

Submission to the
House Standing Committee on Education and Employment
Inquiry into workplace bullying

13 July 2012

"...This case has everything: plagiarism; falsification of documents; fabricated 'performance reports' commissioned years after the event; fraudulent (mis)use of the names of industry professionals... The list goes on..."

('Universities and Other Myths')

Introduction:

This submission outlines and details ongoing Workplace Bullying in the tertiary/academic context - in particular at the **University**). It includes contextual material by way of background and also addresses the **Terms of Reference** specifically.

culture of Workplace Bullying is systemic and ongoing, even beyond the bounds of the workplace itself and into the IR system, which has been corrupted, contaminated and perverted through the submission by of: factually incorrect; fabricated; and falsified documents. The case spans approximately three years in total, including some 18 months beyond the tenure of my employment as an academic with , to the present.

In support of my submission, I attach several Appendices (19 in total) comprising documentary evidence verifying my statements.

Background:

I used to assume that people who ran universities must be intelligent.

This assumption was severely put to the test when the **University** to which I was tenured, made me redundant on 13 October 2010 widely promoted ‘*Stress Less Day*’) precisely one week **before** awarding me a prestigious *Senior Learning & Teaching Fellowship* (20 October 2010) – which could not be implemented due to the university’s own policies requiring that a Fellow must be a ‘full-time employee’.

Even the then Deputy Vice Chancellor (Global Learning) considered this bizarre situation to be:

“...a tad Kaffka-esque; it is counterintuitive, to say the least, and full of ironies...I hope that a sensible resolution can quickly be worked out”.

(email communication 8/12/2010)

However ironic it might have been, unfortunately, no such ‘sensible solution’ was worked out or even seriously considered by management.

Thus, the final outcome of this politically motivated, remarkable stupidity is that on my redundancy-effective date of 8 December 2010, I duly left the employ of that university. The fact that the very *day* before that redundancy-effective date, the university published a photograph on its public website of Fellowship recipients - myself included - being congratulated at a special Vice-Chancellor’s function, in the full knowledge that I had already been made redundant effective the very next day, did not seem to bother the university in the slightest in terms of ethics, integrity, or any other reasonable professional behaviour. (refer Appendix 04)

In fact anyone viewing the website, either internally or externally to the university, could have readily drawn the inference that an academic staff member who was awarded one of only two Senior Fellowships on one day, and was mysteriously made redundant the very next, must have been involved in some kind of incompetence or impropriety – neither of which was the case.

(refer Appendix 07 -

)

This may seem like an extraordinary and bizarre situation, but it is mild in comparison to what led up to it, and what has ensued over the next 18 months...

The redundancy represented the culmination of a number of instances, over a sustained period of time, of my being excluded from activities for which I was the most qualified staff member and which were indeed integral to my role. Exclusion from crucial staff meetings called to discuss the redundancy of my position and how my salary would be redeployed only became known to me inadvertently, and the subsequent ham-fisted attempts by the Head of Department to

disguise and justify my exclusion became one those lies in life which requires a litany of even bigger lies to justify the first lie.

The fact that I had been: awarded not just one but indeed two L&T Fellowships in consecutive years – the first of which had been, in the university’s own words, “*a striking success*”; that enrolments in my courses had increased three-fold; that my teaching evaluations were consistently high-scoring; together with my international academic publications etc, obviously presented the university with something of a dilemma in terms of justifying my redundancy.

Conveniently however, my departure for Cambridge (UK) to present at an international conference (representing the university), provided the perfect opportunity for my Head of Department to commission fabricated and falsified ‘performance reports’ - years after the events to which they purported to refer - unencumbered by my presence on campus or indeed in the country. Within a few short weeks of my return the redundancy was engineered and implemented.

As one colleague wrote at the time: “... ***if this has happened to you, none of us are safe***”. (refer Appendix 14)

According to [redacted] own Harassment Policy – in particular, 2.3 *Forms of Workplace Harassment* – [redacted] was itself in breach of its own policies through ongoing bullying which included (but was not restricted to):

- *maliciously excluding or isolating a person from work activities*
- *sabotaging someone’s work by deliberately withholding vital information*
- *spreading misinformation or malicious rumours*
- *spreading gossip or false, malicious rumours with an intent to cause that person harm*

According to the State Government’s definitions, patterns of professional workplace exclusions over a sustained period of time constitute workplace bullying. And, given the impact the bullying behaviour was having on my health and family, it was **on medical advice** (refer Appendix 13) that I made a claim to **WorkCover** to that effect. Not about the redundancy per se, but rather: the manner in which; the circumstances leading up to/surrounding; and the justification of, that formed the basis of my claim.

In its defence of that *WorkCover* claim, [redacted] has **knowingly** and **repeatedly submitted: factually incorrect; fabricated and falsified documents** (refer ***Terms of Reference*** below)

“If your organization isn’t managing conflict, it’s encouraging it”.

<http://www.proactive-resolutions.com/products/incidentmgmt/index.html>

Workplace Bullying at

demonstrated, destructive, bullying attitude to its employees is not restricted to my case alone. There is a widely held view within the employee body that routinely tolerates, encourages and perpetrates workplace bullying. And whilst holds up its 'policies' as a defence, staff have seen little evidence that applies those policies in any realistic, equitable, constructive or productive way – quite the opposite in fact.

As articulated by a staff member on the VC's blog:

*"It is ironic that openly supports this ['White Ribbon'] campaign but **refuses to either acknowledge or seriously address the issue of bullying and harassment on campus...**At the start of EB [enterprise bargaining] negotiations **employees requested zero tolerance to bullying and harassment on campus and...nothing was done to either acknowledge or seriously address this matter.** (posted 25/11/2010) (emphasis added)*

And as also noted by former staff members:

*"... **has a way of treating it's employees poorly**, and that filters through from upper to middle management and sometimes further down..." (14/10/2010) (emphasis added)*

*"...I was bullied by another staff member for years, and... the supervisor ...decided to ignore the issue... **I didn't have the feeling that HR were particularly interested in resolving our issues... Consequently, they never got resolved"** (29/12/2010) (emphasis added)*

*"...I realised very quickly that there was a **subculture of this type of [bullying] behaviour existing in the university** and really did not want to get involved... **I have not experienced any form of harassment such as that which I endured at** ", (10/01/2011) (emphasis added)*

continues to demonstrate, in both its day-to-day HR practices and its response documents to Industrial Relations processes, that a widespread culture of **Workplace Bullying** is not only tolerated - and indeed defended - but has become that institution's '**normal**'.

While this indefensible conduct has manifested in my particular case as outlined in the following pages, claims of '*reasonable management action*' are perhaps best refuted by the following unsolicited email (refer [Appendix 14](#)):

Dear

I'm stunned and appalled by the manner in which you have been treated... your work [is] of the highest standards... However, my stunned response does not obfuscate the serious problems I see experiencing, much of which relates to lack of professionalism, foresight and simple decency at all levels. (emphasis added)

(Staff email communication - 6/12/2010)

Terms of Reference:

Below are my responses to the House Standing Committee's **Terms of Reference:**

- *the prevalence of workplace bullying in Australia and the experience of victims of workplace bullying;*

Workplace Bullying is: insidious; widespread; disguised behind 'legitimate' policy jargon; perpetrated at all organisational levels including management, and sanctioned by that same management – either through inaction at the preventative level, or active encouragement of and indulgence in this utterly destructive, deeply distressing and unproductive behaviour.

In my own case Workplace Bullying has been characterised by:

- Deliberate and repeated exclusion from professional activities for which I was the most qualified - over a sustained period of time
- Deliberate exclusion from staff meetings called to discuss my position being made redundant and how my salary would be redeployed (*Agenda Item 1.7 Theatre Redundancy*)
- Ham-fisted attempts to justify such exclusion after the event as an oversight, a “*minor administrative error*” when the entire discipline staff numbered only five (5)
- Fabricated and falsified ‘performance reports’ commissioned some three (3) years after the events to which they allegedly refer, and which directly contradict my official performance reports at the time
- Factually incorrect, false and fabricated ‘quotes’ criticising my work, falsely attributed to industry professionals who categorically confirm, in writing, that no such discussions ever took place (*refer Appendix 01*)
- False accusations of ‘passing off’ levelled against me which are utterly and comprehensively refuted with documentary evidence in written, photographic and electronic forms (*refer Appendix 02*)
- Plagiarism and falsification of Proposal documents (*refer Appendix 03*)
- Undeclared conflicts-of-interests in academic promotion assessment panels
- Withdrawal of retraining options whenever I expressed interest in those retraining options for potential redeployment

- Denying me access to the email system (including my own emails) while I was still a employee
- Gross invasion of privacy – i.e. demands that I apply for sick leave to attend medical appointments during my own private, weekend and non-work hours.

The culmination of this Workplace Bullying came in the form of my being made redundant in late 2010 – despite being the most academically and professionally qualified lecturer across the relevant disciplines. (refer Appendix 06)

This redundancy was confirmed to be politically motivated precisely **one week later** by the same university awarding me a prestigious Fellowship, which I could not undertake due to the university having made me redundant the week before. (refer Appendix 05 & Appendix 07 - ‘

This Workplace Bullying has continued well beyond my tenure at - over the past 18 months since that time - and indeed continues to this very day through the following means:

- Submissions by of: factually incorrect; fabricated; and falsified ‘evidence’ to WorkCover and Q-Comp, in order to deny my legitimate, medically initiated and medically supported claim
- Public website announcement (7/12/2010), titled: ‘*Staff contribution to Learning & Teaching honoured*’, including a photographic image of me being awarded a Fellowship for 2011 - **in the full knowledge that I had been made redundant effective the very next day** and could not undertake the Fellowship. This false and fraudulent use of my image in this context is mocking, demeaning, offensive, professionally insulting and exposed me to professional and public ridicule and inferences of misconduct and/or incompetence – neither of which was the case (refer Appendices 04, 05, 06 & 07)
- Fraudulently using my name in a research funding/promotional document falsely claiming that had awarded me a Fellowship in 2010/11. This is factually incorrect and false in that my Fellowship was ultimately **not** awarded - due to my **redundancy**. I therefore consider this as fraudulent or at best a serious misrepresentation of the facts. It is also professionally and personally offensive, insulting and demeaning (refer Appendix 08).

- Submission by [redacted] of false and misleading statements to a psychiatrist assessing my TPD claim – i.e. stating that my position was a **‘fixed-term’** position when in fact it was a **fulltime, ongoing, tenured** position since January 2005 (refer Appendices 09 & 10)
- [redacted] commissioning high-profile lawyers to intimidate me and ‘railroad’ legitimate IR processes*. As my response to those lawyers (13/07/2012 – this very day) indicates:

... Please note that, as the subject heading of your own letter confirms, this matter is [redacted]. Whilst [redacted] have been granted the right to ‘intervene’, they have not, in my understanding of these processes, been granted the right to forcibly **direct or dictate** those processes, nor indulge in intimidating, threatening or bullying behaviour.

...Whilst such behaviour is perfectly consistent with [redacted] demonstrated pattern of bullying, harassment, intimidation and the submission of factually incorrect, false and fabricated ‘evidence’ over the past 18 months, I will not be intimidated by [redacted] or [redacted] misleading, offensive and inflammatory statements, nor will I acquiesce through such bullying and intimidation to unreasonable demands.

* **N.B.** It is interesting to note in this context that a university which teaches its Law students ‘*Applied Ethics in Legal Practice*’, including “...*the increasingly important alternative methods of resolving disputes*”, is simultaneously submitting factually incorrect, fabricated and falsified ‘evidence’ to statutory Industrial Relations authorities, via a legal firm which is itself, “...*infamous for advising its... clients to destroy documents*” (**refer below)

**Refer the following information in the public domain:

- a) [redacted]
- b) “...at every stage, lawyers played an absolutely central role in the implementation of fraudulent schemes.” (<http://www.theage.com.au/opinion/politics/tobacco-cases-reignite-debate-over-the-complex-legal-system-and-bias-20110210-1aojh.html#ixzz1uTZ61yxu>)
- c) “...it had subverted the document discovery process by destroying material relevant to the case. This destruction was said to have been conducted under the Orwellian “document retention” policy devised by its lawyers at the national firm Clayton Utz”
<http://www.smh.com.au/opinion/society-and-culture/big-tobacco-and-its-posse-still-in-the-saddle-after-eight-long-years-20100107-lwlv.html#ixzz1uTcSfCBY>
- d) Clayton Utz...found that two of its partners had behaved improperly. One had frustrated the discovery of documents and the other had given evidence that was “potentially perjurious”...[the] litigation hinges on the extent to which incriminating documents are destroyed.
<http://www.theage.com.au/opinion/politics/tobacco-cases-reignite-debate-over-the-complex-legal-system-and-bias-20110210-1aojh.html#ixzz1uTZ61yxu>

As I wrote in submissions to these IR processes:

The indisputable fact - acknowledged in writing by ; WorkCover; and Q-Comp - is that I have suffered a 'personal injury'. That such injury is a direct result of sustained workplace bullying and harassment over a sustained period of time is confirmed by:

1. Medical evidence - letters and medical certificates covering a period of years (refer Appendix 13)
2. An ongoing series of regular counselling sessions over more than 2 years dealing specifically and exclusively with these ongoing workplace bullying and harassment issues
3. responses and justifications which have been proven, comprehensively and irrefutably, to be consistently: false; self-contradictory; fabricated; falsified; misleading; hearsay unsupported by evidence; and in flagrant breach of own policies on confidentiality, academic honesty and ethics

That has sought to justify its position in relation to this matter by such fundamentally flawed and demonstrably false submissions **in itself constitutes bullying and harassment - sustained well beyond the tenure of my employment with them.**

In support of the above and to underline the seriousness of the consequences of Workplace Bullying, I refer the Committee to letters from two (2) credentialed mental health nurses whom I have been consulting on an ongoing basis (Appendix 15, 16 & 17)

*"... was referred to the mental health nurse service by and I saw him for an initial consultation on 4/08/11. The referral was for depressed mood and increasing anxiety **arising from work place bullying**... This is ' first use of the mental health service in any capacity and he reports good mental health prior to this referral. The **situational crisis of work-place bullying and subsequent loss of employment** resulted in requiring the interventions of a mental health nurse... The aim of the sessions are to increase ' ability to cope with a difficult and ongoing legal situation that has **increased stress to intolerable levels...**" (emphasis added)*

(- assessment letter – 23/02/2012)

mental health has deteriorated significantly since December 2010...

(- letter to WorkCover - 30/05/2012)

*...I see many gentlemen from the same demographic as in my role as a credentialed mental health nurse at and I also work in a supporting advisory role to a psychiatrist in Brisbane. This practice has had experience of several recent **work-related suicides** and this is **a well-documented reality in cases of this nature**... (emphasis added)*

(- letter to WorkCover – 6/06/2012)

And from a Higher Education sector perspective, as stated by the President of (refer Appendix 18) in response to *The Australian Higher Ed.* article (refer Appendix 07):

*...I was appalled at the **incomprehensible and badly managed experience**. You have been poorly treated and unfortunately, you are not the only example that is being seen across the sector...**This is a bad period in Australian HE history and is a poor indictment of university practices.*** (emphasis added)

(- President , to CW, 2/07/2012)

- *the role of workplace cultures in preventing and responding to bullying and the capacity for workplace-based policies and procedures to influence the incidence and seriousness of workplace bullying;*

As noted in “*Workplace Bullying in Academia: A Canadian Study*”, by McKay et al:

*Systematic bullying, hazing and abuse generally are identified with poor, weak or toxic organisational cultures. Cultures that are toxic have **stated ethical values that are espoused but not employed, and other non-ethical values which are operational, dominant, but unstated**. Such cultures thrive when good people are silent, silenced, or pushed out; when bad apples are vocal, retained, promoted, and empowered; and when **the neutral majority remain silent in order to survive**. Those who are most successful in such a toxic culture are **those who have adapted to it, or adopted it as their own**” (emphasis added)*

(McKay, Huberman Arnold, Fratzi, Thomas, *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Volume 20, No: 2, June 2008, p. 92)

As long as these toxic and bullying organisations have policies which they cite but do not enact, they continue to use and abuse those policies as a ‘smokescreen’ in order to justify their ongoing bullying behaviour - whilst claiming the high moral ground and claiming to be at the forefront of Workplace Bullying prevention. In doing so they blatantly breach their own policies on: ‘*Academic Honesty*’; ‘*Academic Misconduct*’; and ethics, which clearly state:

*Academic honesty includes a commitment not to engage in or tolerate **acts of falsification, misrepresentation or deception**. Such **acts of dishonesty violate the fundamental ethical principles of the University community and compromise the worth of work completed by others**.* (emphasis added)

(<http://policy.usq.edu.au/portal/custom/detail/academic-honesty/index.html>)

- *the adequacy of existing education and support services to prevent and respond to workplace bullying and whether there are further opportunities to raise awareness of workplace bullying such as community forums;*

HR departments whose role it is to be the fair and reasonable 'go-between' in the workplace between management and staff have demonstrated themselves to represent a significant component, if not the majority of the problem. There is therefore no-one to whom one can turn in the case of Workplace Bullying. In my own case, when I contacted the university's Chancellor () by telephone to alert her to the systemic Workplace Bullying at she asked: "Have you spoken to HR about this?" My verbatim response was: "**HR is the problem**"

There is a generally reluctance to speak out due to direct intimidation and/or threatening behaviour which can be blatant or subtle or both. As stated in my own case by a colleague (refer Appendix 14):

*... I'm totally confused and bewildered by what you're going through. It also reflects that **if this has happened to you, none of us are safe...** (emphasis added)*

(Staff email communication - 5/12/2010)

This kind of response reflects the palpable fear of managerial recriminations which colleagues experience and puts them in a position of not wishing to be seen to be supporting the bullied staff member. The other equally predictable response encompasses those who will collude with bullying management in order to ingratiate and advance themselves. This extends to fabricating and falsifying documents, on behalf of management, which are submitted to statutory authorities with not only the approval and encouragement of management, but indeed management's authorising sign-off on falsified documents stating that a "*thorough investigation*" has been carried out. Certainly a thorough 'snow-job' has been carried out.

I am aware of at least one currently ongoing investigation into HR department and its continued Workplace Bullying – which includes *physical* abuse - and the university's fraudulent attempts to claim that the matter has been 'dealt with' when in fact no action has been taken against the perpetrators whatsoever.

I am also (unofficially) aware of a current investigation into senior management (since late 2011) and my understanding is that there have thus far already been certain high level resignations in the expectation of adverse findings by the .

- *whether the scope to improve coordination between governments, regulators, health service providers and other stakeholders to address and prevent workplace bullying;*

My case provides the perfect example of the fundamental failure of statutory IR processes to investigate a legitimate, medically supported – indeed medically *initiated* - claim of Workplace Bullying. Despite volumes of corroborative documentary medical and other evidence provided to those statutory authorities (refer Appendix 13, 15, 16 & 17). As I recently wrote to the Chair of QLD's **Crime and Misconduct Commission** (CMC):

Over the past 18 months dealing with this case through various statutory authorities, I have been confronted by: gross misconduct; compounded by gross incompetence; compounded by gross negligence; compounded by gross conflict-of-interest; compounded by the perversion of the course of justice through falsified and fabricated 'evidence' submitted to statutory authorities.

(, CMC, 13/07/2012)

- *whether there are regulatory, administrative or cross-jurisdictional and international legal and policy gaps that should be addressed in the interests of enhancing protection against and providing an early response to workplace bullying, including through appropriate complaint mechanisms;*

My case again provides the perfect example of the complete failure of statutory IR processes to investigate due to fundamental incompetence and/or blatant bias. This fundamental failure has been acknowledged by *WorkCover* (refer Appendix 12), Yet despite such acknowledgement and written apology, *WorkCover* refuse to overturn their fundamentally flawed decision - and continue to justify that through blatant conflict-of-interest. (refer Appendix 17),

In addition to *WorkCover's* rejection letter being littered with factual errors, *WorkCover* claimed in writing to have investigated, but had not. *WorkCover* stated, in writing, that they had contacted my nominated witnesses but had not. However, the most telling acknowledgement in the letter of apology I finally received, a year later (refer Appendix 12), was that *WorkCover* had **failed to investigate serious allegations of fabricated and falsified 'evidence'** having been submitted by to *WorkCover* and subsequently to Q-Comp, to whom I had applied in the intervening time for a Review of *WorkCover's* decision.

Perhaps even more telling, Q-Comp, in upholding *WorkCover's* flawed decision, **actually quoted – verbatim – 'evidence' proven to be false and fabricated** (refer Appendix 11),

That *WorkCover* refuses to overturn its demonstrably and acknowledged flawed decision - and has in fact been guilty of gross conflict-of-interest in seeking to avoid any remedial action - demonstrates the need for some serious improvement in both the manner in which decision processes are (mis)handled and also the mechanism by which flawed processes and outcomes are managed.

- *whether the existing regulatory frameworks provide a sufficient deterrent against workplace bullying;*

The short answer is a resounding **NO**.

As long as toxic organisations are able to blatantly thumb their noses at regulatory frameworks by hiding behind a thin veneer of ‘policies’ they will continue to elicit the following kinds of responses:

*This...represents the most recent in a long litany of informally/inadvertently unearthed tidbits of information which, combined, build up an **unmistakably clear picture of ongoing deceit; exclusion; non-communication; hidden agendas; instability; workplace-induced stress, etc,** which runs perilously close to, if not providing a textbook example of, workplace harrassment and bullying - according to own definition... (emphasis added)*

(Dean of Arts 8/10/2010)

- *the most appropriate ways of ensuring bullying culture or behaviours are not transferred from one workplace to another;*

This is probably best answered by the following quote from the Productivity Commission whose 2010 report makes it very clear indeed that Workplace Bullying is a very serious and very costly problem to the Australian economy. Many would argue that the psychological costs are even more significant (refer Appendix 13, 15, 16 & 17).

“...Employers need to be proactive in preventing bullying in order to meet their obligations under OHS legislation to provide a safe and healthy working environment”

(Productivity Commission 2010, *Performance Benchmarking of Australian Business Regulation: Occupational Health & Safety*, Research Report, Canberra).

How the government deals with recalcitrant employers who refuse to reign in or indeed actually encourage psychopathic¹ employees/managers, is why we pay politicians. All we can do as individuals is to highlight the problem whilst doing all we can to protect ourselves from the toxic cultures they create, maintain and perpetuate. All the while thumbing their noses at regulators and throwing hundreds of thousands of dollars at lawyers to identify and exploit legal loopholes and technicalities.

¹ Refer ‘*Working with Monsters*’ by John Clarke. Published by Random House Australia, 2005

- *possible improvements to the national evidence base on workplace bullying.*

Given my experience over the past years and continuing up until the present, it would be my clear and unequivocal recommendation that organisations such as universities which are identified as maintaining, protecting and encouraging their ‘toxic culture’ of Workplace Bullying:

- a) be publicly identified as such
- b) have their State and Federal funding withdrawn or suspended until such time as they actually address, rather ‘window-dress’ their policies, attitudes and practices of Workplace Bullying
- c) and further, that such funding be withheld until irrefutable proof can be demonstrated through consultations with the majority of employees that the ‘toxic culture’ has been replaced by one of ‘**A Respectful Workplace**’, as defined by *ProActive Resolutions*:

Well-defined policies and procedures, open and robust communication, embracing diversity, collaborative and inclusive

[\(http://proactive-resolutions.com/\)](http://proactive-resolutions.com/)

In my experience this definition represents the **very opposite** of workplace culture.

Conclusion:

My case began and has been sustained throughout by a classic, irrefutable, text-book example of Workplace Bullying.

That has subsequently applied the same principle and practices to my politically motivated redundancy, through submitting factually incorrect, fabricated and falsified documents to IR statutory authorities and processes, is clearly evident and has equally clearly contaminated those processes and perverted the course of justice.

The series of significant failures of and deficiencies in the various statutory organizations and processes has not only seen the employer’s demonstrably false claims being upheld, but as a direct result of *WorkCover*’s acknowledged incompetence and failure to investigate and/or overturn their own decisions – no matter how flawed those decisions are acknowledged to be – I now find myself in a position where I have been subjected to some 18 months of unnecessary and unsustainable stress; legal costs; damage to my career, professional reputation and capacity to earn a living (refer Appendix 13, 15, 16 & 17).

This represents **Workplace Bullying** on a **grand scale**: a scale and scope which **continues well beyond my tenure at** – currently some 18 months, and counting.

The issues outlined here have evolved over this time well beyond just bullying 'in the workplace'. bullying, unethical, dishonest and intimidating culture has been extrapolated well beyond the workplace itself and has contaminated the entire Industrial Relations process – which has itself been - through a combination of acknowledged incompetence, procedural failures and blatant bias - a willing participant in and ally to bullying culture.

In doing so, it is my considered view that these issues call into serious question fundamental notions of: ethics; professional integrity; tertiary education standards; academic honesty; plagiarism; fabrication of evidence; official misconduct; perverting the course of justice, etc, etc.

My case continues to prove that for bureaucrats, statutory authorities, the legal profession and academia:

- truth means nothing
- documentary evidence means nothing
- ethics and integrity mean nothing
- justice means nothing

Workplace Bullying forms the very foundation, essence and life-blood of this Industrial Relations toxicity.

All of which begs the question: why would anyone have any faith whatsoever in the legitimacy of any academic institution, statutory or legal process in this state - or indeed in this country?

As I articulated in a letter to the *Courier* (5/11/2011) in relation to another university (refer [Appendix 19](#)):

*“...As Mr Story quite rightly suggests, “integrity was paramount to universities”. However perhaps a more accurate assessment would be that integrity ‘should be’ paramount to universities. I would suggest that is by no means the only university which, like much of academia, espouses the ‘theory’ of integrity, yet fails to match that theory with demonstrated practice. In my own experience of academia’s current panic for ‘profit over pedagogy’, **ethics and integrity appear to be the first lofty academic principles to be jettisoned.** (emphasis added)*

