

Dear Andrew Sabl,

Thanks for your reply; it's worth many (and thanks for your second reply, too, which just came through).

Let me try to clear at least some of the apparent fog by saying that the statements on the website's homepage by professors Val Rust and Robert Brenner were made some five years back, after they had examined the case again, "in excruciating detail," in the words of Brenner.

Here are their statements again:

"The case is clear-cut: they had no basis for dismissing you, as you met the formal qualifications. Moreover, they gave no other reasons, so any further reasons they give now are beside the point. All this is obvious." Robert Brenner; UCLA History Dept.

"This [student termination] is a wrong to right." Val Rust; UCLA Education Dept.

What seems plain to me but is apparently confusing to many is this: How is it that UCLA's own tenured faculty members have made these statements, yet no one there seems to know what to do with them? Or to put this another way, suppose that faculty members had made these statements about your summary termination from UCLA and another faculty member's reply to you on the matter took you to task for not stating your case in an appropriate manner.

In fact, I think an extremely valuable course of research on the university would be to hide crucial facts under a mountain of gibberish (and perhaps even a little indecorous commentary) and put it out there for the university's faculty to examine—on the assumption that they are paid to do the digging necessary for vital research.

I truly appreciate your having given some time and effort to wading through what you see as mud, and you have raised some crucial questions.

However, at this point, I think it's enough to respectfully ask you to simply ring up your colleagues there, perhaps starting with Brenner and Rust, and ask them how it was that they came to their conclusions yet no action was taken and this student termination still stands. Or perhaps you can simply ask yourselves: How often is it that UCLA faculty make these statements on student terminations but do nothing? And are these UCLA students then expected to happily turn and walk away?

Facts and academic principles are the substance of the university (regardless of what anyone thinks of the messenger), and I mention this truism because I suspect that if you do decide to ask around there about this case, you'll likely hear about the messenger, but to the exclusion of the facts and academic principles (and elementary ethics) in this case.

Finally, you might also consider that no one has come forth to refute any of the statements of fact (or the faculty statements) found on the website, though they've now had some time to do so. Surely one cannot even hope to go up against the powerful UC Regents without solid evidence for these facts and faculty statements.

Again, thank you for the time and effort you've already given to this matter, though in my view it is indeed the work (and responsibility) of all UCLA professors to wade through deep muck to determine how the university operates, again, in their names. And just one UCLA faculty member's statement that "this [student termination] is a wrong to right" should readily start them all moving.

Sincerely,  
Tom Wilde

Ps. I've had to resort to my gmail account to send this message, but you can still reply using [tomwilde@mac.com](mailto:tomwilde@mac.com)<<mailto:tomwilde@mac.com>>

On Mar 21, 2011, at 1:24 PM, Andrew Sabl wrote:

Dear Tom (first names are fine with me, since I'm assuming you're not, say 17 years old),

Thanks for your measured response. I was afraid that my criticisms would rankle more than my willingness to take a look would please.

At the risk of going around and around, I think it's actually your responsibility to state on your own behalf answers to the substantive case against you (i.e. to document how you know you got passing grades in those classes for which you had previously received incompletes). Brenner and Rust's statements are consistent with their objections being purely procedural—but while the procedures are important, you'll gain more supporters chiefly by showing that the dismissal was /substantively/ wrong, i.e. that your GPA was fine at the time and your progress towards degree satisfactory. Absent that, you're asking people to put in a great deal of effort only to obtain for you a rehearing that will end up with your being dismissed a second time.

To be sure, such a rehearing might well comfort you regardless of the result. But most faculty, or others who are not you, will want to be satisfied that this was not only a case of strange procedures but an actual miscarriage of justice--especially given the time that's elapsed. Many people will happily dig through muck to find gold, but not to find a rock. And you need to convince people that there is actually gold to be found.

All best,  
AS.

Andy Sabl  
Associate Professor, Public Policy and Political Science  
UCLA  
[\(310\) 825-7196](tel:(310)825-7196) <tel:%28310%29%20825-7196>; [sabl@ucla.edu](mailto:sabl@ucla.edu) <mailto:sabl@ucla.edu>

Andrew Sabl  
Associate Professor of Public Policy and Political Science, UCLA  
[sabl@ucla.edu](mailto:sabl@ucla.edu)  
[\(310\) 825-7196](tel:(310)825-7196)

Dear Andrew Sabl,

Thank you for your reply.

I'm not surprised that you took the (minor) risk of going around and around; that's standard when faculty choose not to face facts and academic principles (and university administrators). Indeed, the bulk of faculty spend their entire careers going around and around, precisely because they know this mutual tail-chasing is what allows them to keep their academic careers.

As I said, the thing to do at this point is simply ask your colleagues there about their statements and the facts that led them to make their conclusions on this case.

Again, when one UCLA faculty member states that "this [student termination] is a wrong to right," others go directly to him to see if the quote is in fact correct. And if so, then they ask what is holding faculty members back from righting this wrong.

And when another faculty member states that the UCLA Graduate Division "cannot be expected to do that"—where "that" refers to checking the accuracy of information on which a student termination decision is made—others go directly to her to ask whether she in fact said this; and if so, they then ask: Is it in fact actual policy in the Graduate Division to terminate students without first checking the veracity of the information on which the student termination decisions are made?

Too, apparently I need to point out that faculty members don't put themselves to this work for a student; they put themselves to this work because it is their responsibility (and their job) to see that the university is hewing to facts and academic principles when it terminates a student—in their names. In short, this work is done to ensure the proper functioning of the university, that is, proper according to UCLA's own mission statement and global marketing campaigns.

And when a faculty member states to a terminated student that the UCLA Graduate Division cannot be expected to check facts before terminating a student, this faculty member's statement is more than what's necessary to show that under the university's own muck, there's something quite important to be found. (I'll venture a guess here that if you were thrown out of your academic career and then another faculty member had the audacity to tell you quite candidly that the university cannot be expected to verify the accuracy of the information it used to throw you out, you'd most assuredly know that digging through the muck was not only necessary, but also that underneath it all was something of considerable value: an exceedingly rare but crucial look at how the university actually operates on people.)

Of course UCLA administrators cannot terminate students without first verifying the information used to make student termination decisions. Not only is this plainly unethical, it also violates the University's own Faculty Code of Conduct.

In my view, if you're concerned about how UCLA terminates students, you'll ring up the woman who I am saying made this statement to me and simply ask her if she made this statement to me. That's the necessary first step as far as I can see. (And I think it's safe to say that I'd be in for some extremely serious libel if I were making any of this stuff up.)

Several others before you haven't been able to take this step, for reasons that are a very large part of the muck.

Sincerely,  
Tom Wilde

From: \*Andrew Sabl\* <[sabl@ucla.edu](mailto:sabl@ucla.edu) <<mailto:sabl@ucla.edu>>>  
Date: Tue, Mar 22, 2011 at 9:57 AM  
Subject: Re: UCLA  
To: Tom Wilde <[wildetom@gmail.com](mailto:wildetom@gmail.com) <<mailto:wildetom@gmail.com>>>

Dear "Tom Wilde,"

I submit that I now have some idea why your attempts at vindication have gotten nowhere.

You wrote me, out of the blue, claiming that you had been done an injustice. I said that I was willing to consider evidence that this was true, but that you hadn't yet made a prima facie case. I told you what you would need to provide in order to make such a case, and what I requested should not be hard to provide. You could at any time send me (or post on your website) official transcripts showing that until your final year your progress had been satisfactory, i.e. that you had had a long record of taking a full load of classes, completing class work on time, and receiving B or better grades. If your transcripts would fail to prove your position because of bureaucratic reasons (though that seems unlikely: your materials as posted concern precisely two, and only two, incomplete grades), you could provide letters from your former instructors saying that if your forms hadn't been lost, you would have been on record as having received B or better grades in their classes. And you could easily have sought such letters years ago. Instead, you seem to have proceeded all these years on a hopeful assumption that you passed those classes, absent any evidence that you did.

Instead of providing the most basic evidence that you have been treated unjustly (as opposed to just oddly but with a completely fair result), you assume that you are already right, without needing to provide evidence. You then assume that anyone who asks for evidence thereby reveals that he or she is corrupt and indifferent to the way UCLA treats people. That is: you resort to insults, which I do not take kindly, to cover up \*your own\* failure to make your case, or even seriously to attempt to do so.

You suggest that it is my responsibility to figure out why about three of my colleagues (after what seems to be years of your trying) have sent you short messages saying the procedures under which you were dismissed were unfair. \*It is not.\* There are hundreds of faculty members at UCLA. Three of them over twenty years can be found who will endorse just about any cause when that requires only statements one or two sentences long (which is all you've given me--not full letters or emails that might provide further context or caveats). And given your style, you should consider the possibility that three faculty in twenty years have sent you brief messages of support solely in order to make you stop bothering them. If you have a case to present, \*you\* need to present it. To the extent that you don't, people are justified in inferring that you can't.

In spite of being extraordinarily busy--not only with teaching, research, and family life but with large numbers of requests that I take up causes that present much clearer and more serious injustices than yours is even if your accusations are true (i.e., it is still unclear why, if your dismissal from UCLA was so arbitrary and unexpected, you could not have simply enrolled in another school and carried on)--I am willing to consider your case if and when you see fit to provide me with any substantial evidence that it's a good one. Short of that, I'll have to wish you good day and good luck, and to express my regret that I have already taken this much time on your complaint.

I will respond in future to emails containing evidence. I will not respond to any containing only insults or accusations of corruption and self-dealing. Neither, frankly, will anyone else.

Sincerely,

Andy.

Dear Andrew Sabl,

Thank you for your reply.

I will happily continue to put time and effort into responding to your important points if you'll allow our exchange—our prior and all our future emails on this case—to go out to the public (though you're welcome to edit your prior messages, as I trust you'll maintain the integrity of your points). We'd simply create a "blog" on this case on which we could publicly make our respective points to an important audience: all UCLA students, not to mention the public that owns this university.

Without your consent to put our entire exchange (including this email) out for the public's attention on a crucial public matter—how UCLA expels students—I'm afraid you will have thereby demonstrated the accuracy of Chomsky's quote on the primary function of our schools: selection for obedience and conformity. And you will have also shown that any further responses to you on this case are a waste of time and effort.

In fact, you've already indicated (in a prior email) that you've been selected for obedience and conformity by your choosing not to speak out publicly to condemn UCLA's attempt to quash free speech regarding my website (nor, apparently, could you bring yourself to send even a private word of support).

There's deep (and extremely dangerous) irony in a public university's professors' refusal to speak publicly on how this university actually functions when throwing out its students and then attempting to violate free speech laws.

In any event, your last message (below) shows that you're quite sure you've got the strongest points. But as you know, there's no better way to test the strength of your points than by putting them out for others to examine (as I've done in my case).

Of course if you choose not to put these points out for the public, then you'll have shown that you're not willing to do anything at all—since this important case involving a public university can never be honestly and fully addressed by anyone who says they're willing to help but at the same time insists on hiding behind the university's own heavy cloak.

Finally, it's a point you apparently can't understand, but I'll say it again for the record: UCLA faculty members aren't deciding whether or not to "help" me in this important case; rather, they're deciding whether or not to fulfill their job requirements as these are set forth in the University of California's Faculty Code of Conduct.

Sincerely,  
Tom Wilde

On Mar 27, 2011, at 8:33 PM, Andrew Sabl wrote:

Dear Mr. Wilde,

Under no circumstances do I give permission for this or future posts to be placed on your web site or planned blog. (I don't give permission regarding past posts either. I suppose I can't prevent you from posting those, but I hope you won't.) I have no desire to be part of a public dialogue when you have failed to convince me there is any important principle or issue at stake. Your attributing to me qualities of "obedience and conformity" is extremely offensive. And I have no faith in your ability to engage in honest debate without willfully distorting what I and others say. (To take one instance among many: when you accuse me of "choosing not to speak out publicly to condemn UCLA's attempt to quash free speech,"

you assume that I knew about your free speech case before and said nothing. In fact, the reason I did not speak out is that I had not the slightest knowledge of anything involving you or your free speech issue before you emailed me. I therefore had no knowledge of the case before it was, apparently, settled in your favor, making comment superfluous. You would have known this had you bothered to ask me before leveling an accusation, as you did not.)

Should you decide to present me with any substantial evidence at any time, I'll listen. Short of that, while you should have every right to accuse others of covering up misconduct, I can tell you that people will listen no more than they have to this point. Nor, in my opinion, should they.

As said, I shall not respond to further messages absent such evidence. I responded to this one only to forestall any assumption on your part that you were entitled to post my previous emails.

Sincerely,

Andy Sabl.

**From:** Tom Wilde <[wildetom@mac.com](mailto:wildetom@mac.com)>

**Subject:** Andrew Sabl e-mail

**Date:** December 2, 2018 at 6:02:52 PM PST (Original send date was in April, 2011)

**To:** Tom Wilde <[tomwilde@mac.com](mailto:tomwilde@mac.com)>

Dear Andrew Sabl,

Thank you for your message, and please pardon my delay in responding.

It wasn't so much an outright assumption on my part but rather a plausible reading of your 3/21 reply regarding UCLA's attempt to quash free speech, in which you said, "I have looked into this matter briefly" (where I took your use of the present perfect to mean that you had done this prior to my 3/21 message to you). But I agree with you that I should have asked you about this point first in order to be sure; I offer you my apologies for my carelessness.

(However, I'll stick with the bit about your being selected for obedience and conformity, at least until I see evidence to the contrary. Indeed, to help you consider why I am retaining this stance, you might want to seriously consider why, in a university of UCLA's stature, you knew nothing about UCLA's attempts to quash free speech at the time this was happening, and knew nothing of it thereafter, until I brought it to your



attention. Indeed, the fact that UCLA faculty didn't come together to collectively denounce this obscenity against this public university speaks volumes about the culture of silence and timidity—as alternate forms of obedience and conformity—on the university campus, as well as within those many organizations closely monitoring this campus climate.)

The prima facie case you asked for earlier is found in the statements made by UCLA faculty following my termination. For surely UCLA faculty members don't make these sorts of statements against their own university unless they have solid evidence to support their conclusions on this case.

Of course you can continue to ignore their statements—or immediately dismiss them as nonsense as you did here, thereby implying that these professors are simply slandering their own university (I don't think they'd ever do this [for career and liability reasons alone], but evidently you do).

Or given that you have no faith in my ability to engage in honest debate without willfully distorting what you and others say, why then wouldn't you want to haul me out into public light so as to show the public what you believe to be true about me: that I'm incapable of engaging in honest debate? After all, given your own Ivy League credentials, you should be able to make short order of a mere individual that UCLA itself has discarded as refuse.

But given the facts and UCLA faculty statements I've gathered so far on this case, I strongly suspect that I've stumbled upon one of those extremely rare birds that allow us to discover "important truths about the real workings of power" (to borrow the words of UCLA professor emeritus Carlos P. Otero). And I suspect that that's the real reason why you and others there are unwilling to come out into public light with this case in hand in order to challenge the facts and UCLA faculty statements I've offered to the entire University of California (and the world) through the UCLA Weeding 101 website.

This is still a public university (apparently much to the chagrin of some faculty there), but as it is with institutions striving mightily to become fully privatized entities, UCLA will enforce on its faculty less and less transparency regarding its operations and dealings with the public. To counter this, the public must remain committed to UCLA's own motto: "Let there be light." And I would hope that as a steward of this still public university, you're not only resisting the university's moves to further obscure its operations, but also committed to bringing to light those operations of the University of California that show a serious abuse of its very significant power.

In any case, please free to circulate my emails to you on this case.

Sincerely,  
Tom Wilde