
From: THADDEUS LINDNER [mailto:talindner@worldnet.att.net]
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2006 10:27 PM
To: board@rmwc.edu; Skip Kughn
Cc: Gene Mason; Eliotmill@aol.com; Hoinkes; Alex Bell; Nancy Erickson; Gene Dahmen
Subject: Board Decision

After constant e-mails and phone calls, I finally decided to express my resentment at the erroneous assumption by the board and Ginger that I and all other alumnae who oppose the board's decision are controlled by or are "mouthpieces" of PEC. Since we are well educated women with minds of our own, I think most of us are able to form our own conclusions.

In my case my opposition began before I had ever heard of PEC. I had been vaguely aware of the possibility of coeducation and strategic planning, but, even though I received most board mailings, there was nothing definite even from my daughter who was on the board at that time. I now realize that the alumnae and the students were purposely kept in the dark.

I was one of the "major donors" called by A & S. I can't recall every question, but two stand out. I was asked if I would contribute if the college went coed, but was not asked if I would contribute if the college remained single-sex. I would think the latter very important information and must conclude that the board did not want to know because they didn't care about alumnae support or they had already decided.

In 2005 Tad and I made a pledge to PER after hearing of the need to upgrade the facility. We were informed by the Administration and Val Cushman that the project was greatly needed to attract more young women who are now more interested in athletics. Did they as members of the staff not know about your plans? At a later meeting in DC re the PER again no mention of coeducation. In May 2006 we were on campus, shown the architectural drawings--still no mention of coeducation.

In June we attended the A & S presentation in Washington and, along with many others (including 2 trustee emeritae) were confused by the graphs and the explanations and interpretations of their conclusions. We couldn't understand how so many young men who had never heard of RMWC would flock to the college. If I remember correctly, A & S even admitted that their global honors project might not be successful--a contrast with the present assurances to the contrary.

As Madeline Miller says, your actions are causing deep divisions amongst classmates, friends, faculty and families. Unfortunately, I am personally affected by the latter. My daughter Ann and I disagree on the board's actions. We are both hurting and have agreed to disagree. I refused to be a plaintiff in any lawsuit because of the hurt to her and probable damage to our relationship. I still have my strong feelings and hope and pray our loving relationship will not suffer because of actions taken by others.

Tad and I also attended the DC meeting in October and were dismayed to say the least. About 100 people were there and it appeared that 90% were opposed to the board's plan. Financial explanations were poor, neither president knew what the current tuition was and many questions were unanswered or ignored. Regarding the art: first a denial any would be sold, then no direct answer, now, apparently some pieces will be sold (not a very good example of our Honor Code). If it is OK to sell art works for a coed college, why was it not considered OK to keep the college single sex?

RMWC has always been very dear to me. It made a self-confident woman out of an insecure, naive girl. I received an excellent education that enabled me to use my major in working as an intelligence analyst for CIA. Graduate school was impressed by the college I attended. I have worked for the college for almost 60 years in various ways including President of the Alumnae Association, trustee

for 12 years, and, most recently chairman of the successful campaign to raise money for the Alumnae House.

My husband (who is as angry as I am) and I have always contributed to RMWC as have our children (in my honor). I feel badly that Tad's gift for volunteer leadership may some day not go to a woman. We have a Presidential scholar who is a sophomore. She was offered a scholarship to William & Mary and RMWC (I don't know the cash difference) and she chose RMWC. (I wonder why after hearing from a friend the atrocious treatment of some prospective students by the Admissions staff) She keeps in touch, loves RM and feels she could not be in a better place (at least she did a few months ago). I feel for her. I am grateful to Ginger for allowing us to alter the wording of our scholarship so that it will only be available to women.

You already know of our withdrawal of any support including bequests. We originally felt a moral obligation to fulfill our PER pledge. However, since you felt no moral obligation to tell us the truth, we will not pay any more on the pledge and regret we have already paid so much.

I feel my college has been destroyed. The buildings on Rivermont Avenue are only on a location where I spent 4 years in residence and 58 years in service. I have my wonderful memories and many friends with whom I still keep in touch. These two things I'll always have.

What memories will you have?

Mary Jean Wellford Lindner '48