

Presented to the library by
David Bowlin on behalf
of the sponsors.

GROUNDS FOR DISSENT

A Supplement to the
Revelle College Dissenter

Vol. 1

No. 1

NOTE

The volume of material compiled by the publishers of the Dissenter was of such magnitude that to have it all printed would have been prohibitively expensive. Consequently, the publishers have included the rest of the material in this supplement.

The supplement includes the following:

1. A list entitled "Responsibilities of Resident Assistants" issued by the Office of the Provost.
2. An interview with Mr. Ronald Kirkby, former Head Resident.
3. A statement by Mr. Jan Diepersloot.
4. A statement by five residents of Suite 450, Galathea Hall.
5. An interview with Chancellor Galbraith.
6. An interview with Dr. Leonard Liebermann, chairman of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom.
7. An interview with Provost Goldberg.
8. A letter from Mr. Kirkby to the provost concerning Erica Sherover.
9. Mr. Kirkby's letter of resignation as Head Resident.

REVELLE COLLEGE RESIDENCE HALLS

RESPONSIBILITIES OF RESIDENT ASSISTANTS

(issued in December, 1965
by the Office of the Provost)

- 1) To encourage students to take advantage of the intellectual, cultural, and recreational opportunities offered at the University.
- 2) To help supplement these opportunities offered at the University through residence hall activities.
- 3) To promote individual and group activities that will facilitate and carry over classroom learning to the residence halls.
- 4) To create a friendly atmosphere in the residence hall.
- 5) To assist the individual students in adjusting effectively to all aspects of the University.
- 6) To help provide opportunities for the students which will give them a chance to learn the responsibilities which must accompany freedom.
- 7) To inform the students of the development of the rules, regulations, policies and customs of the University and of the means by which the rules and regulations may be modified when they are thought to be inappropriate.
- 8) To support the administration and faculty in actions which further the educational goals of the University.

In other words, the role of the Resident Assistant is not a passive one. He actively influences the environment in such a way that challenges are constantly provided to the student. The Resident Assistant can exert a continuous and active influence to make certain that the students leave the University with a greater awareness and appreciation of higher education.

Interview with Mr. Ronald Kirkby

When asked how he became involved in the Bauerlein-Diepersloot affair, Mr. Ronald Kirkby replied: "On Saturday, December 11, I talked with Miss Avery about the list of applicants for the positions of dorm resident assistant for the winter quarter. One of us mentioned that James Bauerlein and Jan Diepersloot were among the applicants. Miss Avery then said that they were unsuitable as resident assistants because their political views and activism made them controversial. She claimed that if Bauerlein and Diepersloot were allowed to become resident assistants the campus of this university would come to look like Berkeley."

Q: What was your reaction to her statement?

A: I objected strongly.

Q: What was Miss Avery's reaction to your objection?

A: She said that I did not belong here and that I belonged at Berkeley.

Q: What happened then?

A: This episode so upset me that I telephoned Provost Goldberg and asked to see him that afternoon. We talked and I told him that I thought the question of the qualifications and suitability of the resident assistants was a matter of educational policy. The Provost agreed.

Q: Are you quite sure, Mr. Kirkby, that the Provost agreed that the qualifications of resident assistants were a matter of educational policy?

A: Yes, I am.

Q: Did you discuss anything else?

A: Yes. I briefly recounted my conversation with Mary Avery and stated that I did not like her attitude towards our educational task. In the course of our conversation the Provost said that he wanted the decision on the qualifications and selection of the R.A.'s to be Mary Avery's. I insisted again that the issue was a matter of educational policy and that therefore the Provost should take part in the decision. He agreed to do this.

Q: What was the next development?

A: On Monday, December 13, Mary Avery, Provost Goldberg and myself looked over the application forms of the candidates. After we had done this, Mary Avery reiterated her views as to the unsuitability of Bauerlein and Diepersloot. She said that her mind was already made up, that nothing would change it, that their political activism made them too dangerous to have in the residence halls where they could exert influence.

Q: Did you make any comment on her statement?

A: Yes I did. I told her that I thought that it was not within her competence to make the decision as to the qualifications of resident assistants since this was a matter of educational policy.

Q: What happened then?

A: We exchanged heated words on this matter and there was quite an uproar. When this subsided Provost Goldberg said that he intended to ask Bauerlein and Diepersloot about their political aims with respect to the residence halls.

Q: How did the matter proceed?

A: On Tuesday, December 14, four applicants were interviewed by the Provost, Mary Avery and myself.

Q: I understand that one of the qualifications for the position of resident assistant is an acceptable social appearance. How were the applicants dressed?

A: They were all dressed very neatly.

Q: Did you take part in the interviews of Bauerlein and Diepersloot?

A: No, I kept silent and listened.

Q: Do you remember any of the questions which were put to the candidates?

A: Yes. All the applicants were asked why they wanted to become resident assistants. All the applicants were also asked whether they would support the administration's rules for the residence halls even if they disagreed with a specific rule. All of the applicants said "yes."

Q: On the basis of your acquaintance with Bauerlein and Diepersloot and on the basis of the statements they made during their interviews, did you consider them qualified to be resident assistants?

A: It was my carefully considered opinion (and still is) that both Bauerlein and Diepersloot would make excellent resident assistants.

Q: Were any kinds of questions put to Bauerlein and Diepersloot which were not put to the other candidates?

A: Yes, both Bauerlein and Diepersloot were asked about their political intentions with respect to the dormitories. In fact the bulk of their interviews consisted of questions about political matters. The other applicants were not asked any such questions.

Q: How did Bauerlein and Diepersloot respond to these questions?

A: They answered all the political questions in the negative, they seemed upset about the discussion.

Q: Did Bauerlein and Diepersloot say that they wanted to use their positions as resident assistants for political purposes?

A: No.

Q: Who first introduced the political issue?

A: Provost Goldberg. He asked Bauerlein and Diepersloot whether they would proselytize in the dormitories. Diepersloot, for example, was asked whether he thought that he might either consciously or unconsciously influence the students politically.

Q: What happened after the interviews were concluded?

A: Mary Avery stated that the interviews with Bauerlein and Diepersloot had done nothing to change her mind about them. She repeated that the fact that they were controversial made them unsuitable to be resident assistants.

Q: Who participated in the actual decision as to which applicant would be hired?

A: Provost Goldberg, Mary Avery and myself.

Q: How did the vote go?

A: Mary Avery and the Provost voted in favor of the man who was hired. Mary Avery said that he was less of a risk than either Bauerlein or Diepersloot. The Provost agreed.

Q: I understand, Mr. Kirkby, that at the time of the interviews there was only one resident assistant position open.

A: To the best of my knowledge that is correct.

Q: But wasn't Mr. Raffke hired after the interviews took place?

A: I believe so, yes.

Q: Was he one of those interviewed on December 14?

A: No.

Q: Mr. Kirkby, when did you resign?

USE MIC

A: My resignation was accepted on the eighteenth of December.

Q: Why was your resignation accepted?

A: Because I sent a letter to the Provost stating that unless the hiring of resident assistants was determined by a faculty committee I would have to resign. The Provost told me that this condition put undue restraints on his office.

Statement by Jan Diepersloot

I have shown this statement to Jim Bauerlein, we talked it over, and he is in agreement with the contents. Since our experience in this affair has been essentially the same we have agreed that I shall speak for both of us.

The facts are simple and straightforward. In early December, James Bauerlein and I filed applications for the position of resident assistant in the dormitories at UCSD. A few days later we were interviewed by Provost Goldberg, his assistant Mary Avery, and the then head resident of the dorms, Ron Kirkby, to determine our qualifications and eligibility for the job. The interview was an affront and an insult. We were subjected to an interrogation of our political beliefs and activities. The line of questioning was, in our opinion, intended to disqualify and eliminate us on account of our political convictions. This was exemplified by such questions as, "Don't you think that either consciously or unconsciously you will influence the thinking of the students?" Bauerlein told the Provost he thought it would be criminal for a resident assistant to proselytize in the dorms. That same afternoon we were informed that we were not to be hired. To the best of our knowledge the Provost subsequently admitted to several faculty members that the determining factor in the decision was the contents of an editorial written by us which had appeared in the school newspaper earlier this year.

Most importantly, the provost never gave us an opportunity to explain and elaborate on what we wrote; he never asked us to clarify our statements. He never allowed us to say that the editorial was above all the result of our reaction to the stifling atmosphere of the undergraduate institution which we had attended, where our time and efforts had been spent in years of futile battle against the fraternity-sorority clique who controlled all major activities on the campus and perpetuated the socially-oriented anti-intellectual atmosphere for which they are so well-known. Our sole purpose in writing the editorial in question was to prevent this from happening here at UCSD (for there were signs that it might) and to keep the campus an intellectually stimulating and culturally rewarding place.

The matter becomes more incredible when it is realized that the provost himself influenced us, either consciously or unconsciously, in our decision to be actively engaged in campus activities. Throughout the quarter we had amiable conversations with him about affairs on campus and what was needed to make it more alive. He constantly applauded and urged us on in our activities. He was enormously cooperative in the organization of the Vietnam Day protest; he constantly reiterated the need for an alive, politically active campus; he told us he wanted the dorms to organize and engage in controversial activities; he wanted a newspaper called the Revelle College Dissenter; and so forth. These urgings and conversations were of great influence in our actions.

To make matters worse, there was a clear and utter disregard of experience and need. It was with great difficulty that I succeeded at last in pointing out during the interview that I had the experience for the job and also that I needed it. On the first point, I was, for one full year, the Assistant to the Resident Director of the California State Colleges' International Programs in France. This consisted of being in charge of the American students who were in the program and lived in the dorms. I am a teaching assistant in the Linguistics Department and have fluent command of French, German, and Dutch.

On the second point, I was hospitalized twice last year for rather extended periods of time. Insurance covering only part of the expenses, there remains a staggering amount to be paid by myself. This, added to the fact that I have had to support my mother and family since my father's death, makes my financial position very precarious, and I have to supplement my income as a teaching assistant by milking cows on weekends. The resident assistantship would have provided the way for me to solve my financial problems.

When these facts became known (this was in the week before Christmas vacation), several faculty members became very upset. A great number of conferences and confrontations, took place. The result was that the provost apparently admitted that he had made an error, and agreed to hire us. As I was told by one faculty member: "I left for Chicago during the vacation with the impression that you had a job." This was also reported by several other faculty members. However, things changed again, and as Mary Avery told Douglas Hopkins, reporter, "under no circumstances will Bauerlein and Diepersloot be hired." The provost himself told Dr. Bartley that they would no more hire Diepersloot and Bauerlein than they would put a priest in the dorms. More conferences followed, and a formal complaint of breach

of academic freedom was made to the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Freedom. Then in early January, I had a telephone conversation with Dr. Liebermann, chairman of this committee, in which he assured me that he had, in writing, the promise that we would be hired if the funds became available.

Simple arithmetic showed that the funds had become available. Ron Kirkby, Head Resident, resigned, in protest over this and other matters, making two budgeted food cards available. Mike Monahan, a resident assistant, was then appointed head resident. This made at least one room available. Nevertheless, in an interview on January 18, the provost told us: "Well, I talked to Mary Avery, and we decided that we would not hire any R.A.'s this quarter." I then made the observation that "the arithmetic of the whole thing adds up to the fact that there is at least one full position open." He made the reply that "...that's one way of looking at it but we also need two maids, and Blackstock has been pressuring me to get them, so you have to make a decision." He also said that one of the reasons we were not originally hired was that we had mentioned that the position would help us financially and that didn't interest him a bit.

The provost, moreover, has consistently said that there was only one position to be filled. The fact is that two persons were hired, and one of these after we were told that the one position was filled, and therefore none remained open. The second person was hired before Ron Kirkby resigned, with the understanding that his job was to be not a regular resident assistant, but a language resident with the specific function of organizing foreign language activities in the dorms. After Kirkby's resignation his job was redefined as being a regular

resident assistant, with the stated purpose of moving him into the room vacated by Mike Monahan's moving into Kirkby's apartment. This enabled the provost to avoid hiring either Jim or myself.

Facts pile up. On January 17, the provost told us: "Tomorrow I have a meeting with the Executive Committee of Revelle College [which consists of the provost, Dr. Carlos Blanco, and Dr. Paul Libby]. At that time we will decide, because we will have had a chance to look at the latest financial statement. There is a need for R.A.'s." His opening statement the next day was as already quoted: "Well, I talked to Mary Avery, and we decided that we would not hire any R.A.'s this quarter." That same day Dr. Blanco stated to me that the matter of the budget in regard to hiring us was not at all brought up in this executive meeting.

These statements, this hedging, these promises and reversals of promises, these paradoxes of real and stated intent, these inconsistencies, these postponements, these contradictions in sayings and actions have solidified my suspicion into belief and certainty that his final answer is "no," and that it is clouded in uncertain and evasive terms to prevent and avoid open manifestations of discontent.

Statement by five residents of Suite 450, Galathea Hall.

We first heard about Ricky's dismissal through a rumor on the 7th or 8th of December. On Thursday, December 9th, two of us, Naomi Schiff and Alice Cook, met with Provost Goldberg to talk about Ricky's dismissal and assorted other problems. We asked him how the students could affect the decision on Ricky's dismissal. He implied that a petition presented to Mary Avery, signed by the majority of the 70 residents of Galathea Hall, would have considerable effect.

The next day, a petition was circulated by Mary Ann Pohl. The petition said: "We, the undersigned residents of Galathea Hall, would like to keep Ricky Sherover as Resident Assistant." About 10 of the students were away for the weekend, but, of those who were present, only six declined to sign. The exact number of signatures is still in some doubt. Dr. Goldberg said that there were 48 signatures, but he didn't know exactly and claimed that he was unable to find the petition to verify his estimate.

On the day after that, Saturday, December 11, Naomi Schiff met Mary Avery on the campus and asked her if Ricky was to be fired. Miss Avery replied that she would be. The decision, she said, was jointly made by Ron Kirkby, the provost, and herself. She complained that Ricky had not been available at the times of various emergencies, that she spent too much time in her office [150 yards away], and that she had not made an attempt to come to the administration with "constructive ideas."

Immediately after this exchange, Naomi talked to Ron Kirkby, who denied that he wanted Ricky to be fired. Then we talked to Ricky, who said that she had heard that she was going to be fired, but had not been officially notified in writing. Nor had she received a written statement of the charges against her.

On Monday morning, December 13th, the suite representatives talked with Mary Avery, who presented them with a sheet entitled "Responsibilities of Resident Assistants." [This was issued by the Provost's Office in December, 1965; see supplement.] Mary Avery went over the list and claimed that Ricky did not discharge these responsibilities. She said that Ricky did not fit in with the administration's idea of what an ideal Resident Assistant should be. She went on to say that Mr. Kirkby, the Chancellor, Dr. Watson of the health service, and the provost, were unanimous in their decision to fire Ricky, and that, as of December 3rd, a new Resident Assistant had already been hired.

After that, Naomi Schiff and Alice Cook went to see Chancellor Galbraith. He said that he had vaguely heard of the matter, but did not know the names of the people involved, or any other details. He said that it was the affair of the provost's office and Revelle College.

That evening, a group of interested girls from Galathea Hall met with the provost. At this time he produced the same official list of "Responsibilities

of Resident Assistants." When he mentioned Ricky's purported deficiencies, the students countered his allegations with examples of her responsibility. Provost Goldberg seemed impressed with these, and said "O.K., you won. We were wrong. But it may be too late to do anything about it." He mentioned financial arrangements as a difficulty, and also said that a new Resident Assistant had been hired. He asked the students to meet with him again on Wednesday evening.

On Wednesday evening, December 18th, about 15 students arrived to speak with Provost Goldberg. Mary Avery was there, too. The students were informed that, although Ricky Sherover may have seemed competent as far as the Galathea students were concerned, she also had a responsibility to the administration, and the administration had found it difficult to cooperate with her. According to Provost Goldberg and Mary Avery, the only times Ricky appeared at the provost's office were upon those occasions when she had reported student complaints. This was insufficient, they said, since she was expected, on her own initiative and without ever having been informed that she was to do this, to visit there often with "constructive criticism" and suggestions to promote happiness and cooperation in the dormitories. Also, they claimed, even if they had been wrong in firing her, a new Resident Assistant had already been hired and nothing else could be done.

Interview with Chancellor Galbraith

January 18

Interviewed by our reporters, Chancellor Galbraith stated that he would not comment on any area in which he did not have direct information. Asked if he knew anything about the "four points" put to Provost Goldberg by Dr. Saunders, the Chancellor replied that he had no direct information on this, but he doubted that such an agreement was ever made. When asked if Dieperloot and Bauerlein might come to discuss the problem with him, the Chancellor replied that he would listen to anyone, but he stressed "listen". He would only intervene if it became clear that a manifest injustice had been done. He stated that he would not negotiate with "ad hoc" groups. He ended by reiterating his confidence in the Provost.

Interview with Dr. Liebermann

When interviewed by our reporter on Tuesday, January 18, about the Bauerlein-Diepersloot affair, Dr. Leonard Liebermann said that a formal charge was brought before his committee by a faculty member. He said that an extensive investigation was conducted which is now complete, and that the conclusions (but not the proceedings) will be made public in an official report to the Academic Senate within a few weeks. Dr. Liebermann said that as far as he is concerned it is a dead issue; it is his understanding that Bauerlein and Diepersloot are at the top of the list of applicants and will be hired as soon as funds are available. Dr. Liebermann added that the issue would be revived if someone else were hired before Bauerlein and Diepersloot, in which case Bauerlein and Diepersloot would have a lot of support from the general faculty, and not only from the Philosophy Department. Beyond this, he is not at liberty to speak, since the proceedings of his committee are confidential.

Interview with Provost Goldberg
January 18

After James Bauerlein and Jan Diepersloot had finally been refused the position of resident assistant, the Dissenter sent a reporter to interview the provost and Mary Avery on this matter. Provost Goldberg explained his position. Originally, before all the difficulties came up, three positions as resident assistants were open. Two were hired, leaving one place vacant. The provost's office decided to fill this remaining place by publicly advertising for applicants, 20 or 30 of whom responded. These applicants were all considered in terms of the criteria of motivation, scholarship, previous experience, undergraduate background, and foreign language ability. Four of the applicants were interviewed to determine their qualifications. Since certain faculty members were concerned about the implications of political questions put to Bauerlein and Diepersloot, two committees investigated the performance of the provost's office. According to the provost, both the Chancellor's Administrative Committee and the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom found no violation of academic freedom on the part of the provost in the case of Bauerlein and Diepersloot.

Next the provost explained the present state of affairs in the dormitories. Everything is going well in dorms although the resident assistants must try to create a better social and academic environment for the students. The expected ability of applicants to handle these two problems was a primary consideration in their selection. The man who was hired for the position that was refused Bauerlein and Diepersloot was a top scholar at MIT. According to the provost, he has turned out to be very effective in combatting the

study and boredom problems in the dormitories. Although Bauerlein and Diepersloot might have been very good on these problems, the man who was selected was the most qualified in every respect. The provost asked our reporter why his office should disturb this good situation by hiring extra resident assistants.

At this point, Mary Avery commented that in hiring resident assistants it is important to show consideration to those assistants already in the dormitories. Placing two assistants in a dormitory that already has one deprives the original man of a part of his function. This cannot be ignored in hiring more resident assistants.

The provost now took up the financial problems of his office. He explained that the present budget of his office was to be maintained. Although extra funds were indeed made available by the resignation of Ron Kirkby as head resident, other obligations such as maid services intervened to prevent the provost from hiring more than the original single assistant he had planned on. At this moment, the provost feels that the complement of assistants in the dormitories is sufficient. The situation there is good and hiring more would create financial problems for his office. But, the provost explained, next quarter, if funds are available for additional resident assistants, Bauerlein and Diepersloot will be at the top of the list of applicants.

Provost Goldberg told the Dissenter's reporter that the issue in the case of Bauerlein and Diepersloot cannot be one of academic freedom because the position of resident assistant is purely administrative. Certain individuals on the faculty did not understand this and therefore saw the problem as one of academic freedom. This contributed to the confusion over the issue. On the larger issue of job discrimination because of political beliefs, the provost claimed that his office

is blameless.

The provost stated that the Sandscript editorial of Bauerlein and Diepersloot did not conform to his idea of either democratic goals or of a good dormitory system. The job of resident assistant, the provost said, is not meant to be used for the purpose of political organization, and no matter what a man's political beliefs, if he stated that he intended to use this job for such a purpose, he could not be hired. On the other hand, since Bauerlein and Diepersloot had assured the provost of the contrary, that they had no intention of misusing their position in the dormitories for political ends, this consideration never entered into the decision not to hire them. The decision was based entirely on the criteria mentioned earlier, according to the provost.

Finally Provost Goldberg told our reporter that he believed that the University should lead the community rather than follow it. He had never had any intention of stifling political discussion at UCSD in order to prevent shocking San Diego. Furthermore, he does not believe that political considerations should be allowed to influence the decision of whom to hire as resident assistants. The provost explained that he is deeply committed to civil liberties; in fact he is nearly a radical on the subject. He described how considerations of civil liberties enter in the determination of the kinds of political questions that can be asked in job interviews. Since the function of the resident assistant excludes political organization of the students by the resident assistants, the interviewer may ask applicants if, in terms of the nature of the position, they would misuse this position for the purposes of political organization. If the answer is "yes", they must be excluded. If the answer is "no", whatever the political views of the applicant, be they Nazi or anything else, he cannot be excluded because of them. This is the only way in which an interviewer may introduce political questions into his discussion with a prospective resident assistant.

The provost went on to explain that a question of the form "Would you through your own conviction use the job for the purpose of political organization?" is absolutely excluded by the nature of civil liberties. The job and the person must be distinguished. Provost Goldberg explained that his "mistake" was to have asked political questions in the interview with Bauerlein and Dieperaloot that were either somewhere between the two forms presented above, or subject to such an interpretation, or confusing. This led these students and others to the erroneous conclusion that Bauerlein and Dieperaloot were being excluded on the grounds of their political beliefs. In fact, the provost concluded, whatever he said in the interview (and he does not remember exactly) political considerations never entered into his decision not to hire these two students.

Mr. Kirkby's Letter to Provost Goldberg

December 16, 1965

To: Provost Goldberg

From: Ronald Kirkby

I regret very much having to inform you that I believe that we have committed a terrible injustice to Miss Erica Sherover. It has been my fault. I should have stood up to be counted on where I stand with respect to firing her, and I did not do so. Instead, I acquiesced in what I took to be your and Mary Avery's determination to be rid of her, and I deeply regret it. I did not speak out and tell you flatly what I knew to be the case, namely that this whole matter of Erica Sherover has been, from the beginning, a personality conflict between Erica and Mary Avery. Erica has, I know, grated on your nerves, and she has occasionally grated on mine. But be that as it may, it in no sense constitutes grounds for firing Erica.

My greatest error in the matter was that I did not stand up to what amounted to the riding of Erica Sherover, while she was in absentia. Instead, I vacillated, hesitated, temporized, and tried to see all sides of the matter, to see everyone's point of view. In point of fact, there is only one side to the matter, one point of view: that we have, and that I in particular have, treated Erica Sherover shabbily and unjustly.

There is, I think, only one possible remedy for that injustice. That remedy is that Erica Sherover be retained as the, or as one of the, Resident Assistant(s) for Galathea Hall. Any other solution allows the injustice of her being fired on insufficient grounds to stand. I therefore urge you to reconsider the matter, and to solve it in the way you suggested to me on Monday evening last, namely by putting two Resident Assistants in Galathea, one of whom is Erica.

I am deeply sorry that I have placed you in an awkward position in the matter. As I have said, I have done this by not speaking out and by hesitating and thinking of all the little questions. There is only one question: shall we be just? My answer is that we have no choice.

Ronald Kirkby
Acting Assistant Professor

Mr. Kirkby's Letter of Resignation

December 17, 1965

To: Provost Goldberg

From: Ronald Kirkby

Dear Dr. Goldberg:

I am very sorry to have to report that I can no longer work with your assistant, Miss Mary Avery. I think she has been occupying herself with matters that are entirely outside her competence, namely with educational policy. The case in point is her outrageous statements about the two recent applicants for the position of Resident Assistant in the residence halls, Mr. J. Bauerlein and Mr. J. Diepersloot. As you will recall, she asserted that the mere fact that they were in some sense controversial is enough to exclude them from becoming RA's. She also commented that their political views and activism made them too dangerous to have in the residence halls, where they could exert undue influence. That sort of comment, and that sort of view of the nature of our task in Reville College, I find absolutely reprehensible and intolerable. I cannot, therefore, work with her any longer.

When we talked first, so many months ago, about the nature of the task in the residence halls, namely that they should be an integrated part of the intellectual life of the college, I was enthusiastic about the prospects of working with you in carrying out this task. It was my belief then, and it is my belief now, that you and I could have worked closely and amicably on this task. Had that been the situation, I feel sure that nothing like the matter of Bauerlein and Diepersloot would have arisen. Unfortunately, however, it has arisen.

I have suggested to you, and I thought that you agreed, that the hiring and firing of RA's is for the most part a matter of educational policy. I believe that the source of our present difficulties is the fact that administrative personnel who are not members of the academic community here, and who cannot be expected to be committed to the same goals as the academic community, have been permitted to exercise control over policy in regard to the qualifications and desirability of RA's. The solution to our present difficulties is, I think, fairly clear. It is that the faculty committee appointed to concern itself with extra-curricular activities in the dormitories take on the additional task of selecting RA's. I believe, too, that they should review completely the appointment of RA's for the coming winter quarter.

I have a great deal of respect for your abilities and your accomplishments as Provost of Revvile College. I would like to think that we can continue working together on the Residence Halls. However, if you find the above proposal unacceptable, I have no choice but to resign as Head Resident of the Revvile College Residence Halls.

Sincerely yours,

Ron V. Kirkby
Head Resident
Acting Assistant Professor
of Philosophy