

Defamation and the word “Program:”

In her email of Jan 24, 2013 5:15 (exhibit EZZR) Dean Throop seems to have interpreted the use of the word “program” in the proposed press release prepared by Jessica Erickson, AT&T, to mean that I was misrepresenting facts. She seems to have further interpreted the use of the word “program” in that proposed press release to mean that I was not following departmental and university and system procedures for the creation of new courses and programs. With one word in a proposed press release, that I didn’t write, Dean Throop came to the conclusion that I had broken three sets of rules. She gave no other evidence that I had broken any rule.

January 24, 2013 (exhibit EZZV) Dean Throop sent a defamatory email to Jessica Erickson, AT&T, stating that the press release concerned her deeply and that there were a number of “highly inaccurate—indeed, misleading—statements regarding the status of cyber-security curricula at the University of Wisconsin-Platteville.” She even suggested that the grant check ceremony was “not wise given this” even though we already had accepted the money. She told AT&T that I misled them. That is untrue and it is defamation. I have been damaged by this act. My reputation is injured. This was a slap in AT&T’s face too.

I had been using the word “program” to describe my efforts for months in emails to Dr. Caywood. Dr. Caywood had allowed me to believe that the word “program” fit perfectly with what I was doing by never correcting my use of the word. He didn’t make the correction because he believed the use of the word to be accurate. He saw no problem with my use of the word “program” in numerous communications.

Below is a timeline of communications that show that Dr. Caywood supported my efforts in cyber-crime up to Oct 10, 2012 and that he had no problem with me using the term “program” to describe my cyber security project/program.

Mar 28, 2012 01:13 AM (exhibit EZZZW) In his email, cc’d to Dr. Caywood, Michael Gay, New Ventures of UW-Platteville, said that they had prepared an outline of grant “programs” and attached it to the email. (exhibit EZZZW-1) This outline mentioned the Cyber Scholar Project at the top of the list. All of the abstracts were un-funded. Why is it ok for New Ventures to refer to my Cyber Scholar Project as a “program” but it is not ok for me to do so?

April 20, 2012 (exhibit ZH) Dr. Caywood signed an NSF proposal titled “Institutionalizing Cyber Education” in an obvious and, if funding was awarded, legally binding sign of support for what I was doing.

Sept 12, 2012 (exhibit EZZZZ): I sent an email to Dr Caywood with the subject "Funding Cyber-Crime Program at UW-Platteville." I informed him that I had secured between \$5000 - \$7000 in donations/funding from AT&T. Dr. Caywood did not have any problem with the wording or content of my email. He seemed to support what I was doing.

Oct 06, 2012 10:14 PM (exhibit EZZZZA) The subject line of this email was "A proposal for a cyber security program." I told Dr. Caywood of my plans for a unique cyber-security and homeland security "program." I said it could make us one of the most progressive "programs" in the nation. I attached a document titled "A Proposal for a Cyber Security Program." (exhibit EZZZZA-1) In this document I use the word "program" eleven times. Dr. Caywood did not correct my use of the word "program." He seemed to support what I was doing.

Mon, Oct 08, 2012 08:32 AM (exhibit EZZE) I introduced my online journal www.journalofcriminaljustice.com to Dr. Caywood saying it is for our CJ "program." Dr. Caywood did not correct my use of the word "program." He had no issue with the wording or content of the websites. The content of the web sites did not change until Jan 24, 2012 after he sent me his letter (exhibit A). He seemed to support what I was doing.

Oct 10, 2012 at 9:44 AM (exhibit EZZD) Dr. Caywood wrote an email to me suggesting that I could work to submit another NSF proposal for the cycle in December. This sure seems like he was supportive of what I was doing a few hours before the student complaint.

Jan. 24, 2012 (8:10 am): I invited Dr. Caywood in person to the AT&T donation ceremonial check presentation in my current topics cyber-crime class. Dr. Caywood told me he had been conversing with Dean Throop about the check presentation but gave no indication that there was any problem. I had class from 9:30 am to 12:20 pm. I saw Dr. Caywood again about 1 pm telling him about time slots for him to say something at the presentation and he gave no indication of a problem with the press release. Imagine how my world was turned upside down at about 1:30 pm when I finally was able to check my email messages and learn what had been going on while I was in class.

January 24, 2013 1:27:36 PM (exhibit A1) with attachment (exhibit A) In the attachment Dr. Caywood quotes from the proposed press release, written by Jessica Erickson, and uses them as justification to make this remark about me. "I think you are using this phrase very liberally. This is bordering on false claims when the department or university is doing something when it is not." First; he cc'd this email to Dean Throop. His defamatory accusations spurred Dean Throop into action that has caused me damage. Second; why does he view the statements as "bordering on false claims?" They are not false claims. The sentences from the press release that Dr. Caywood highlighted as problematic seem to be in line with the many email exchanges between he and I regarding my efforts.

In the same letter Dr. Caywood quotes my web sites and, in a poorly constructed and confusing sentence, acknowledges that my websites display several "proposals." How is the cart before the horse when I am saying in essence "I propose to build a program?" Usually the proposal comes before funding.

Also in the letter Dr. Caywood says "You are advertising in press releases and websites that the department and university are supportive of what you are doing. That is in error." Clearly he is saying that on Jan 24, 2012 I did not have his support for what I am doing. This was a 180 degree turn from his position on Oct 10 at 9:44 AM. This letter was the first written indication to me that he had withdrawn his support for my cyber crime efforts. What caused him to withdraw his support? This was retaliation for my involvement in assisting a young female student who had come to me for help. In his letter Dr. Caywood makes it look like I never had his support and cc'd Dean Throop. Of course this caused the Dean to think I was not following procedures or I had "the cart before the horse." It made the Dean think that I never had Dr. Caywood's support though I did. This is defamation and it has caused me real damages.

He ended his defamatory letter with a caution to me about how I present my ideas in media. I have been very careful how I present my ideas. It is Dr. Caywood who has been sloppy, inaccurate and defamatory in his writings.

January 24, 2013 3:45:09 PM (exhibit EZZQ) I wrote a response to Dr. Caywoods harsh and defamatory letter to me.

January 30, 2013: (exhibit O) The press release of the grant check presentation shows a photograph of Dr. Caywood standing, smiling beside me as the ceremonial check is presented. This looks like a show of support to me. I am confused by this. Do I have his support or not? He is saying by standing in the photo that he supports what I am doing but he doesn't.

If Dr. Caywood had a problem with me making claims that were untrue, why did he not tell me of this on the many occasions I asked him what I was doing wrong? The answer is that he didn't want me to change the things I was doing. He wanted to destroy me by ruining my cyber security efforts in hopes that I would get a job elsewhere. That is why he said nothing to me about any problem with wording when he met me face to face on the morning of Jan 24, 2013 hoping instead for a double whammy from Dean Throop to knock me out. He used defamation in an attempt to destroy my cyber security project/program.

I wasn't doing anything wrong. The cart wasn't before the horse. I did have his support before Oct 10, 2012. I did not make false claims. I have been defamed by both Dr. Caywood and Dean Throop.

