What did Martha Saunders teach me?

Martha Saunders and her fellow mobbers taught me how to regard them. If you find yourself hunted by such miscreants, usmnews.net offers, by example, details of how to regard them. Let's start with the following sworn testimony of Martha Saunders. She, in her own words—under oath, identifies herself. Let me show you what I'm talking about.

Observe her for yourself.

Part 1

Questions directed to then-President Martha Saunders at her deposition in *DePree v. Saunders, et al.* on April 12 and 13, 2008. Q is question; A is then-President Saunders' answer.

Q. What investigation of the facts and circumstances of this matter have you undertaken since your [first] deposition in May of 2008?

A. Would you repeat the question?

Q. Surely. What investigation of the facts and circumstances of this case have you undertaken since your deposition in May 2008?

A. None.

Q. None at all? A. None at all.

Part 2

Q. You indicated you had not reviewed the depositions of the other defendants [Jackson, Munn, Jordan, Posey, Anderson, Pate, et al.]?

A. That's correct.

Q. Do you think those would be helpful to you in your understanding of this matter?

A. They maybe.

Q. And when did you plan to review them?

A. I don't know.

Q. And you've had what, a year and a half to review them?

A. Probably more than that.

Q. Did you ever entertain the notion that the allegations contained in those letters [from the other defendants she depended upon to punish DePree] might be false?

A. Yes.

Q. And what investigation did you undertake to confirm that the veracity of the allegations [in the letters]?

A. I called for an investigation by the ombudsman [which was completed in 2007—<u>see</u> <u>Series Gordon Cannon, Ombudsman</u>].

Q. Anything else?

A. No that was the first action.

Q. And you did not read the depositions [of the other defendants which contradicted their own allegations.]?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever take any steps to determine the allegations against Dr. Depree were true or false?

A. I called for an investigation by the ombudsman .

Q. Did the ombudsman tell you if the statements [in the allegations by DePree's accusers] were true or false?...

A. On the matter regarding an attempt to sabotage the reccreditation of SAIS by AACSB, he [ombudsman] indicated that he couldn't determine whether it was his [DePree's] intent to sabotage. But I'm paraphrasing here that he -- but the result could have been that and he did say this could conceivable interfere with the university's to obtain research funding or biased acceptance by peer research funding.

Q. I think you indicated that his [Ombudsman Cannon's] statement says he's been accused of, he may have, he could have?

A. Uh-huh (affirmative).

Q. What further action did you take to confirm or disconfirm?

A. None.

Q. Anything else in here where the ombudsman confirmed or was unable to confirm the truthfulness of the statements [by DePree's accusers]?

A. Well, the next item has to do with being accused of being disruptive and of creating an atmosphere that is not conducive to learning.

Q. Yes?

A. And he went on to say that such actions as placing fliers in a colleague's class without his or her permission is undoubtedly disruptive to teaching effort and completely unacceptable behavior.

Q. Let me stop you there?

A. All right.

Q. Dr. Cannon confirm that Dr. Depree had actually done this?

A. Well, that's the implication.

Q. Did he confirm it or did he just say he was told this?

A. Has been reported to place fliers. There is no confirmation...

Q. Was he able to confirm Dr. Depree's volatile temper?

A. Impossible to substantiate.

Q. Was he able to confirm that Dr. Depree had ever threatened anybody?

A. (Witness looks at document.) I don't see that.

Q. You don't see it?

A. I mean, I don't see his confirming that.

Q. In fact, he says that no faculty member told me [Ombudsman Cannon] that Dr. Depree had ever threatened them in anyway?

A. What line is that.

Q. It's paragraph four, line one, two, three, four -- toward the end of the fourth line?

A. Correct.

Q. And you did not again, read the depositions of the witnesses?

A. I did not.

Q. Do you think reading those depositions would have been helpful?

A. They may have been.

Q. Anything else in here where Dr. Cannon was able to confirm the allegations contained in the letters?

A. That is the end of those points.

Dr. Saunders taught me that she ignores evidence so that she can punish me for speech or any other behavior she and/or others don't like. Of course, if Dr. Saunders ignores evidence that does not support the conclusions she wants to reach, she and her ilk can continue to punish any of us while Mississippi or other taxpayers pick up the tab.

Part 3

Questions directed to then-President Martha Saunders at her deposition on April 12 and 13, 2010--Q is question; A is then-President Saunders' answer.

Q. What evidence today do you have that their [DePree's accusers] fear is factually justified?

- A. I don't have any.
- Q. You have none?
- A. Correct.

[In Saunders' first deposition (2008), she testified under oath that Dr. DePree "was not a danger to students or otherwise." But she still held out fear as a reason for her action in 2008 and her continuing efforts to terminate Dr. DePree's tenure and employment in 2010.]

Q. Thank you. Are there any other reasons that you removed Dr. Depree from teaching and service?

A. That's the one that stands out in my mind.

Q. And no other reason?

A. That I can recall.

Q. Nothing else at all?

A. No.

Q. Just that this group of faculty [Alvin Williams and some accounting faculty] said they were afraid?

A. That led me to the action that I took [in August 2007].

Q. Did anything else support your action?

A. Did any --

Q. Any other facts, information, evidence known to you on August 21st support that action?

A. No.

Q. As we sit here today, do you have any facts or evidence supporting the letter writers' claims of fear?

A. Beyond the ombudsman's affirmation of their fear, no.

Q. Did the ombudsman give you any reason to justify their fear?

A. No.

Do good science, good research, and justice require objective evidence? Taking Dr. Saunders' testimony at face value, she does not agree. Martha Saunders taught me that accusations without a shred of proof is the means she attempted to terminate my employment, i.e., tenure and promotions.

Q. As of today, as we sit here, what information do you have supporting your decision to remove Dr. Depree from teaching and service in the college of business?

A. Say that again.

Part 4

Q. As we sit here today, what information do you have supporting your decision to remove Dr. Depree from teaching and service in the college of business?

A. I have the same information that I had in the beginning.

Q. You have collected no other information?

A. I have not.

Q. Have you made any effort to collect any additional information?

A. If you're referring to my original decision, no.

Q. Well, that's a continuing decision isn't it?

A. It is.

Q. And as we sit here with that continuing decision, do you have any additional information?

A. No.

Then-President Saunders taught me she did not have evidence and still does not have evidence to take the actions she chose, actions that can only be described as arbitrary, capricious, and ignorant. Roughly two and a half million dollars later she has taught me that she spends others' money, squandering Mississippi taxpayers' money, to accomplish her arbitrary, capricious, and ignorant acts.

One more thought. You don't think this is the only example of Dr. Saunders' reckless and wasteful behavior, do you? Just two more examples – <u>her plane</u> and the <u>costs associated</u> with <u>remodeling her boudoir</u>.