and libel?)

I was told I could not sue Mr. Craven nor Mr. Gerry Smith for slander/libel as the NATURE of the charges they stated UNDER OATH would bias a jury against me. Besides, as others on campus who wanted to sue under libel, the lawyers stance is 'you can't get blood from a turnip' and that it would just cost the plaintiffs money they would never recover.

However, other people that were at the gathering where they claim I discussed the matters above have no recollection of my having said what they claim I said! Also, if you check with the state police, I am sure they well tell the evidence that was thrown out of court was a set of 7 photos taken at a nudist gathering, similar to kinds of gatherings Mr. Smith said he went to rather than come to my 4th of July party.

Absolutly no sexual acts were displayed in these photos!!

Craven further swore under oath that I have a program called Netscope, which is legal only for law enforcement to use and is used to hunt down child pornography sites. What kind of nonsense is this? I checked with a colleague and was told there IS a UNIX program called Netscope, but it is unable to be used as stated AND the colleague rather apologetically said that I would not be able to use it for its intended purpose, let alone for hunting down child pornography. I just don't know enough about networks and UNIX.

There was no reference in his stipulations,

however, to the quite conscious and predatory behavior of soliciting private polaroids as was alleged in sworn oath by the WSP detectives and cited in the press accounts at the time.

That is because it was found I had no NEED to respond to these allegations!
I responded to facts, not allegations.

Watson has yet to address the substance of the debate or even the
question of the right/imperative of any faculty or staff or
administrator to bring the debate out into the open--assuming it is even
going on on what many feel are insider-packed/cloistered committees.

Jim Craven

How can I when the substance of every 'debate?' comes back to me. I was not
convicted of any crime! I don't try to 'win' by bullying and intimidation. I
know I am going to be chastised by my colleagues for replying to you, but
you disseminate so much misinformation, I felt I must.

I replied to the school and to the charges as recommended by my lawyer. I
didn't just get a windfall of money by browbeating the college and making up
accusations or twisting facts.

Dennis W. Watson

The Columbian article on my case illustrates some painful realities: a) when
journalists uncritically act as stenographers for those whose patronage and
special access they require for further stories and "scoops" and when the
focus is on personalities rather than issues--within filler spaces around
advertising called news space--injustices and cover-ups are often compounded.

The article mentions the cases of Elman McClain and Dennis Watson as if their
cases were parallel therefore suggesting my treatment is not unprecedented.
Nothing is further from the truth.

Elman McClain was Chief of Security who went up against the present Vice-
president of Administration over the issue of campus lighting. The vice-
president proposed shutting off campus lighting earlier to save some \$8,000
per year while McClain argued that this would involve increased security
risks and that one lawsuit would easily wipe out the \$8,000 saving. Shortly
after this, McClain was charged with sexual harassment. As he fought these
charges, additional charges of use of campus internet to view pornography were
piled on to leverage the original charges (this is the typical modus operandi
at Clark) Even solicitations for anything additional on McClain went out.
McClain was fired and he and his lawyer claimed that he was entitled to an
administrative hearing. After costly litigation, an Administrative Law Judge
ordered that he must be given a dismissal hearing; but, he had already been
fired before his due process rights had been exhausted. It is interesting to
note that while all of this was going on, McClain was given a positive
reference for a position on the Las Vegas Police force, thus beginning the

question: Which was/is the lie--that he was unfit for Clark or unfit for the Las Vegas Police force?

The resulting settlement was supposed to be sealed--but his guilt was never proved through full and competent investigatory processes. This Clark Administration however, contemptuous of basic human and due process rights would now suggest--assuming the reporter got this from the Clark Admin and that is a good assumption from the details or pseudo-details given--that McClain was fired through due process and having to do with pornography on the internet. In other words, a desperate and disingenuous administration, coupled with a reporter acting as a compliant stenographer and not checking basic facts and contexts, further defamed and harmed Mr. McClain. Why the settlement if he was so clearly guilty and due process was followed in removing him?

In the case of Watson, one of the charges leveled against him and for which he was acquitted was misappropriation of government resources in using the computer to collect child pornography (and according to the Washington State Patrol he was not only downloading, he was actively/predatorially soliciting polaroids using Clark.edu). In his case, nothing was made of his business being "personal" only that the marginal costs of computer use on a bulk-rate system were zero or negligible. Again, these basic facts went unchecked and unchallenged. In fact, as a result of complaints by me about harassment by Watson--through spoofed accounts and pseudonyms--brought nothing from Hasart in terms of the scrutiny to which I was subject--this reporter had an e-mail from Hasart professing concern about harassment from Watson and indicating commitment to investigate and do something about it.

Further, Hasart claims there was a credible threat and credible basis to believe that the College was threatened with potential legal exposure and liability in the event of a lawsuit for defamation by Kevin Annett. Repeated inquiries as to Annett's legal Counsel's name has met with no response from the Administration. Further, repeated requests for specific evidence--more than Annett's assertions or allegations--used to establish that the College has legal exposure has brought no result. Further, truth is an absolute and complete defense against libel, slander and defamation and therefore for Hasart to suggest (and summarily convict me of while remaining a reviewing authority) misuse of college resources and producing legal exposure for the college suggests that I indeed did commit defamation or slander or libel. Nowhere in the article does the reporter mention that I categorically deny this and that people like Michele Cheung and members of the Circle of Justice with personal knowledge about the issues all wrote to Hasart to say that I indeed had told the truth.

Plato noted a long time ago: "Those who seek power are invariably the least fit to wield it." That is why those in power hate exposure, accountability or penetrating questions. Most of them are intellectually mediocre and have something to hide. They are used to raw power, lies, cover-ups, intimidation, empty schmoozing, favored insiders/toadies, compliant press and a few competent functionaries to cover-up their own incompetence and duplicity. In the Ed business, at the highest levels we find the opportunists and operators who go through quickie "Ed Leadership" PhD programs and network into positions as if real leadership and credibility could be conferred/legitimated with a degree as opposed concrete skills, knowledge and example.

Of the letters sent to Hasart, I know of only one response: Long Standing Bear Chief, a fellow blackfoot at Browning got a response when she thought she could pile on even more evidence that I was supposedly lining up paid employment at Browning through the campus internet (actually it was an exchange program proposal between Clark and Browning I mentioned to her and she encouraged--just like my work on Residential Schools which was encouraged by Hasart).

Anyway, thanks to all for your support and help. Although many of you who wrote to Hasart and who hold credentials she could never hope to hold will get no response from the etherial powers-that-be at Clark, your ideas stand on their own and need no confirmation from anyone.

I have told the truth and need not remember what I have said and to whom and when I said it. The powers-that-be at Clark are not in such an enviable position--of their own making. Just like Clinton and and as with members of the previous regime at Clark--a site to behold--the disingenuousness will come home to roost when tested through thorough and unrelenting examination and cross-examination there will be more and more to explain and perhaps attempt to cover-up. This time however, no sealed settlement.

These are my constitutionally-protected opinions made on the best evidence available to me and to which I invite rebuttal or correction. They are made without malice and of course my employer has no association--in terms of agreement or disagreement--with my protected opinions.

Jim Craven

JUDGE DISMISSES CHILD PORN CHARGES



Publication:

The Columbian (Vancouver, WA)

Publish date:

November 13, 1996

Author:

BRUCE WESTFALL [Copyright](#)

Ads by Google

[Public Arrest Records](#)

1) Enter Name and State. 2) Access Full Background Checks Instantly.

[InstantCheckmate.com](#)

[Kemper Weld Smoke Filters](#)

Certified for Hexavalent Chromium Special Pricing on Demo Units

[www.KemperAmerica.com](#)

[Child Molestation Charges](#)

Your questions answered by national false allegations expert.

www.FalseAbuse.com

[?Share](#)

A Clark County judge dismissed seven child pornography charges against a Clark College instructor Tuesday. The judge said the criminal case was doomed by an illegal search.

Superior Court Judge James Ladley said state auditors never should have seized instructor Dennis Watson's computer and hundreds of floppy disks in their investigation a year ago.

Watson's computer files allegedly contained thousands of sexually explicit images, one investigator said. There were at least seven images involving youngsters, according to prosecutors. As a result, Watson, 51, was charged in May with seven counts of possession of "depictions of a minor engaged in sexually ...

Schools Examine Policies After Profs Download Porn

By [H. Fields Grenee](#)

Seattle Times Staff Reporter

A geography professor resigns and pleads guilty to Internet child-pornography charges. A California university lecturer accesses a computer in Washington state to get sexual images. A graduate teaching assistant is investigated by U.S. Customs agents for trafficking in child pornography via the Internet, using a school computer.

The three cases - all in the past three months, all in Spokane - have focused attention on a problem universities increasingly face in the computer age: What happens when a teacher uses a school computer to download pornography - or, indeed, any other information unrelated to his or her academic field?

Two of the cases involve teaching staff at Eastern Washington University, including the pending case against the graduate teaching assistant.

The problem first surfaced as an issue for state colleges and universities last September, in a tip filed under the state's whistle-blower's law at Clark College, in Vancouver, Wash. The tip: Dennis Watson, then-chairman of the public college's mathematics and computer-science division, had used the school's Internet connection to download and store sexually explicit files involving children on his office computer and state-owned disks.

State auditors investigated, and the Clark County prosecutor has charged Watson with seven counts of possessing child pornography. School officials said they are waiting until after Watson's trial, scheduled for September, to decide what, if any, disciplinary steps will be taken.

Soon after the Clark College case, a new state regulation addressing the use of the Internet and related technology was created. Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 292-110-010 says, "A state officer or employee may not make private use of state computers or other equipment to access computer networks or other databases including, but not limited to, electronic mail and electronic bulletin boards for personal use unrelated to an official business purpose."

The regulation is basically a management tool, said state Auditor Brian Sonntag, whose office investigated the Clark College case. Schools can interpret the WAC the way they see fit, he said.

Tony Birch, dean of administration services at Clark College, said his school tells users about policies and regulations for Internet use as clearly as possible and leaves it at that. Birch said Clark has no way of reading faculty e-mail or tracking Internet site visits. Clark has no intention of restricting Internet access beyond existing policies.

At the University of Washington, Sandy Moy, director of computing services, said UW presents Internet rules via a university publication, and as people set up computer accounts.

When users log on for the first time, a screen appears outlining the rules. To erase the screen, users must acknowledge receipt by sending a short letter via computer.

One rule, for example, states that it is unlawful to send threatening or lewd messages. If UW employees are suspected of violating computer rules, their accounts are monitored. This can involve the accessing and reading of e-mail messages, but the UW cannot track Internet site visits.

"We don't want to and cannot monitor people all the time, so we want to be sure that they know what their responsibilities are," Moy said.

The UW has had no disciplinary actions or investigations involving Internet misuse.

Most experts say faculty Internet misuse is just another stage in the ongoing implementation of Internet access. (About 16 million people in North America are estimated to use the Internet, with about half gaining access primarily at work.)

And while some say common sense is the unwritten rule dictating use of state-owned equipment and Internet access, not all employees have gotten the hint - as the recent cases at Eastern Washington University and Clark College may suggest.

The investigation of the Eastern Washington University graduate teaching assistant comes on the heels of former EWU geography professor Russell Boggs pleading guilty to two federal counts of receipt and possession of child pornography in May. He was sentenced to two years probation, during which he is to stay in his house and wear a monitoring device.

The state Attorney General's Office said Boggs first came under investigation for allegedly running a personal business out of his university office. Investigators then discovered a collection of child pornography he downloaded from the Internet.

Eastern Washington University is revising its computer policy. Revisions include a clearer definition of how the school will investigate possible future violations and discussions on academic freedom.

The U.S. Customs Service has gotten involved in several cases involving teaching staff because part of the agency's job is to help track the production, distribution and importation of child pornography into the country. Tim Renouard, resident agent for the Customs Service in Spokane, said agents work the Internet to catch people distributing child pornography.

That's what happened in the arrest of William Yaryan, a staff member and part-time lecturer at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Yaryan, 56, was indicted by an Eastern Washington grand jury June 4 on two counts of mailing child-pornographic material that he had downloaded from a Spokane Internet site onto a computer disk. His arrest stemmed from a six-month undercover Internet child-pornography sting operation conducted by the Customs Service in Spokane.

FW: Heads Up!/More Harassment (NB)

From: **Craven, Jim** (JCraven@clark.edu)
Sent: Wed 3/03/10 8:50 AM
To: omahkohkiaayo@hotmail.com

From: Craven, Jim
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2009 8:51 AM

To: Williamson, Bob
Cc: Sims, David; 'Saito, Kevin T.'; Roi, Marcia; 'ldavidson@washingtonea.org'
Subject: Heads Up!/More Harassment

Dear Bob:

Again I am getting more pornography sent. Please note below from my records when this happened previously. I have a friend at Cornell who is both a professor of Computer Science and Physics who has some very specialized skills that various agencies of the U.S. government have used.. Please note his statement:

the last time i checked stuff for you Jim, as i recall, we found a guy on your campus or nearby that was sending you stuff.

Please note this for the record.

Jim/Omahkohkiaayo i'poyi

-----Original Message-----

From: Hans Sprague [mailto:btenormous@servicosindustriais.com.br]
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2009 10:10 PM
To: Craven, Jim
Subject: Her mouth is hungry for some fresh meat. loose-lipped

<http://www.google.com/group/McknightrIdanny?fpkabuqwrvzxowxayzent>

expected Square palm departed
little ungrateful accompanying Cuvier

From: Craven, Jim
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2007 7:20 PM
To: 'kevin.saito@ic.fbi.gov'
Subject: Background

Dave,

[snip]

Jim Craven

-----Original Message-----

From: Craven, Jim [mailto:jcraven@clark.edu]

Sent: Thursday, April 08, 1999 3:07 PM

To: jcraven@clark.edu

Subject: Sycophants, Toadies, Malaise . . . Oh My!!!

Jim, Pat:

I've looked over the headers from the two "porno" emails that Jim received. unlike your claim for previous emails, these came from a source in new south wales, tho oddly enough, a trace route reveals the next to last main hop IS a site in the netherlands.

the subject line certainly LOOKS like the usual porno spam that most people get. for some strange reason, mine always comes early in the morning, so if you can wait till then, i'll check out the headers to see if a similar scheme is used. *the last time i checked stuff for you Jim, as i recall, we found a guy on your campus or nearby that was sending you stuff.* this time around looks like a distant source.

But if you are getting a spate of this stuff, Jim, try to save the entire contents of the messages and headers to a file so i can look at the complete headers -- Pat can surely instruct you on the best way for your system and email apps.

les schaffer

From: Craven, Jim
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2007 7:20 PM
To: 'kevin.saito@ic.fbi.gov'
Subject: Background

Dave,

Here we go again. Notice this time the spoofing of my account. Also, this time this gutless wonder learned how to spell Sycophants and Malaise.

Please check the origin of this message if possible. When does Watson's e-mail get turned upside down as mine was?

Jim Craven

-----Original Message-----

From: Craven, Jim [mailto:jcraven@clark.edu]

Sent: Thursday, April 08, 1999 3:07 PM

To: jcraven@clark.edu

Subject: Sycophants, Toadies, Malaise . . . Oh My!!!

Jim, Pat:

I've looked over the headers from the two "porno" emails that Jim received. Unlike your claim for previous emails, these came from a source in New South Wales, tho oddly enough, a traceroute reveals the next to last main hop IS a site in the Netherlands.

The subject line certainly LOOKS like the usual porno spam that most people get. For some strange reason, mine always comes early in the morning, so if you can wait till then, I'll check out the headers to see if a similar scheme is used. The last time I checked stuff for you Jim, as I recall, we found a guy on your campus or nearby that was sending you stuff. This time around looks like a distant source.

But if you are getting a spate of this stuff, Jim, try to save the entire contents of the messages and headers to a file so i can look at the complete headers -- Pat can surely instruct you on the best way for your system and email apps.

les schaffer

=====

case 1:

Received: from yahoo.com ([203.34.71.203])

by dns1.clark.edu (8.9.3p2/8.9.3/Debian 8.9.3-21) with SMTP id

NAA30272 for <jcraven@clark.edu>; Sat, 12 Apr 2003 13:50:19 -0700

From: zoogonytyoc@yahoo.com

X-Authentication-Warning: dns1.clark.edu: Host [203.34.71.203] claimed

to be yahoo.com

case 2:

Received: from yahoo.com ([203.34.71.205])

by dns1.clark.edu (8.9.3p2/8.9.3/Debian 8.9.3-21) with SMTP id

VAA21772 for <jcraven@clark.edu>; Mon, 14 Apr 2003 21:59:23 -0700

From: crashthkaw@yahoo.com

X-Authentication-Warning: dns1.clark.edu: Host [203.34.71.205] claimed
to be yahoo.com

both are forging yahoo address but originate here:

\$ whois 203.34.71.205

% [whois.apnic.net node-2]

% How to use this server <http://www.apnic.net/db/>

% Whois data copyright terms <http://www.apnic.net/db/dbcopyright.html>

inetnum: 203.34.71.0 - 203.34.71.255

netname: TETROHZ-AU

descr: Tetro HydraZync LTD.

country: AU

admin-c: SS810-AP

tech-c: SS810-AP

mnt-by: MAINT-AU-PS249-AP

changed: schoi@siingchoi.com 20010719

status: ALLOCATED NON-PORTABLE

source: APNIC

person: Siing Choi

nic-hdl: SS810-AP
e-mail: schoi@siingchoi.com
address: 182 Oxford St
address: Sydney NSW 2000
phone: +61 (02) 9279 3419
country: AU
changed: schoi@siingchoi.com 20010719
mnt-by: MAINT-AU-PS249-AP
source: APNIC

\$ tracert.exe 203.34.71.205

Tracing route to 203.34.71.205 over a maximum of 30 hops

1	<10 ms	15 ms	<10 ms	10.122.0.1
2	16 ms	15 ms	<10 ms	dstswr1-vlan-2.rh.ffldct.cv.net [67.83.228.33]
3	15 ms	16 ms	<10 ms	r1-ge13-1.mhe.whplny.cv.net [67.83.228.1]
4	15 ms	<10 ms	16 ms	r2-srp1-0.cr.whplny.cv.net [67.83.238.50]
5	15 ms	<10 ms	16 ms	r1.srp5-0.wan.whplny.cv.net [67.83.238.1]
6	16 ms	15 ms	16 ms	r1-srp-5-0.wan.prnynj.cv.net [167.206.12.165]
7	<10 ms	16 ms	15 ms	r1-srp5-0.in.nycmny83.cv.net [167.206.12.117]

```

 8    15 ms    16 ms    <10 ms    pos5-2.pr1.lga1.us.mfnx.net [167.206.8.154]
 9    <10 ms    16 ms    16 ms    so-3-0-0.cr2.lga1.us.mfnx.net
[208.184.233.217]
10   110 ms    78 ms    93 ms    so-6-0-0.cr2.lhr3.uk.mfnx.net [64.125.31.181]
11   110 ms    93 ms    94 ms    pos11-0.cr1.ams2.nl.mfnx.net [208.184.231.46]
12   93 ms    94 ms    94 ms    pos14-0.mpr1.ams1.nl.mfnx.net
[208.184.231.53]
13   110 ms    94 ms    93 ms    fe08-amsix01.gw.mfis.net [62.93.194.46]
14   93 ms    94 ms    93 ms    203.34.71.12
15   94 ms    94 ms    93 ms    203.34.71.205

```

Trace complete.

it does seem suspicious that the 13-th hop is your netherlands again, almost identical in IPs as the one taht Pat sent.

--

```

_____| Les Schaffer |_____| --->> Engineering R&D <<---
Theoretical & Applied Mechanics | Designspring, Inc.
Center for Radiophysics & Space Research | http://www.designspring.com/
Cornell Univ. schaffer@tam.cornell.edu | les@designspring.com

```

----- Forwarded Message Follows -----

Received: from MAILQUEUE by OOI (Mercury 1.21); 13 May 97 15:05:18 +800

Return-path: <CRAVJM@ooi.clark.edu>

Received: from clark.edu by ooi.clark.edu (Mercury 1.21) with ESMTTP;

13 May 97 15:05:10 +800

Received: from ooi.clark.edu by clark.edu with ESMTTP

(1.37.109.24/16.2) id AA073120782; Tue, 13 May 1997 14:59:42 -0700

Received: from OOI/MAILQUEUE by ooi.clark.edu (Mercury 1.21);

13 May 97 15:05:10 +800

Received: from MAILQUEUE by OOI (Mercury 1.21); 13 May 97 15:04:58 +800

Resent-From: "Vicki Nye" <NYEVIL@ooi.clark.edu>

Resent-To: jcraven@clark.edu

Resent-Date: Tue, 13 May 1997 15:04:52 PST8PDT

Received: from MAILQUEUE by OOI (Mercury 1.21); 13 May 97 14:54:38 +800

Received: from clark.edu by ooi.clark.edu (Mercury 1.21) with ESMTTP;

13 May 97 14:54:28 +800

Received: from ooi.clark.edu by clark.edu with ESMTTP

(1.37.109.24/16.2) id AA055120086; Tue, 13 May 1997 14:48:06 -0700

Received: from OOI/MAILQUEUE by ooi.clark.edu (Mercury 1.21);

13 May 97 14:53:38 +800

Received: from MAILQUEUE by OOI (Mercury 1.21); 13 May 97 14:53:33 +800

From: "James Michael Craven" <CRAVJM@ooi.clark.edu>

Organization: Clark College, Vancouver WA, USA

To: "CLARK COLLEGE MASTER LIST -- DISTRIBUTION LIST"
<supervisor@cs.clark.edu>

Date: Tue, 13 May 1997 14:53:26 PST8PDT

Subject: Lies and Liars

Priority: normal

X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail v3.22

Message-Id: <BD1F7901ADD@ooi.clark.edu>

To the Campus Community,

In response to another provocative e-mail sent by dwm saying that "the truth is hard to refute isn't it?", some lies and liars need to be exposed for what they are. Climates of fear, intimidation, cover-up, cronyism, discrimination can only compromise the integrity, credibility and effectiveness of CLark College as an Institution.

>Mr Watson wrote:

Why is it that Clark faculty had such a good relationship with its administration before your wife wasn't hired? You know Jim, had I know she had applied, I would have tried to get her an interview, out of professional courtesy, even though, when the AG showed me her app., she didn't have the main thrust we needed.

Response: 1) In mediation, Dr. Johnson said in front of witnesses, that my wife was well qualified to teach any of the Biology courses available; 2) In his sworn deposition, Dr. Daniel Luchtel, professor of zoology and environmental health at the University of Washington (who did not know my wife and reviewed the files for no charge wrote:

"As stated previously, Mr. Kibota's score was lowered considerably

because he had yet to obtain his doctoral degree. I also understand that Clark College listed as a requirement that applicants have at least a master's degree with additional coursework preferred. Given this requirement, I do not believe that Mr. Kibota should have even been considered for the position. It has been my experience and practice in the academic field to not consider a candidate for a position requiring a degree until they have actually obtained the degree; Mr. Kibota only stated that he expected to receive his doctorate in July 1994. This simply does not meet the requirement.

Mr. Kibota's lack of degree also raises another serious issue. The transcripts provided by Mr. Kibota only show that he was registered in classes at the University of Oregon until Spring quarter of 1993. His transcript was produced on September 2, 1993. Since his application was submitted in March of 1994, he should have submitted a transcript showing that he was enrolled for the Summer, Autumn and Winter Quarters of 1993-94. In reviewing his transcripts, it appears that Mr. Kibota was not even a registered student during these time periods. The enrollment question is important because a student cannot obtain a degree if they are not registered. Thus, it appears that he was either unlikely or unable to obtain his doctoral degree in July 1994. [his PhD was finally obtained just before being granted tenure in 1997]

3) I have a copy of a check for \$165,000 on my wall; Clark College

settled five days before going to trial and as they were using State money, were in a much better position to go to trial. Why didn't they want to go to trial after their motion for summary dismissal of the case was rejected? The knew what was waiting for them at trial (clear and compelling evidence of perjury, destruction of public records, material alterations of public records, contrived job descriptions and discriminatory hiring practices and subornation and/or willful blindness to all of the above. 4) Federal Judge Robert Bryan, who had reviewed every piece of evidence and representations of all sides prior to dismissing Clark College's petition for summary dismissal of the case wrote: "She [Dr. Thomas] has offered sufficient evidence to show her application was not fairly evaluated, that she was qualified for the position and that she was entitled to participate in the next step." 5) Prof Kibota was only given one out of three possible points for "environmental awareness" and "environmental awareness" points constituted only 3 out of 36 possible screening points thus refuting the later constructed contrived job description and assertion of looking for an "environmental biologist." 6) Prof. Kibota's teaching assignments (e.g. Bioethics, attempted linked classes not in the primary areas for which it was claimed he had special qualifications; 7) Prof Kibota was ranked 8 out of 11 telephone interviewees; he was placed in an unusual sixth finalist position over Dr. Barbara Rose who had a completed PhD and Masters degree

and had received 37 points to Prof Kibota's 34 points on the telephone interview and was ranked number seven of the 11 interviewees; this was done on May 5 1994 after my e-mail to Dr. Johnson expressing concern over the hiring processes; 8) It was claimed that of the 11 telephone interviewees, only Prof Kibota's interview was not taped (We obtained portions of the tape that two individuals swore under penalty of perjury did not exist and later I obtained the whole tape) and that only Prof Kibota's final presentation was not taped of the six finalists--no need to cover-up what is clean, only what is dirty. 9) Prof Kibota claimed in his sworn deposition and letter of application that as he had been a "T.A." in a vertebrate dissection course (dissecting a pig and a shark") he was "fully qualified" to teach Human Anatomy and would be glad to "teach Anatomy and Physiology AGAIN" [emphasis added]; Prof Kibota has not been assigned to teach a full Anatomy and Physiology course despite a demonstrated need and his assertions of being fully qualified to teach it (he has no record of having taken any formal coursework in HUMAN Anatomy and Physiology); 10) Dr James Kohler, full professor of Zoology at the University of Washington wrote:

" I have also reviewed Mr. Kibota's credentials regarding his expertise in environmental biology. While Mr. Kibota does appear to have some ecological background, I certainly would not characterize him as an environmental biologist.

He is, by his own admission, a 'microbial genetecist.'

I could go on and on. The Federal Judge who reviewed all the evidence and could have rejected the settlement, saw that the so- called "environmental biology" focus was a pretext constructed post facto to cover-up discrimination and faulty hiring practices. It is so sad to see these lies and cover-ups being perpetuated. This does show me and other something about why Prof Watson was returned to duty at Clark despite having stipulated to "ethics violations", "misuse of State resources" and "unprofessional conduct": he is still doing "lap dog" duty for those who participated in a clearly discriminatory hiring process and who continue the cover-ups and lies even today--in my opinion and in the opinion of so many others.

More to follow.

Jim Craven

Mr . Watson wrote:

Nothing quite as cozy as losing \$100,000 in money and wages, I am glad I wasn't reprimanded!!! I have stipulated to nothing more than you have done.

I KNOW it is illegal for a state employer to try to get support for any legislative action, even if it does benefit the college! That is a DIRECT ethics violation. Whereas I didn't knowly use school resources for my own benefit. Most people on campus agree. It is the vocal few that are keeping Clark in the spotlight and hence I decided to end the unnecessary publicity that is hurting the college and get on with life.

Response: On November 13, 1996 The Columbian reported:

"Last November, A Washington State Patrol detective

examined 200 disks containing 11,592 files, according to court records. Of those, the detective discovered 1,771 files containing sexually explicit materials.

In addition, a second detective discovered 'several thousand adult pornographic pictures' in other Watson computer files, according to a WSP investigative report. Among the images, reported detective Glen Hobbes were depictions of heterosexual and homosexual acts, as well as sex acts between people and animals.

Also seized were several undated e-mail messages between Watson's college e-mail address and others.

Said one, 'Hi sexy, I was busy on the phone with a new 'friend' in Canada. Can't call her very often, though to[sic] expensive!... By the way, have any sexy photos? He He...If so, send them to Dennis Watson (Or take some new polaroids...he he)."

Further response: 1) Either "The Columbian" is misquoting Det. Hobbes or, Det Hobbes is lying or, Prof. Watson is lying; 2) If "The Columbian" misquoted Det Hobbes, they run the danger of losing further access to a source on future stories (as I noted in a previous missive, the fundamental capitalist-based imperatives of the media demand attention to maintaining good relations with present and potential future sources); 3) If Det Hobbes were misquoted, I know him and Sgt Haw of the WSP (both very intelligent, professional, hard-working and honorable police officers) and Det Hobbes would have demanded a retraction or correction on his statements--he did not; 4) If Det. Hobbes had lied, he would have risked and would be risking exposure and possible litigation for slander or libel as well as loss of his job through statements that could potentially be proved as lies--Det Hobbes is far too intelligent to leave himself exposed in such a way; 5) That leaves what possibility? 6) According to these press accounts, Prof. Watson was not only engaging in the collection of commercial porn, he was engaging in

predatory behavior viz a viz private individuals and soliciting private (polaroid) pictures (the exact charge in the original complaint that led to the investigation).

Further: the "Notice of [Ethics] Board Action dated March 20, 1997 on page 2 (point 3) states:

"I acknowledge that I acted in appropriately when I used the College computers to download pornography from the Internet sites and to transmit personal electronic messages of a sexual nature. Although the Instructor Computer User's Committee (ICUC) did ask me at one time to determine how to access pornographic websites in order to determine how to limit student's access to those sites, I exceeded that authority when I downloaded, collected, and stored pornography in my computer in my office. In short, the downloading, collecting, and maintaining of pornography in my faculty office was not related to my official duties, and I should not have done it."

Which is it? Is Prof Watson lying in this statement about being guilty of the abovementioned offenses (when in fact he has done nothing that "I" haven't done and is in reality "innocent") or is he lying about not being guilty of "unprofessional conduct", "ethics violations" and "misuse of State resources"?

Further: Why the reference to the ICUC when most of the porn collected was from a time period well before the ICUC was set up even and when the demonstration for which he "volunteered" (was he setting up a cover as the ethics complaint against him had already been filed well before the ICUC was even set up or this exercise occurred?) was on a one time basis. Phil Sheehan wrote:

"...I asked for a volunteer from the committee with experience using the www to conduct the demonstration. Dennis Watson agreed to conduct the demonstration...

With the exception of the aforementioned demonstration,

Prof. Watson was not asked or directed to continue the exploring and cataloging sexually explicit sites on the Internet by me or, to my knowledge, any other Clark College administrator. Dr. Johnson neither attended or sanctioned the demonstration."

Response: So why the reference to the ICUC in his statement to the Ethics Board when the ICUC one-time demonstration clearly had nothing to do with the offenses for which Watson was charged? Who gave Dr. Larry Easter the impression that Watson was working at the behest of the ICUC to "research pornography"? Does this irrelevant reference to the ICUC one-time demonstration (with no reference to the fact that he

"volunteered") not suggest that he "volunteered" for this assignment to give himself a potential cover for charges that had already been filed and about which the Administration had knowledge? (I alerted the WSP at the time that a potential cover was possibly being constructed and that short of a outright conviction, he would be returned to Clark because of his tight relationship with the Administration--one WSP Detective later said to me "You called it (that he would return) and I just didn't want to believe it.")

The fact is, that several individuals have been dismissed from employment (denial of tenure or outright dismissal) for far less than Prof Watson has admitted to having done and with a lot less due process than Watson has been given. The fact that he continues to tell outright and provable lies about his own case and that of my wife shows why he has been returned to Clark, it shows the need for comprehensive and fairly applied standards of due process at Clark (available to those who are not compliant sycophants of the powers-

that-be) and the imperative to end all cover-ups and built proper foundations at Clark,.

More to follow.

Jim Craven

* James Craven	* " For those who have fought for it,	*
* Dept of Economics	* freedom has a taste the protected	*
* Clark College	* will never know."	*
* 1800 E. McLoughlin Blvd.	* Otto von Bismark	*
* Vancouver, Wa. 98663	*	*
* (360) 992-2283	*	*
* jcraven@clark.edu	*	*

* MY EMPLOYER HAS NO ASSOCIATION WITH MY PRIVATE/PROTECTED OPINION *

-----Original Message-----

From: Craven, Jim

Sent: Monday, October 04, 1999 7:47 PM

To: Hasart, Tana; Jackson, Yvette; Craven, Jim

Cc: Farley, Janelle

Subject: FW: Response II to Mr. Watson -- Please delete if you have no interest.

Dear Dr. Hasart:

I'm not planning to respond to this on the master list but I will be referring to this matter again in another venue.

If you define "collegiality" as a willingness to say black is white and white is black, and a willingness to ratify, cover-up or spread outright lies, then I will never be "collegial". If being "collegial" means testifying under oath that someone who was interviewed for a position was not tape recorded (while my voice is on the tape telling that person he is being taped), or if being "collegial" means destroying and altering public records associated with a hire that is the subject of litigation in a Federal Title VII case, then I will never be "collegial". If being "collegial" means turning away from or even participating in job rigging for insiders or using public resources for personal empire building of a few--taking away needed resources for the central missions and mandates of this institution--I will never be collegial.

But I don't just blame Watson for continuing to tell lies that he knows are lies. He has been given plenty of green-lights by others that telling outright lies at Clark is business as usual. By the marginalization, demonization and ostracization of me that has gone on at Clark for many years, he has been given a green light to continue his harassment. A simple example: this collector of child pornography sits on a tenure committee while I have never served on one in my time--seven years-- here. Marginalization, demonization and ostracization are all forms of harassment, intimidation that cause tangible damages and represent violations--federal offenses-- of Title VII under the USC. They not only tacitly and explicitly call into question my credibility, stature and credentials as a professor, they signal to the Watson types that it is open season on me and the Administration will do nothing about it--as has been the case in the past when I have complained about harassment from Watson and nothing was done. According to Watson, he wasn't even given a letter of reprimand in his personnel file as a result of the findings--to which he stipulated--of the Ethnic Commission; contrast that with how I have been treated at Clark.

He now says that I "bilked" the College in my ex-wife's settlement. Really?. Why did a conservative Federal Judge, Robert Bryan, in denying Clark College's motion for summary dismissal of the case on procedural grounds, write: "She [Dr. Thomas] has offered sufficient evidence to show her application was not fairly evaluated, that she was qualified for the position and that she was entitled to participate in the next step." ? Why did Clark College demand, as a condition of settlement, that my ex-wife not seek to have prosecuted, any crimes that "may have" been committed by Clark College personnel? Why did Clark College settle four days before going to a Federal Court and go from \$30,000 to \$50,000 plus part-time with retirement contributions, to \$90,000 to \$125,000 to \$162,500 to \$165,000 (with the stipulation that Aleyamma never apply for any position at Clark). Further,

because of all of the obstruction of discovery, misuse of discovery, perjury, destruction of public records, material alterations of public records, obstruction of justice and subornation of the previously-mentioned that took place in that case, Aleyamma could have filed for legal fees in a separate judgment but was so burned out and beaten down she wanted nothing more to do with this cesspool. Further, the College also tried to demand that I (not even a co-litigant) also waive the right to sue for the damages I suffered from that case? Why in nine separate presentations to the Clark Board and a separate meeting with AGs, was I given no answer or rebuttal to my allegations and specific physical evidence of perjury and alterations of public materials/records? Why do I have a copy of a check for \$165,000? Why did Dr. Johnson and Vice-President Burch sneak out like whipped dogs forging the usual "shaking of hands" after a settlement? Why do I have a copy of a tape, released under discovery, in which all but a portion of Kibota's interview was redacted--all but the part where he states his name and is told that the interview is being recorded-- and yet have a full copy of his whole interview (that two illustrious faculty members swore under penalty of perjury was never made) released later under RCW 41.17.250? Why have the Clark Board and AGs not commented on this matter after having been provided copies of both tapes?

Watson now claims that no child pornography was in his computer and then claims simultaneously any child pornography in his computer was planted by myself and/or Gerry Smith. According to the Columbian article on the matter, based on court records of sworn testimony of the Washington State Patrol detectives, they not only found some 1700 pornographic files, but those files included materials that involved "homosexual, heterosexual, animal sex acts plus children engaged in explicit sex acts"? Has Watson filed charges against those detectives for perjury and swearing false oaths and/or filed a lawsuit for libel against the Columbian (which does have money to go after)? Why did the "Independent" article on the Watson case mention an e-mail written from Watson's account mentioning being on the telephone with a new "little friend" in Canada and soliciting pornographic polaroids? And as for this nonsense that these Washington State Patrol detectives engaged in any form of duplicity or "playing-one-off-against-another" or engaged in anything less than highly professional police work is pure slander and/or libel--and I will inform them of this bogus allegation.

I could go on and on with very specific and concrete evidence revealing that Mr. Watson's lies have only begat more lies. "Oh what a tangled web we weave, when we practice to deceive". Those involved in my ex-wife's case, writing even more ugly and harmful lies in print in the Independent, were not sanctioned but rather encouraged and supported by the previous

failed-President and Dean, and now find themselves in your administration promoted and ratified in their own minds.

I will never submit to a definition of "collegiality" that involves ratifying--by silence and acquiescence--naked and provable lies and cover-ups. Since logic and reason and evidence seems not to work around this place, perhaps a Federal Court, with very specific rules of evidence/hearsay, protocols and prohibitions against piling on contrived and irrelevant pseudo-evidence, will be necessary for me to practice some real "effective citizenship" and seek redress for my grievances. I am sick and tired of posturing pretenders, thinking they are some kind of royalty, trashing and hijacking the institution at which I work, ratifying/covering-up old lies and allowing new ones.

If Watson dares to repeat his harassment and lies one more time, this letter goes out on the master list and we go full-court-press with my attorney Mr. Zoretic--and all of you in the Admin and the Clark Board will be named personally with the exception of Dr. Jackson--and we'll let discovery and the Court process (there will be no settlement with public monies at the last moment) sort out who is who and what is what; who is lying and who is telling the truth. This is not a threat, this is merely a statement to mitigate potential damages; it is a statement of my intent to lawfully pursue my legal and civil and Constitutional rights, and is intended as a statement of the agony and damages to which I have been subject and that have been exacerbated by Clark Administration failure to act, double-standards and insider versus outsider treatment--in my protected opinion that is shared by my attorney Mr. Zoretic who has written and protested the denial of due process I have suffered at Clark many times with no response.

Sincerely,

James M. Craven
Professor, Economics

-----Original Message-----

From: Dennis Watson [<mailto:dwatson@xxxxxxxx>]

Sent: Sunday, October 03, 1999 2:15 PM

To: Craven, Jim; Campus Master List

Subject: RE: Response II to Mr. Watson -- Please delete if you have no i

nterest.

Jim, you state:

I agree here that debate is impossible if one or more parties feels free to tell lies at will with no qualms. So anyone wanting to know who lies and who doesn't can request the following from the Washington State Ethics Commission: "Notice of Board Action", March 20, 1997, of the State of Washington Executive Ethics Board.

One should read the ENTIRE document, not just the quoted passages.

The charges were not specifically Collecting Child Pornography (note the press accounts quoting the Washington State Patrol Detectives who reviewed all materials in Watson's computer indicated--in sworn testimony-- not only collecting/disseminating child pornography--children engaged in sexual acts with adults-- but also predatory behavior in requesting privately-made pornographic "poloroids" of "little friends" be sent using Clark.edu as the originating address; have those sources been sued for slander and libel?)

I was told I could not sue Mr. Craven nor Mr. Gerry Smith for slander/libel as the NATURE of the charges they stated UNDER OATH would bias a jury against me. Besides, as others on campus who wanted to sue under libel, the lawyers stance is 'you can't get blood from a turnip' and that it would just cost the plaintiffs money they would never recover.

However, other people that were at the gathering where they claim I discussed the matters above have no recollection of my having said what they claim I said! Also, if you check with the state police, I am sure they well tell the evidence that was thrown out of court was a set of 7 photos taken at a nudist gathering, similar to kinds of gatherings Mr. Smith said he went to rather than come to my 4th of July party.

Absolutly no sexual acts were displayed in these photos!!

Craven further swore under oath that I have a program called Netscope, which is legal only for law enforcement to use and is used to hunt down child pornography sites. What kind of nonsense is this? I checked with a colleague and was told there IS a UNIX program called Netscope, but it is unable to be used as stated AND the colleague rather apologetically said that I would not be able to use it for its intended purpose, let alone for hunting down child pornography. I just don't know enough about networks and UNIX.

There was no reference in his stipulations,

however, to the quite conscious and predatory behavior of soliciting

private polaroids as was alleged in sworn oath by the WSP detectives and

cited in the press accounts at the time.

That is because it was found I had no NEED to respond to these allegations!
I responded to facts, not allegations.

Watson has yet to address the substance of the debate or even the question of the right/imperative of any faculty or staff or administrator to bring the debate out into the open--assuming it is even going on on what many feel are insider-packed/cloistered committees.

Jim Craven

How can I when the substance of every 'debate?' comes back to me. I was not convicted of any crime! I don't try to 'win' by bullying and intimidation. I know I am going to be chastised by my colleagues for replying to you, but you disseminate so much misinformation, I felt I must.

I replied to the school and to the charges as recommended by my lawyer. I didn't just get a windfall of money by browbeating the college and making up accusations or twisting facts.

Dennis W. Watson

The Columbian article on my case illustrates some painful realities: a) when journalists uncritically act as stenographers for those whose patronage and special access they require for further stories and "scoops" and when the focus is on personalities rather than issues--within filler spaces around advertising called newsspace--injustices and cover-ups are often compounded.

The article mentions the cases of Elman McClain and Dennis Watson as if their cases were parallel therefore suggesting my treatment is not unprecedented. Nothing is further from the truth.

Elman McClain was Chief of Security who went up against the present Vice-president of Administration over the issue of campus lighting. The vice-president proposed shutting off campus lighting earlier to save some \$8,000 per year while McClain argued that this would involve increased security risks

and that one lawsuit would easily wipe out the \$8,000 saving. Shortly after this, McClain was charged with sexual harassment. As he fought these charges, additional charges of use of campus internet to view pornography were piled on

to leverage the original charges (this is the typical modus operandi at Clark)

Even solicitations for anything additional on McClain went out. McClain was fired and he and his lawyer claimed that he was entitled to an administrative hearing. After costly litigation, an Administrative Law Judge ordered that he must be given a dismissal hearing; but, he had already been fired before his due process rights had been exhausted. It is interesting to note that while all of this was going on, McClain was given a positive reference for a position on the Las Vegas Police force, thus begging the question: Which was/is the lie--that he was unfit for Clark or unfit for the Las Vegas Police force?

The resulting settlement was supposed to be sealed--but his guilt was never proved through full and competent investigatory processes. This Clark Administration however, contemptuous of basic human and due process rights would now suggest--assuming the reporter got this from the Clark Admin and that is a good assumption from the details or pseudo-details given--that McClain was fired through due process and having to do with pornography on the

internet. In other words, a desperate and disingenuous administration, coupled

with a reporter acting as a compliant stenographer and not checking basic facts and contexts, further defamed and harmed Mr. McClain. Why the settlement

if he was so clearly guilty and due process was followed in removing him?

In the case of Watson, one of the charges leveled against him and for which he

was acquitted was misappropriation of government resources in using the computer to collect child pornography (and according to the Washington State Patrol he was not only downloading, he was actively/predatorially soliciting polaroids using Clark.edu). In his case, nothing was made of his business being "personal" only that the marginal costs of computer use on a bulk-rate system were zero or negligible. Again, these basic facts went unchecked and unchallenged. In fact, as a result of complaints by me about harassment by Watson--through spoofed accounts and pseudonyms--brought nothing from Hasart in terms of the scrutiny to which I was subject--this reporter had an e-mail from Hasart professing concern about harassment from Watson and indicating commitment to investigate and do something about it.

Further, Hasart claims there was a credible threat and credible basis to believe that the College was threatened with potential legal exposure and liability in the event of a lawsuit for defamation by Kevin Annett. Repeated inquiries as to Annet's legal Counsel's name has met with no response from the

Administration. Further, repeated requests for specific evidence--more than Annett's assertions or allegations--used to establish that the College has legal exposure has brought no result. Further, truth is an absolute and complete defense against libel, slander and defamation and therefore for Hasart to suggest (and summarily convict me of while remaining a reviewing authority) misuse of college resources and producing legal exposure for the college suggests that I indeed did commit defamation or slander or libel. Nowhere in the article does the reporter mention that I categorically deny

this and that people like Michele Cheung and members of the Circle of Justice with personal knowledge about the issues all wrote to Hasart to say that I indeed had told the truth.

Plato noted a long time ago: "Those who seek power are invariably the least fit to wield it." That is why those in power hate exposure, accountability or penetrating questions. Most of them are intellectually mediocre and have something to hide. They are used to raw power, lies, cover-ups, intimidation, empty schmoozing, favored insiders/toadies, compliant press and a few competent functionaries to cover-up their own incompetence and duplicity. In the Ed business, at the highest levels we find the opportunists and operators who go through quickie "Ed Leadership" PhD programs and network into positions as if real leadership and credibility could be conferred/legitimated with a degree as opposed concrete skills, knowledge and example.

Of the letters sent to Hasart, I know of only one response: Long Standing Bear Chief, a fellow blackfoot at Browning got a response when she thought she could pile on even more evidence that I was supposedly lining up paid employment at Browning through the campus internet (actually it was an exchange program proposal between Clark and Browning I mentioned to her and she encouraged--just like my work on Residential Schools which was encouraged by Hasart).

Anyway, thanks to all for your support and help. Although many of you who wrote to Hasart and who hold credentials she could never hope to hold will get no response from the etherial powers-that-be at Clark, your ideas stand on their own and need no confirmation from anyone.

I have told the truth and need not remember what I have said and to whom and when I said it. The powers-that-be at Clark are not in such an enviable position--of their own making. Just like Clinton and and as with members of the previous regime at Clark--a site to behold--the disingenuousness will come home to roost when tested through thorough and unrelenting examination and cross-examination there will be more and more to explain and perhaps attempt to cover-up. This time however, no sealed settlement.

These are my constitutionally-protected opinions made on the best evidence available to me and to which I invite rebuttal or correction. They are made without malice and of course my employer has no association--in terms of agreement or disagreement--with my protected opinions.

Jim Craven

-----Original Message-----

From: Craven, Jim

Sent: Friday, March 28, 2003 1:32 PM

To: Smith, Gerard

Subject: FW: Response to Phil Sheehan's Open Letter

-----Original Message-----

From: James Michael Craven [mailto:CRAVJM@ooi.clark.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 1997 6:32 AM

To: jcraven@clark.edu

Subject: Response to Phil Sheehan's Open Letter

In response to legitimate concerns expressed by Prof. Jim Craven in a recent e-mail, I offer the following explanations/clarifications in response to three of the questions he raised.

This will be my last response on the issues that Phil Sheehan has raised in his response. I should note that I have absolute confidence in his integrity, his reasons for responding and his attempts to address the issues raised.

Response to question 1) "Why would Dr. Larry Easter...."

Both Larry Easter and Dennis Watson were members of the Instructional Computer Users Committee (ICUC) during the 1994/95 academic year. The ICUC members were considering a proposed WWW policy for Clark College since there are aspects of web use and administration that are not specifically addressed in Clark's Computing Resources Policy. Because web browsers have made access to Internet resources much easier than previously available technologies, I expressed the concern that access to sexually-explicit or otherwise offensive web sites (particularly by students) might create problems for the college. At the April 14, 1995 meeting of the ICUC, I proposed that a demonstration be conducted to determine if it was possible to access web sites with sexual or other potentially offensive content using web search engines. I felt that the committee members should have an understanding of the scope of the problem before attempting to formulate policy. The committee membership concurred, whereupon I asked for a volunteer from the committee with experience using the WWW to conduct the demonstration. Dennis Watson agreed to conduct the demonstration. Members of the Instructional Computer Users Committee, the Administrative Computer Users Committee, and the Computing Policy Committee were invited to attend the demonstration. The demonstration was conducted and no sites with nudity or other sexually-explicit material were found.

With the exception of the aforementioned demonstration, Prof. Watson was not asked or directed to continue exploring and cataloging sexually explicit sites on the Internet by me or, to my knowledge, any other Clark College administrator. Dr. Johnson neither attended nor sanctioned the demonstration.

Question: According to press accounts the materials seized from Prof Watson by the Washington State Patrol covered the period 1992 and ended in October 1993; this period was well before the Instructional Computer Users Committee was formed, in which case how could anyone believe or be led to believe that there was any connection between the alleged seized materials and Prof. Watson's responsibilities on that committee? Why did Dr. Easter--in response to my inquiries-- continue to sincerely believe in this

representation eventhough out of concern for his deserved high reputation, several people sent word that this representation would not pass muster and could only cause him embarrassment and/or a belief that he and his high reputation were being used?

Response to question 2) "According to press accounts,...."

In September of 1993, Prof. Watson received a new Macintosh Centris 660 AV computer. This was one of four identical machines purchased for faculty in the SMED division at a cost of \$3200 each. Prior to this upgrade, Watson used a vanilla Macintosh with no special capabilities. The Centris 660 AV differs from a standard Macintosh Centris 660 by the addition of multimedia hardware (CD-ROM and audio capabilities). These added features did not significantly benefit Prof. Watson with respect to his ability to access Internet resources at the time. Without getting into the debate over which operating system (Mac OS or DOS) is easier to use, neither platform is inherently more capable than the other for the purpose of accessing Internet services. Watson and ten other SMED faculty and staff subsequently received Power Mac 7100 machines in the summer of 1995.

These upgrades and many other computer purchases were funded by the Education Technology Initiative. It was Watson's PowerMac 7100 that was seized by the state auditors at the start of their investigation.

The choice to purchase Macs vs. PCs and how much to allocate to computer purchases in general has traditionally been the prerogative of departments/divisions based on their requirements and priorities.

Response: According to press accounts the materials seized covered the period of time from when Clark obtained internet in 1992 up to October 1993. In 1992, to download alleged pornographic materials on a relatively primitive internet system required some very specialized hardware including a binary compiler. How many faculty on campus had access to the hardware and capabilities necessary for downloading movies and pictures in 1992? How many faculty in computer science had access to such hardware and capabilities? How much did such hardware cost? By whom and on what basis was the allocation of this specialized hardware to Prof Watson authorized? What representations did Prof. Watson make as to why such capabilities were consistent with his professional responsibilities (He is on the computer science RIF list but has not taught any computer courses here to the best of my knowledge)? If the use of such hardware was not truly consistent with Prof/ Watson's responsibilities, would the acquisition and use of such capabilities not be a case of misuse of State resources significant enough to justify an Auditor's search? In view of the fact that the settlement agreement involved Prof. Watson accepting the charges of misuse of State property, ethics violations and unprofessional conduct, was the respresentation of the Clark Administration to the Washington State Auditor--that these specialized capabilities acquired by Prof. Watson were consistent with his professional responsibilities--accurate and honest? Was this representation by the Clark Administration (which had to be accepted under the limitations of compliance authority for the Auditor)

instrumental in undercutting the potential case against Prof. Watson?

Final Question: According to the Oregonian Feb 28, 1997 "Clark College Lets Watson Return as Teacher" by Aaron Fentress: "[President] Johnson said that he was advised by the school's legal counsel to limit the college's investigation and not review the material found on the disks which were ruled to be inadmissible in the criminal case. According to Johnson, nothing illegal was found on his hard drive." Question: If nothing illegal was found on Prof. Watson's hard drive or anything of his that it was permissible to examine, why has Prof. Watson been suspended without pay until June 13, 1997, lost his job as chairman of Math/Computer Science Division and denied Internet access for one year and facing a \$5000 fine? Why has Prof. Watson suffered any sanctions if no admissible evidence of wrongdoing was found? Or, if some evidence not found on his computer was taken into account to justify these sanctions, why was not all potential evidence considered? Since Prof. Watson signs his new e-mail address as dww@innocent.com, why did Prof. Watson agree to accept or stipulate to such sanctions and findings (unprofessional conduct, ethics violations and misuse of State resources) none of which were sustainable with admissible evidence? Was does that say about the level of due process received by Prof. Watson if the representations that nothing illegal was found on his hard disk?

Jim Craven

* James Craven * "Reason is a narrow system swollen *

* Dept of Economics * into an ideology. *

* Clark College * *

* 1800 E. McLoughlin Blvd. * With time and power it has become a *

* Vancouver, Wa. 98663 * dogma, devoid of direction and *

* (360) 992-2283 * disguised as disinterested inquiry. *

* jcraven@clark.edu * *

* * Like most religions, reason presents*

* * itself as the solution to the *

* * problems it has created." *

* * *

* * (John Ralston Saul in "Voltaire's *

* * Bastards") *

* MY EMPLOYER HAS NO ASSOCIATION WITH MY PRIVATE/PROTECTED OPINION *

-----Original Message-----

From: Craven, Jim
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2003 1:32 PM
To: Smith, Gerard
Subject: FW: Response to Phil Sheehan's Open Letter

-----Original Message-----

From: James Michael Craven [mailto:CRAVJM@ooi.clark.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 1997 6:32 AM
To: jcraven@clark.edu
Subject: Response to Phil Sheehan's Open Letter

In response to legitimate concerns expressed by Prof. Jim Craven in a recent e-mail, I offer the following explanations/clarifications in response to three of the questions he raised.

This will be my last response on the issues that Phil Sheehan has raised in his response. I should note that I have absolute confidence in his integrity, his reasons for responding and his attempts to address the issues raised.

Response to question 1) "Why would Dr. Larry Easter...."

Both Larry Easter and Dennis Watson were members of the Instructional Computer Users Committee (ICUC) during the 1994/95 academic year. The ICUC members were considering a proposed WWW policy for Clark College since there are aspects of web use and administration that are not specifically addressed in Clark's Computing Resources Policy. Because web browsers have made access to Internet resources much easier than previously available technologies, I expressed the concern that access to sexually-explicit or otherwise offensive web sites (particularly by students) might create problems for the college. At the April 14, 1995 meeting of the ICUC, I proposed that a demonstration be conducted to determine if it was possible to access web sites with sexual or other potentially offensive content using web search engines. I felt that the committee members should have an understanding of the scope of the problem before attempting to formulate policy. The committee membership concurred, whereupon I asked for a volunteer from the committee with experience using the WWW to conduct the demonstration. Dennis Watson agreed to conduct the demonstration. Members of the Instructional Computer Users Committee, the Administrative Computer Users Committee, and the Computing Policy Committee were invited to attend the demonstration. The demonstration was conducted and no sites with nudity or other sexually-explicit material were found.

With the exception of the aforementioned demonstration, Prof. Watson was not asked or directed to continue exploring and cataloging sexually explicit sites on the Internet by me or, to my knowledge, any other Clark College administrator. Dr. Johnson neither attended nor sanctioned the demonstration.

Question: According to press accounts the materials seized from Prof Watson by the Washington State Patrol covered the period 1992 and ended in October 1993; this period was well before the Instructional Computer Users Committee was formed, in which case how could anyone believe or be led to believe that there was any connection between the alleged seized materials and Prof. Watson's responsibilities on that committee? Why did Dr. Easter--in response to my inquiries-- continue to

sincerely believe in this representation eventhough out of concern for his deserved high reputation, several people sent word that this representation would not pass muster and could only cause him embarassment and/or a belief that he and his high reputation were being used?

Response to question 2) "According to press accounts,...."

In September of 1993, Prof. Watson received a new Macintosh Centris 660 AV computer. This was one of four identical machines purchased for faculty in the SMED division at a cost of \$3200 each. Prior to this upgrade, Watson used a vanilla Macintosh with no special capabilities. The Centris 660 AV differs from a standard Macintosh Centris 660 by the addition of multimedia hardware (CD-ROM and audio capabilities). These added features did not significantly benefit Prof. Watson with respect to his ability to access Internet resources at the time. Without getting into the debate over which operating system (Mac OS or DOS) is easier to use, neither platform is inherently more capable than the other for the purpose of accessing Internet services. Watson and ten other SMED faculty and staff subsequently received Power Mac 7100 machines in the summer of 1995.

These upgrades and many other computer purchases were funded by the Education Technology Initiative. It was Watson's PowerMac 7100 that was seized by the state auditors at the start of their investigation.

The choice to purchase Macs vs. PCs and how much to allocate to computer purchases in general has traditionally been the prerogative of departments/divisions based on their requirements and priorities.

Response: According to press accounts the materials seized covered the period of time from when Clark obtained internet in 1992 up to October 1993. In 1992, to download alleged pornographic materials on a relatively primitive internet system required some very specialized hardware including a binary compiler. How many faculty on campus had access to the hardware and capabilities necessary for downloading movies and pictures in 1992? How many faculty in computer science had access to such hardware and capabilities? How much did such hardware cost? By whom and on what basis was the allocation of this specialized hardware to Prof Watson authorized? What representations did Prof. Watson make as to why such capabilities were consistent with his professional responsibilities (He is on the computer science RIF list but has not taught any computer courses here to the best of my knowledge)? If the use of such hardware was not truly consistent with Prof/ Watson's responsibilities, would the acquisition and use of such capabilities not be a case of misuse of State resources significant enough to justify an Auditor's search? In view of the fact that the settlement agreement involved Prof. Watson accepting the charges of misuse of State property, ethics violations and unprofessional conduct, was the representation of the Clark Administration to the Washington State Auditor--that these specialized capabilities acquired by Prof. Watson were consistent with his professional responsibilities--accurate and honest? Was this representation by the Clark Administration (which had to be accepted under the limitations of compliance authority for the Auditor) instrumental in undercutting the potential case against Prof. Watson?

Final Question: According to the Oregonian Feb 28, 1997 "Clark College Lets Watson Return as Teacher" by Aaron Fentress: "[President] Johnson said that he was advised by the school's legal counsel to

limit the college's investigation and not review the material found on the disks which were ruled to be inadmissible in the criminal case. According to Johnson, nothing illegal was found on his hard drive." Question: If nothing illegal was found on Prof. Watson's hard drive or anything of his that it was permissible to examine, why has Prof. Watson been suspended without pay until June 13, 1997, lost his job as chairman of Math/Computer Science Division and denied Internet access for one year and facing a \$5000 fine? Why has Prof. Watson suffered any sanctions if no admissible evidence of wrongdoing was found? Or, if some evidence not found on his computer was taken into account to justify these sanctions, why was not all potential evidence considered? Since Prof. Watson signs his new e-mail address as dw@innocent.com, why did Prof. Watson agree to accept or stipulate to such sanctions and findings (unprofessional conduct, ethics violations and misuse of State resources) none of which were sustainable with admissible evidence? What does that say about the level of due process received by Prof. Watson if the representations that nothing illegal was found on his hard disk?

Jim Craven

```
*-----*
* James Craven * "Reason is a narrow system swollen *
* Dept of Economics * into an ideology. *
* Clark College * *
* 1800 E. McLoughlin Blvd. * With time and power it has become a *
* Vancouver, Wa. 98663 * dogma, devoid of direction and *
* (360) 992-2283 * disguised as disinterested inquiry. *
* jcraven@clark.edu * *
* * Like most religions, reason presents*
* * itself as the solution to the *
* * problems it has created." *
* * *
* * (John Ralston Saul in "Voltaire's *
* * Bastards") *
* MY EMPLOYER HAS NO ASSOCIATION WITH MY PRIVATE/PROTECTED OPINION *
```

-----Original Message-----

From: Craven, Jim
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2003 1:30 PM
To: Smith, Gerard
Subject: FW: Board Settlement

-----Original Message-----

From: James Michael Craven [mailto:CRAVJM@ooi.clark.edu]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 1997 10:55 AM
To: jcraven@clark.edu
Subject: Board Settlement

----- Forwarded Message Follows -----

From: "Earl P. Johnson" <JOHNEP@ooi.clark.edu>

Organization: Clark College, Vancouver WA, USA
To: "CLARK COLLEGE MASTER LIST -- DISTRIBUTION LIST"
<supervisor@cs.clark.edu>
Date sent: Thu, 27 Feb 1997 09:25:42 PST8PDT
Subject: Board Settlement
Priority: normal

Good Morning,

I want to share with the campus community that last night an agreement was reached between Professor Dennis Watson and the Clark College Board of Trustees. I am writing to you in an effort to inform you of this resolution before it is reported by the media. The media have already contacted me and the settlement will be reported in today's papers.

Professor Watson will return to work after the end of spring quarter.

The terms and conditions of the settlement cannot be summarized here, but the media will file public records requests and they will undoubtedly obtain that information.

It may be helpful for you to know that after exhaustive legal research, the college was limited in the scope of its investigation to the contents of Professor Watson's computer hard drive and e-mail messages. No illegal material was discovered on the hard drive or in the e-mail messages.

The action by the Board was based on the grounds of misuse of state property, violation of the state ethics law, and unprofessional conduct by Professor Watson.

Media coverage will be extensive and will make it difficult to focus on the positive aspects of our work. The focus group surveys, recently conducted for the upcoming accreditation self-study, found that our community overwhelmingly understands and supports the high quality instructional effort at Clark. The community supports the services and efforts we provide for our students.

I know that this has been a difficult issue for everyone and I hope that this resolution will bring closure.

Earl P. Johnson
President

Response:

The term "closure" reflects an interesting and illusory concept. When Kim Goldman, sister of Ron Goldman was asked if she felt some "closure" after the second civil trial and verdict related to O.J. Simpson's role in the murder of her brother, she said: "I don't know what that term "closure" means.

For some, the call for "closure" really means a call for an end to nagging and provocative questions that remain unanswered--in lieu of addressing and answering those substantive questions. Some

nagging questions that remain unanswered include:

1) Why would Dr. Larry Easter, a very sober, stable and highly respected person, state--and apparently really believe--at a Science Division meeting that Prof. Watson had been commissioned by the Computing Committee, with the knowledge of the President, to investigate pornography and accessibility to it? Why would Prof. Watson or anyone be selected to "investigate pornography"?

2) According to press accounts, the alleged pornographic materials seized from Prof. Watson went up to October 1993. Between 1992 and 1993 the computer hardware necessary for downloading pictures on a relative primitive internet system was available to a very few if not only Prof. Watson. Why would someone on the RIF list in computers but not teaching computer science have access and even exclusive use of such hardware when those teaching computer science had no such hardware in their offices? By whom and on what basis was this state-of-the-art and expensive hardware authorized/allocated? Did the representations of the Clark Administration to the Washington State Auditor that this hardware was consistent with Prof. Watson's professional responsibilities undercut their case that significant misallocations/misuses of public resources had occurred?

3) Why was the AHE Senate approached to put together a standing dismissal committee and told that it might be used in connection with the case of Prof. Watson when at the same exact time a faculty member was told by the Administration that terminating Prof. Watson would involve a "million dollar lawsuit" if it were attempted? Why was the AHE Senate told (and a letter written) that if termination processes were commenced, it would be on the basis of alleged pornography allegedly seen personally by the President and not on the basis of any evidence gathered/tainted during the investigation? Were my inquiries--with the AHE Senate and the Washington State Patrol--as to how it was possible that the President could have personally seen any alleged pornography not tainted or part of the investigation the basis for terminating this possible process?

4) It is impossible to unring a bell. The Columbian Reported on November 13, 1996:

"Last November, a Washington State Patrol detective examined 200 disks containing 11,592 files, according to court records. Of those, the detective discovered 1,771 files containing sexually explicit materials.

In addition, a second detective discovered 'several thousand adult pornographic pictures' in other Watson computer files, according to a WSP investigative report. Among the images, reported detective Glen Hobbs were depictions of heterosexual and homosexual acts as well as sex acts between people and animals.

Also seized were several undated e-mail messages between Watson's college e-mail address and others. Said one, 'Hi sexy, I was busy on the phone with a new 'friend' in Canada. Can't call her very often, though to[sic] expensive!...By the way, have any sexy photos? He he...If so, send them to Dennis

Watson (Or take some new poloroids...he he)'.."

If students or parents of students who have read this and need the course Prof. Watson is teaching but feel they have legitimate reasons for not wanting to take a course from him, what considerations/arrangements can/will be made for such students?

5) If the Washington State Auditor and the Washington State Patrol were unable to have their probable cause for search and subsequent search legally sustained, on what legal basis has the Administration recently proposed to have authority to obtain computer passwords, review files and hard drives and computer histories for faculty and others suspected of using State computers for alleged nefarious purposes? On what basis has the Administration allegedly proposed to ban "political activities and discourse" on campus computers and how are "political" activities and discourse defined? What standard is to be employed for probable cause for Administration examination of computer files and histories? What mechanisms exist for notification that computer messages and histories are being reviewed and when is notification to be given? Could the Watson case paradoxically be used to develop processes and controls--not allowed in the Watson case-- that could be used to choke off free speech and legitimate concerns by the Clark Administration?

These are but some of the legitimate questions that flow from this case and real "closure" cannot occur by summarily sweeping away legitimate questions and concerns. At a State institution, no one, not even the Administration or the Board is above accountability and scrutiny. If mechanisms for scrutiny or accountability do not exist and/or are being subverted, there is always the U.S. Constitution, Federal Laws and of course free speech for those who dare to exercise it. In Kerala, India there is a saying in Malayalam: "If the crow takes a bath, can it become a swan?" To this rhetorical question the answer is always "Never".

Jim Craven

* James Craven * "Reason is a narrow system swollen *
* Dept of Economics * into an ideology. *
* Clark College * *
* 1800 E. McLoughlin Blvd. * With time and power it has become a *
* Vancouver, Wa. 98663 * dogma, devoid of direction and *
* (360) 992-2283 * disguised as disinterested inquiry. *
* jcraven@clark.edu * *
* * Like most religions, reason presents*
* * itself as the solution to the *
* * problems it has created." *
* * *
* * (John Ralston Saul in "Voltaire's *
* * Bastards") *
* MY EMPLOYER HAS NO ASSOCIATION WITH MY PRIVATE/PROTECTED OPINION *

-----Original Message-----

From: Craven, Jim
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2003 1:36 PM
To: Smith, Gerard
Subject: FW: Prof. Watson's recent comments

-----Original Message-----

From: James Michael Craven [mailto:CRAVJM@ooi.clark.edu]
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 1997 9:00 AM
To: jcraven@clark.edu
Subject: Prof. Watson's recent comments

Dear President Johnson and Dean Fulton:

I recently wrote to you requesting your assistance in forcing Prof. Watson to cease and desist his obvious attempts at harassment and having him delete me from his little "suppressed list".

I don't mind being called "paranoid" or any names. You notice that when I responded to Prof. Watson's provable lies about my wife, her background and her case I gave concrete evidence and sources for my assertions. I do mind the following:

"It is so sad to see THESE[emphasis in original] lies when you know Dr. G Smith was your lap-dog when he spent days in my office asking my mac questions, I would have my back to him, he would 'examine' my disks. His last 'visit' was just before the Auditors came. He claimed he was just stopping by to visit, but we know that by the time you two had hatched a marvelous plot to get the one whom you thought was chair of the committee. Did he plant evidence? I know he goes skinny-dipping in the summer, did he take those pictures? Or did you have them from some of your DEA activities?"

and: "How many times must you be told child. I am innocent of the indecent child porn charges. I can only assume how they got there, since 'I' had never seen these pictures until my lawyer showed them to me. But you seem to know all about them. Coincidence?"

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that State employees are considered "public personalities" in terms of the standards for establishing libel and slander. This means that to knowingly tell a falsehood or to tell a falsehood with reckless disregard for facts (failure to verify facts that could easily be established as facts), to do so with malice and in the course cause damages, is libel if done in print and slander if done verbally.

Here Prof Watson is suggesting criminal conspiracy to plant evidence, cause a criminal charge to be placed against Prof Watson and violate the human rights of Prof Watson.on the part of Dr. Smith and myself. He offers no evidence for this assertion; nor does he offer any willingness to hear/gather counter-evidence.

All of this speaks to issues such as malice, mental stability, integrity, intellect, willingness to accept personal responsibility and fitness to be entrusted with the special forum and responsibilities of a teacher. This also speaks to the issue of the basis and correctness of the decision to have Prof Watson return to this campus after having stipulated to "ethics violations", "misuse of State resources" and "unprofessional conduct."

Please advise me of what you propose to do about this situation. I have not answered these disingenuous assertions and naked lies as I do not wish to inflame the situation more. In the event that you fail to take action, I will respond to Watson's latest charges in ways that will cause virtually the whole campus to see him for what he truly is; of course failure on the part of the Administration to take action to stop these petty forms of harassment will be noted in any possible future legal actions.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

James M. Craven
Professor, Economics

* James Craven * " For those who have fought for it, *
* Dept of Economics * freedom has a taste the protected *
* Clark College * will never know." *
* 1800 E. McLoughlin Blvd. * Otto von Bismark *
* Vancouver, Wa. 98663 * *
* (360) 992-2283 * *
* jcraven@clark.edu * *
* MY EMPLOYER HAS NO ASSOCIATION WITH MY PRIVATE/PROTECTED OPINION *

-----Original Message-----

From: Craven, Jim
Sent: Monday, October 04, 1999 7:47 PM
To: Hasart, Tana; Jackson, Yvette; Craven, Jim
Cc: Farley, Janelle
Subject: FW: Response II to Mr. Watson -- Please delete if you have no interest.

Dear Dr. Hasart:

I'm not planning to respond to this on the master list but I will be referring to this matter again in another venue.

If you define "collegiality" as a willingness to say black is white and white is black, and a willingness to ratify, cover-up or spread outright lies, then I will never be "collegial". If being "collegial" means testifying under oath that someone who was interviewed for a position was not tape recorded (while my voice is on the tape telling that person he is being taped), or if being "collegial" means destroying and altering public

records associated with a hire that is the subject of litigation in a Federal Title VII case, then I will never be "collegial". If being "collegial" means turning away from or even participating in job rigging for insiders or using public resources for personal empire building of a few--taking away needed resources for the central missions and mandates of this institution--I will never be collegial.

But I don't just blame Watson for continuing to tell lies that he knows are lies. He has been given plenty of green-lights by others that telling outright lies at Clark is business as usual. By the marginalization, demonization and ostracization of me that has gone on at Clark for many years, he has been given a green light to continue his harassment. A simple example: this collector of child pornography sits on a tenure committee while I have never served on one in my time--seven years-- here. Marginalization, demonization and ostracization are all forms of harassment, intimidation that cause tangible damages and represent violations--federal offenses-- of Title VII under the USC. They not only tacitly and explicitly call into question my credibility, stature and credentials as a professor, they signal to the Watson types that it is open season on me and the Administration will do nothing about it--as has been the case in the past when I have complained about harassment from Watson and nothing was done. According to Watson, he wasn't even given a letter of reprimand in his personnel file as a result of the findings--to which he stipulated--of the Ethnic Commission; contrast that with how I have been treated at Clark.

He now says that I "bilked" the College in my ex-wife's settlement. Really?. Why did a conservative Federal Judge, Robert Bryan, in denying Clark College's motion for summary dismissal of the case on procedural grounds, write: "She [Dr. Thomas] has offered sufficient evidence to show her application was not fairly evaluated, that she was qualified for the position and that she was entitled to participate in the next step." ? Why did Clark College demand, as a condition of settlement, that my ex-wife not seek to have prosecuted, any crimes that "may have" been committed by Clark College personnel? Why did Clark College settle four days before going to a Federal Court and go from \$30,000 to \$50,000 plus part-time with retirement contributions, to \$90,000 to \$125,000 to \$162,500 to \$165,000 (with the stipulation that Aleyamma never apply for any position at Clark). Further, because of all of the obstruction of discovery, misuse of discovery, perjury, destruction of public records, material alterations of public records, obstruction of justice and subornation of the previously-mentioned that took place in that case, Aleyamma could have filed for legal fees in a separate judgment but was so burned out and beaten down she wanted nothing more to do with this cesspool. Further, the College also tried to demand that I (not even a co-litigant) also waive the right to sue for the damages I suffered from that case? Why in nine separate presentations to the Clark Board and a separate meeting with AGs, was I given no answer or rebuttal to my allegations and specific physical evidence of perjury and alterations of public materials/records? Why do I have a copy of a check for \$165,000? Why did Dr. Johnson and Vice-President Burch sneak out like whipped dogs forgoing the usual "shaking of hands" after a settlement? Why do I have a copy of a tape, released under discovery, in which all but a portion of Kibota's interview was redacted--all but the part where he states his name and is told that the interview is being recorded-- and yet have a full copy of his whole interview (that two illustrious faculty members swore under penalty of perjury was never made) released later under RCW 41.17.250? Why have the Clark Board and AGs not commented on this matter after having been

provided copies of both tapes?

Watson now claims that no child pornography was in his computer and then claims simultaneously any child pornography in his computer was planted by myself and/or Gerry Smith. According to the Columbian article on the matter, based on court records of sworn testimony of the Washington State Patrol detectives, they not only found some 1700 pornographic files, but those files included materials that involved "homosexual, heterosexual, animal sex acts plus children engaged in explicit sex acts"? Has Watson filed charges against those detectives for perjury and swearing false oaths and/or filed a lawsuit for libel against the Columbian (which does have money to go after)? Why did the "Independent" article on the Watson case mention an e-mail written from Watson's account mentioning being on the telephone with a new "little friend" in Canada and soliciting pornographic polaroids? And as for this nonsense that these Washington State Patrol detectives engaged in any form of duplicity or "playing-one-off-against-another" or engaged in anything less than highly professional police work is pure slander and/or libel--and I will inform them of this bogus allegation.

I could go on and on with very specific and concrete evidence revealing that Mr. Watson's lies have only begat more lies. "Oh what a tangled web we weave, when we practice to deceive". Those involved in my ex-wife's case, writing even more ugly and harmful lies in print in the Independent, were not sanctioned but rather encouraged and supported by the previous failed-President and Dean, and now find themselves in your administration promoted and ratified in their own minds.

I will never submit to a definition of "collegiality" that involves ratifying--by silence and acquiescence--naked and provable lies and cover-ups. Since logic and reason and evidence seems not to work around this place, perhaps a Federal Court, with very specific rules of evidence/hearsay, protocols and prohibitions against piling on contrived and irrelevant pseudo-evidence, will be necessary for me to practice some real "effective citizenship" and seek redress for my grievances. I am sick and tired of posturing pretenders, thinking they are some kind of royalty, trashing and hijacking the institution at which I work, ratifying/covering-up old lies and allowing new ones.

If Watson dares to repeat his harassment and lies one more time, this letter goes out on the master list and we go full-court-press with my attorney Mr. Zoretic--and all of you in the Admin and the Clark Board will be named personally with the exception of Dr. Jackson--and we'll let discovery and the Court process (there will be no settlement with public monies at the last moment) sort out who is who and what is what; who is lying and who is telling the truth. This is not a threat, this is merely a statement to mitigate potential damages; it is a statement of my intent to lawfully pursue my legal and civil and Constitutional rights, and is intended as a statement of the agony and damages to which I have been subject and that have been exacerbated by Clark Administration failure to act, double-standards and insider versus outsider treatment--in my protected opinion that is shared by my attorney Mr. Zoretic who has written and protested the denial of due process I have suffered at Clark many times with no response.

Sincerely,

James M. Craven
Professor, Economics

-----Original Message-----

From: Dennis Watson [<mailto:dwatson@xxxxxxxx>]
Sent: Sunday, October 03, 1999 2:15 PM
To: Craven, Jim; Campus Master List
Subject: RE: Response II to Mr. Watson -- Please delete if you have no interest.

Jim, you state:

I agree here that debate is impossible if one or more parties feels free to tell lies at will with no qualms. So anyone wanting to know who lies and who doesn't can request the following from the Washington State Ethics Commission: "Notice of Board Action", March 20, 1997, of the State of Washington Executive Ethics Board.

One should read the ENTIRE document, not just the quoted passages.

The charges were not specifically Collecting Child Pornography (note the press accounts quoting the Washington State Patrol Detectives who reviewed all materials in Watson's computer indicated--in sworn testimony-- not only collecting/disseminating child pornography--children engaged in sexual acts with adults-- but also predatory behavior in requesting privately-made pornographic "poloroids" of "little friends" be sent using Clark.edu as the originating address; have those sources been sued for slander and libel?)

I was told I could not sue Mr. Craven nor Mr. Gerry Smith for slander/libel as the NATURE of the charges they stated UNDER OATH would bias a jury against me. Besides, as others on campus who wanted to sue under libel, the lawyers stance is 'you can't get blood from a turnip' and that it would just cost the plaintiffs money they would never recover.

However, other people that were at the gathering where they claim I discussed the matters above have no recollection of my having said what they claim I said! Also, if you check with the state police, I am sure they will tell the evidence that was thrown out of court was a set of 7 photos taken at a nudist gathering, similar to kinds of gatherings Mr. Smith said he went to rather than come to my 4th of July party.

Absolutly no sexual acts were displayed in these photos!!

Craven further swore under oath that I have a program called Netscope, which is legal only for law enforcement to use and is used to hunt down child pornography sites. What kind of nonsense is this? I checked with a colleague and was told there IS a UNIX program called Netscope, but it is unable to be used as stated AND the colleague rather apologetically said that I would not be able to use it for its intended purpose, let alone for hunting down child pornography. I just don't know enough about networks and UNIX.

There was no reference in his stipulations,
however, to the quite conscious and predatory behavior of soliciting
private polaroids as was alleged in sworn oath by the WSP detectives and
cited in the press accounts at the time.

That is because it was found I had no NEED to respond to these allegations!
I responded to facts, not allegations.

Watson has yet to address the substance of the debate or even the
question of the right/imperative of any faculty or staff or

administrator to bring the debate out into the open--assuming it is even going on on what many feel are insider-packed/cloistered committees.

Jim Craven

How can I when the substance of every 'debate?' comes back to me. I was not convicted of any crime! I don't try to 'win' by bullying and intimidation. I know I am going to be chastised by my colleagues for replying to you, but you disseminate so much misinformation, I felt I must.

I replied to the school and to the charges as recommended by my lawyer. I didn't just get a windfall of money by browbeating the college and making up accusations or twisting facts.

Dennis W. Watson

The Columbian article on my case illustrates some painful realities: a) when journalists uncritically act as stenographers for those whose patronage and special access they require for further stories and "scoops" and when the focus is on personalities rather than issues--within filler spaces around advertising called newsspace--injustices and cover-ups are often compounded.

The article mentions the cases of Elman McClain and Dennis Watson as if their cases were parallel therefore suggesting my treatment is not unprecedented. Nothing is further from the truth.

Elman McClain was Chief of Security who went up against the present Vice-president of Administration over the issue of campus lighting. The vice-president proposed shutting off campus lighting earlier to save some \$8,000 per year while McClain argued that this would involve increased security risks and that one lawsuit would easily wipe out the \$8,000 saving. Shortly after this, McClain was charged with sexual harassment. As he fought these charges, additional charges of use of campus internet to view pornography were piled on to leverage the original charges (this is the typical modus operandi at Clark) Even solicitations for anything additional on McClain went out. McClain was fired and he and his lawyer claimed that he was entitled to an administrative hearing. After costly litigation, an Administrative Law Judge ordered that he must be given a dismissal hearing; but, he had already been fired before his due process rights had been exhausted. It is interesting to note that while all of this was going on, McClain was given a positive reference for a position on the Las Vegas Police force, thus begging the question: Which was/is the lie--that he was unfit for Clark or unfit for the Las Vegas Police force?

The resulting settlement was supposed to be sealed--but his guilt was never proved through full and competent investigatory processes. This Clark Administration however, contemptuous of basic human and due process rights would now suggest--assuming the reporter got this from the Clark Admin and that is a good assumption from the details or pseudo-details given--that McClain was fired through due process and having to do with pornography on the internet. In other words, a desperate and disingenuous administration,

coupled with a reporter acting as a compliant stenographer and not checking basic facts and contexts, further defamed and harmed Mr. McClain. Why the settlement if he was so clearly guilty and due process was followed in removing him?

In the case of Watson, one of the charges leveled against him and for which he was acquitted was misappropriation of government resources in using the computer to collect child pornography (and according to the Washington State Patrol he was not only downloading, he was actively/predatorially soliciting polaroids using Clark.edu). In his case, nothing was made of his business being "personal" only that the marginal costs of computer use on a bulk-rate system were zero or negligible. Again, these basic facts went unchecked and unchallenged. In fact, as a result of complaints by me about harassment by Watson--through spoofed accounts and pseudonyms--brought nothing from Hasart in terms of the scrutiny to which I was subject--this reporter had an e-mail from Hasart professing concern about harassment from Watson and indicating commitment to investigate and do something about it.

Further, Hasart claims there was a credible threat and credible basis to believe that the College was threatened with potential legal exposure and liability in the event of a lawsuit for defamation by Kevin Annett. Repeated inquiries as to Annett's legal Counsel's name has met with no response from the Administration. Further, repeated requests for specific evidence--more than Annett's assertions or allegations--used to establish that the College has legal exposure has brought no result. Further, truth is an absolute and complete defense against libel, slander and defamation and therefore for Hasart to suggest (and summarily convict me of while remaining a reviewing authority) misuse of college resources and producing legal exposure for the college suggests that I indeed did commit defamation or slander or libel. Nowhere in the article does the reporter mention that I categorically deny this and that people like Michele Cheung and members of the Circle of Justice with personal knowledge about the issues all wrote to Hasart to say that I indeed had told the truth.

Plato noted a long time ago: "Those who seek power are invariably the least fit to wield it." That is why those in power hate exposure, accountability or penetrating questions. Most of them are intellectually mediocre and have something to hide. They are used to raw power, lies, cover-ups, intimidation, empty schmoozing, favored insiders/toadies, compliant press and a few competent functionaries to cover-up their own incompetence and duplicity. In the Ed business, at the highest levels we find the opportunists and operators who go through quickie "Ed Leadership" PhD programs and network into positions as if real leadership and credibility could be conferred/legitimated with a degree as opposed concrete skills, knowledge and example.

Of the letters sent to Hasart, I know of only one response: Long Standing BearChief, a fellow blackfoot at Browning got a response when she thought she could pile on even more evidence that I was supposedly lining up paid employment at Browning through the campus internet (actually it was an exchange program proposal between Clark and Browning I mentioned to her and she encouraged--just like my work on Residential Schools which was encouraged by Hasart).

Anyway, thanks to all for your support and help. Although many of you who

wrote to Hasart and who hold credentials she could never hope to hold will get no response from the etherial powers-that-be at Clark, your ideas stand on their own and need no confirmation from anyone.

I have told the truth and need not remember what I have said and to whom and when I said it. The powers-that-be at Clark are not in such an enviable position--of their own making. Just like Clinton and and as with members of the previous regime at Clark--a site to behold--the disingenuousness will come home to roost when tested through thorough and unrelenting examination and cross-examination there will be more and more to explain and perhaps attempt to cover-up. This time however, no sealed settlement.

These are my constitutionally-protected opinions made on the best evidence available to me and to which I invite rebuttal or correction. They are made without malice and of course my employer has no association--in terms of agreement or disagreement--with my potected opinions.

Jim Craven