

**CONFIDENTIAL**

5 Roehampton Circle  
Kingston 19  
Jamaica

January 24, 1993

Telephone: (809) 9240800

Professor M. S. Wrighton  
Provost  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
77 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
U.S.A.

Sir

I wish to petition your Administration:

1. To reimburse my tuition fees of US\$22,200.00 for the academic year September 1990 to May 1991, as reparation for breach of the agreement between myself /The Organisation of American States, and the Centre for Advanced Engineering Study as set out in letters of admission dated August 4 1988, September 28 1988, January 9 1990, and March 12 1990 enclosed herein;
2. To annul my transcript which includes grades "C" and "J" for 6.001 and 10.95 respectively, obtained as a direct consequence of this breach, and
3. To waive the Institute's claim for repayment of \$6,442, incurred during the period September 1991 to May 1992 during which time the document dated August 29 1991 from the OAS to the Bursar's office, the Institute's invoice to the OAS and subsequent acceptance of payment for tuition in the aforementioned period signified admission to a graduate degree programme.

## **Reimbursement of tuition for the academic year 1990-1991, and annulment of transcript**

The documents enclosed attest to the failure of the Centre for Advanced Engineering Study to honour its obligations in respect of the specific objectives which formed the basis of my application and admission to the Centre.

My letter of January 14, 1988 to Brown proposed Applications in Systems and Control Engineering, as the central theme of my programme, with reference to the attached revised Statement of Objectives set out in items 16 and 17. Item 16 of my CAES application emphasized my major objective as being "computer based control system techniques especially (but not necessarily exclusively) in the area of chemical, process control", while item 17 asserted that "my active participation in some appropriate research project [was] a central objective."

Brown's letter of March 12, 1990 to the OAS stated how the Centre would offer me activities in the areas of Control and Artificial Intelligence. His letter of January 9 1990 listed 8 courses in Chemical Engineering, Control, and Artificial Intelligence, and significantly specified Professor Mark Kramer as my faculty advisor. This letter further indicated my involvement in a research project if a good match between my background, interests, and the tasks of the project could be found.

Note that it had already been established that there was an excellent match between my background, interests, and the tasks of available research. Brown's letter of August 4, 1988 notified me of Professor Kramer's decision to "involve [me] in his research and to help [me] decide which academic subjects to attend". My telefax message to Brown of July 7, 1988 (stamped by Jamaica International Telecommunications Limited) confirmed my decision to participate in Kramer's research. I followed up my acceptance to the Centre through several telephone conversations with Brown during January to August of 1990. These conversation served to reaffirm my goals, work with Professor Kramer (as referred to on page 3 of my OAS application of 1990), and my general hopes for my programme. Brown advised me that he would communicate with the OAS regarding my programme, and appeared to be pleasant, accommodating, and supportive throughout this time.

The enclosed abstract of the particular research project in which I would have participated in 1988 "Project on Chemical Plant Malfunction Simulation" pointed to Kramer's wider research activities in Modelling, Control, and Artificial Intelligence in Chemical Engineering. On my arrival at the Centre in September, my first priority was to discuss my research endeavours with Kramer who in this first meeting suggested that there was a remote possibility to use this research towards a

Masters degree. Even if Kramer may not have been actively engaged with the above captioned project at the time there was no question that the opportunity existed for me to do research consistent with my objectives.

When I arrived at the Centre in the first week of September 1990, Brown instructed me to speak with other CAES Fellows about courses – particularly Christine Smith with whom I shared an office. I made the appointment to meet Professor Kramer but Brown urged me to discuss my plans with Lyman Hazelton who offered lectures in Artificial Intelligence and Lisp in CAES.

My meeting with Hazelton disclosed his previous knowledge of my dispute with the University of Aberdeen, and his belief that my intentions were to seek admission to a graduate degree programme by using CAES as a back door. I mentioned the courses I was considering for registration: 6.001, 6.034, 13.61, and 1.123. Hazelton approved of the courses but he mentioned creative students who did not get good grades, and advised me not to do a research project since he felt that this would make it difficult to obtain the grades necessary for admission. Hazelton concluded by encouraging me to consider applying for entry to the Graduate School, and suggested that I consult him before doing this to ensure that the application would reach " a particular Professor's desk".

When I met with Kramer he intimated that the four courses, 6.001, 6.034, 13.61, and 1.123, were a good choice. He queried whether I was at the Centre to work or to sight-see in Boston, and emphasized that all MIT students did four courses per semester. Kramer did not appear to be interested in starting work on the research project until the spring.

I found that the first homework assignment for 6.034 required a crash course in 6.001, but having done the homework (with the aid of Common Lispcraft by Wilenski), I surmised that perhaps 6.034 might not require much more in the way of Lisp since Professor Kramer had considered the diet of courses a good choice, the professor in charge of the course had implied that many 6.034 students would have forgotten 6.001 anyway, and Christine Smith had advised me that prerequisites were not always essential. Against this background I continued with the courses especially since I needed to win Kramer's approval in order to work with him. This was my first exposure to the American system of education and the notion of "dropping" courses after registration seemed like the equivalent of "dropping out" with its attendant stigmas.

Brown did mention that I was doing a lot of work, but when I asked his advice as to which course should be dropped he said he did not know, but chose to consult Hazelton about the matter in my presence. At that meeting we decided to discontinue 6.034. I had become skeptical and

apprehensive of Brown's real intentions. He consistently appeared to be disappointed, offended, and at times even angry with respect to my resolve to secure a research project relevant to my employment opportunities in Jamaica. His reluctance to advise me directly, and the sequence of events described above suggested that there was no genuine intention to allow me to achieve my objectives.

Instead there seemed to be another agenda. Throughout the rest of the semester and the Independent activities period, Brown continued to make veiled suggestions to speak with either of 3 professors with regard to application to the Masters Programme. His first suggestion pertained to work with Professor Dubowsky in his research on mechanical part recognition using Computer Vision. I later found this to be surprising since he openly discouraged my interest in computer vision in the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science. However I had no contact with Professor Dubowsky, so he encouraged me to consider work with Professors Sriram and Simpson. Professor Kramer did not seem to be interested in permitting my participation in his research. This seemed to be consistent with Hazelton's advice against research projects, and Brown's pressure to speak with the above mentioned professors.

The course overload for which I registered was obviously not a prescription for success, but even more overwhelming was the mental enervation created by the burden of conflict. Frustrated by my inability to achieve the goals I felt were crucial to my future, I sustained repeated bouts of insomnia and general ill health throughout the term. My letter of January 20, 1991 to Professor Grimson outlined some of the conflicts I experienced in CAES, their effect on my work, and my recognition then of the threat imposed by Brown to my relationships within the MIT community, and the clear implications for prohibiting my access to research opportunities.

During the Independent Activities Period of January 1991, I aggressively set out to secure the central objective of my programme. I convinced Professor Evans of Aspen Technology Inc. to allow me to do a modelling project with his Company. Brown had no suggestions with regard to a project in Chemical Engineering, instead, he continued to urge me to speak with Professor Sriram about the Masters Programme. He even maintained that unlike many other professors Sriram did not have a narrow focus and was well able to work on projects involving Control. Naturally, I preferred to study Chemical Engineering under the tutelage of a Professor of that discipline. I decided not to advise Brown of my efforts to undertake research at Aspen Tech until registration day.

At Aspen Tech Professor Evans seemed to welcome my interest. He introduced me to Dr. Chau Chen and Douglas Denholm who would supervise my work. At first, Chen was responsive and

welcoming, but later although he had perused my qualifications and had already decided that having done courses in Chemistry and Mechanical Engineering I had a background that would allow me to begin study on the requirements of the project, throughout IAP I sensed a reluctance to permit me to start work. I had reason to believe that Professor Evans had advised Brown of my efforts as a matter of professional courtesy. I found it necessary to consult the Medical Department throughout IAP, I wrote to Professor Grimson during this period, I felt pressured by Brown, was under considerable strain and therefore unable to do further work on 1.123 which had been registered as incomplete. There was also no time to consult professors about courses I considered taking that semester.

The project involved revising obsolete Aspen Plus code for an old Bayer model designed by Aspen Technology Inc. for Reynolds Metals Company. The code in the various programmes comprising the model needed to be made compatible with the current version of Aspen Plus. The Company planned to use this model in their work with Nabalco Australia, and we decided that I would update the Reynolds model and write a term paper on my work.

In my introductory discussions with Evans, Chen, and Denholm, I pursued the possibilities for remuneration, and informed them of my monthly OAS stipend of \$500. Chen and Denholm asked if I would be interested in permanent employment with the Company after completing my programme of studies in CAES. I was flattered by the question but explained that I was hoping to equip myself with knowledge which would enable me to work in Process Industries in Jamaica. I added that in any case I also hoped to complete a PhD programme in Electrical Engineering/Computer Science and so was not in a position to entertain the possibility of employment with them.

When it became obvious that Brown already knew of my discussions at Aspen Tech, I discussed the possibility of remuneration with him. He advised me that this would not be possible since my "J" visa did not allow me to work off campus. However, Professor Evans suggested that if I was making progress with the project in the Spring term, the Company would be willing to pay me for the summer months.

Early in the spring term, Brown emphasized that the Centre would not allow me to continue if I was not making progress with the project. His assumption was suspiciously premature, but in retrospect was undoubtedly related to my supervisors' behaviour at this time. They had departed from their initial welcoming attitude, had become disinterested, and did not introduce me to the Reynold's simulation until add date. It was about this time that Professor Ezekiel informed me that as a J-1 visa holder, there was a provision allowing me employment in the USA for purposes of practical training after "graduation " from the Advanced Study Programme in CAES.

That semester I attended a 3-day course on Model Manager, the graphical user interface to Aspen Plus, experimented with Model Manager, and completed revision of DIGTL1, the Simple Mass Balance model for Bayer digestion. Chen and Denholm suggested the references, Process Flowsheeting by Westerberg, and the Chemical Engineering encyclopaedias, Othmer, and McKetta. However, they did not outline a programme of reading and problem solving.

I was aware of criticisms that I was not spending enough time at Aspen Technology Inc. but the exercise specified by Chen and Denholm was not one that involved learning the logic, grammar, or syntax of the simulation; it provided little chemical engineering knowledge or programming experience, was time intensive and not in itself particularly worthy of credit. Fortunately, the 3 day course enabled me to identify aspects of the theoretical background I would need to acquire. The above references provided little of the necessary theory but the Haydn library provided useful information on essential aspects of thermodynamics and physical chemistry, and I was able to start the process of building a knowledge base. There was no in-depth intensive instruction or tailor made course here, the unguided learning process absorbed much of my time. I also needed to review my mathematics for work in Control theory so I also registered for 18.085, Mathematical Methods for Engineers. I discovered that I did not have the Linear Algebra background required for the course and consequently sat in informally on 18.06 lectures midway through the term. The criticism of my use of time was not essentially different from the implications of laziness in the first semester and was again unfounded.

There were signs of communication between Brown, and my supervisors and Professors. Consequently, my relationships were strained. I found it necessary to isolate myself physically and mentally from the Centre for Advanced Engineering Study in order to accomplish any work. I found solace in the Cheney room for Women Students where I did most of my work not requiring computing facilities.

At the end of the spring semester, I renewed my efforts for payment for the summer. Page 25 of the MIT Summer Employment Directory indicated that J-1 visa holders could obtain permission to work from their visa sponsors. In any case, despite Brown's advice, I believed it was legally possible to be paid by Aspen Technology Inc. either through CAES or through Evans' office as a Professor in the Department of Chemical Engineering. I again approached Chen on the matter of payment, but he indicated that Aspen Technology Inc. had no budget for students.

In the first week of June Brown hastened me to contact the OAS regarding tuition for the summer. He suggested that I could finish the project over the summer so as to complete my programme of

studies in CAES. I believe I was being pressured to register. Although I had made it clear at the end of the spring semester that I would not be registering for the summer, my letter of June 11, 1991 to Brown refers to several instances when both himself and his administrative assistant Devine continued to press the matter of registration. I did not register. I had already exhausted my OAS allowance of \$6000, so that without payment from Aspen Tech I saw no possibility of completing my project in the summer. That summer I survived on a pittance earned as a subject in an experiment on auditory sensing in building 36. Chen had indicated that I would always be welcome at Aspen Tech, so I decided to do what I could on the project, while I renewed my OAS fellowship for a further year. I was also in the process of considering how to achieve my academic goals since this did not seem possible in the CAES environment. I decided to apply to other programmes and to return to Jamaica for a holiday.

Brown visibly resented my decision not to register for the summer. Loss of tuition fees for one student was clearly not significant to the Centre but I was unable to ascertain the reason for his resentment. Brown's draft of the letter dated June 6, 1991 which he proposed sending to Dr. Cortina of the OAS gave the distinct impression that I was gainfully and illegally employed by Aspen Technology Inc.

Alarmed by the repercussions which could arise from such a letter, I again sought Professor Ezekiel's assistance (I had previously asked him to oversee all communication from Brown for my protection), together we substituted the offending paragraph for another (copy of Professor Ezekiel's handwriting enclosed). The enclosed copies of letters dated June 6, June 11, June 11, June 12, June 13, and June 18, 1991, delineate the ensuing struggle to protect my OAS funding.

Although I had asked Mrs. Nunez in the first week of June to send application forms for extending my fellowship, there was no immediate response. My enclosed telefax message to her of June 14, 1991, repeated this request. My receipt of the application forms in July led me to believe that the OAS may have had the impression that I was either not interested in or eligible for further funding. I continued to press Professor Ezekiel to screen all communication from Brown which pertained to me.

Brown's letter of June 6, 1991 gave the impression I was employed to Aspen Tech. My letter to Brown of June 11 asked for his support and indicated where his letter could disfavour my application. In Brown's note of June 11, claiming ignorance of my work he declined to support my fellowship application but suggested that I obtained a letter of support from Professor Evans. Brown's handwritten note on his draft to Cortina of June 13 suggested that I ask Professor Evans to

write his letter on Chemical Engineering Departmental stationery as opposed to his Aspen Technology Inc. letterhead – implying a relationship with Aspen Technology Inc. of which the OAS would not approve. I recognised the continued threat to my funding and asked Professor Evans to submit the letter to the OAS on his Company's letterhead so there would be no suggestion of fraudulence. Brown's letter of June 18, 1991 to Cortina was the actual letter sent.

I felt badgered by Brown throughout the summer. Although it was the standard practice for participants continuing in the fall to retain their keys during the summer, Brown asked me to return mine in July. My note of July 30 reported this to Professor Ezekiel. During the summer, I applied to the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science as a special student. The application was not successful. Brown's note of July 29, 1991 was attached to a set of OAS forms of the type required of applicants for new fellowships. J-1 visa holders are normally required to leave the USA upon completing their study objectives, and are subject to a 2 year home country physical presence requirement before being allowed entry to a new programme of studies. By presenting me with the application forms, Brown was suggesting that I should apply for a fellowship to fund a new programme of studies.

My conversations with Mrs Nunez revealed skepticism with regard to my application. Disturbed by this turn of events, on July 31, 1991, I replied to Brown, wrote to Mrs. Nunez and Dr. Cortina of the OAS, suggesting that they contact Dean Colbert, or Professor Ezekiel if the need arose for queries. I decide to delay reactivation of my application to the University of Stanford, and all other applications for fear of jeopardising my funding and the continuation of my studies. In a bid to protect my funding, I presented the letter of June 6, 1991 which Brown had proposed sending to the OAS, to the Ombudsperson Professor Rowe, and reported my impressions of his attempts to compromise my fellowship application.

In July when the forms finally arrived from the OAS, I wrote to Chen explaining that although Professor Evans had already written to the OAS, they required the standard reference form. In my letter of July 12, 1991 to Chen, I reiterated my hopes for progressing to a PhD programme. Chen was reluctant to support my application. His manner became abrupt and some time passed before he decided to complete the reference.

That week Dr. Rodrigo Trevino of Aspen Tech Japan Co. Ltd., introduced himself to me for the first time. Trevino introduced the subject of Aspen's work with Nabalco in Australia, suggested that I was ready for a simulation exercise in a real plant, and scoffed at what he termed "the token PhD" I would be getting at MIT. It is at times like these that I am grateful for my Jamaican heritage, my

sense of self, worth, and esteem. I also reflected then that ironically, not one of my peers at the University of Aberdeen, all of whom did less well than I, and some of whom went directly to PhD programmes, would have been subjected to this indignity. I made a mental note not to ask my supervisors at Aspen Tech to support my applications for PhD programmes.

Over the next few weeks I returned to tutorials on Model Manager which I had not completed in the spring because a personal computer was often unavailable for my use. Then after considering the process theory required for the various stages of the Bayer circuit, I decided to concentrate on the DGFL9, the rigorous mass and energy balance model for Bayer digestion. The complete Bayer circuit simulation consisted of several component models: digestion, clarification, precipitation, calcination etc. Rather than updating the models for the complete process, I decided to focus my efforts on a single stage of the circuit in order to derive some academic benefit. I chose the Bayer digestion models since this stage was in many respects considered to be most crucial to the overall efficiency of the process. The dissolution chemistry was not complicated, and I had some fundamental knowledge of the underlying theory of vapour-liquid equilibrium, heat transfer, and thermodynamics which I could develop.

Chen agreed that after working on the DGFL9 model I would have spent enough time on the computer, and the remaining time should be devoted to writing my project paper. I completely updated the code for DGFL9 but the simulation failed to run. Chen claimed to have been unable to identify the problem. Eventually, he referred me to colleagues who identified the problem as a faulty systems routine which they said they could not correct. I needed to investigate how the model could generate information for Control purposes but there appeared to be no imminent solution to the problem. It was August by then, and I had had no response from the OAS as to whether my fellowship had been extended. I spent the remainder of August lobbying the OAS for a response and was unable to go home.

At the beginning of September, Chen advised me that he proposed to change my spring registration for 10.95 from the previously registered 12 credit units to 9 credit units. There were evidently circulating reports that I had not done enough work on 10.95. For example, at about that time one of the deans implied that I had been indolent. It was this exploitation of the stereotype of laziness, this indefensible attempt to compromise my academic progress, which precipitated my final decision to withdraw from the Advanced Study Programme. In my note to Dean Levak of September 11, 1991, I intimated this decision.

I discussed the issue of credit with Professor Evans. I explained that 10.95 had been registered for

12 units which I had earned in the spring term, that I was not registered in the summer, but that I felt entitled to at least another 3 units which I would earn while writing the report. He agreed to the 15 units of credit.

In my PhD application to study Computer Vision in the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, I described my work in 10.95. The description was taken from an early abstract of my report which at the time of writing was intended to include a final section on the relationship and interplay between Simulation and Control studies. I had planned to use this background later after doing courses in Control, but this last section of the work was never realised. Mysteriously, just as I planned to leave the project, DGFL9 failed to run, and could not be rectified by Chen or his colleagues.

Professor Evans maintained that Chen would be available whenever I needed assistance, but Chen was generally unavailable and disinterested in my queries. My handwritten memo of October 23, 1991 to Chen demonstrates their attempt to withhold information I needed for my paper. It was unlikely that the documentation referred to had been mislaid since this information was crucial to their work with Nabalco. My letter to Professor Evans of November 8, 1991 attached to two chapters of my paper (which had grown into a report), met with no response.

Although my supervisors used the excuse that since I was not a chemical engineer I would require years to assimilate the necessary knowledge, they prescribed no programme of reading. They hastened me to submit the project report yet were unwilling to answer questions. Their unwillingness to support my work translated to unwillingness to make the project a success. Consequently, I distrusted their intentions and continued to work independently on the project. I had little money, and the confusion resulting from the OAS document dated August 29, 1991 retarded my work, but I was able to present theory fundamental to Bayer digestion, its simulation, and a practical venture carried out at Alcan Jamaica in a 50 page report which is still incomplete.

From my interactions at Aspen Technology Inc., I deduced that Chen and Denholm would have liked to have had someone with a technical background who was new to the field of simulation, to assist with their documentation. Their temporizing actions led me to believe that they were hoping to prolong my project duration to run concomitantly with their work for Nabalco.

In summary, the behaviour of my supervisors seemed to be in concordance with that of Paul Brown, in efforts to discourage my aspirations to enter the PhD programmes for which I would apply by:

1. Constraining the facility for progressing with the project by not providing guidance,
2. The manipulative decision not to pay me unless I was willing to abandon my academic aspirations for employment at Aspen Technology Inc.,
3. Undermining the process of securing an extension of my OAS fellowship.

Although I had been admitted to the University of Stanford to pursue the Master's Programme, the "in-depth intensive instruction" and opportunity to pursue studies tailored to my background, needs, and objectives as featured in the brochure on the Advanced Study Programme, won my interest. The Advanced Study Programme appeared to be a superior offer, exceptional in its potential to interface my electrical engineering knowledge with that required in a process plant. **Successful completion of the programme for which I was admitted was itself a goal.** In my Statement of Purpose which formed part of my application to the OAS, I argued the case for the Advanced Study Programme over conventional degree programmes where I questioned the usefulness of university programmes and their relevance to our environment. I felt at the time that I should pursue the Advanced Study Programme on its merits, since degree programmes were likely to constrain any facility for in-depth intensive instruction, flexibility and tailor made offerings provided by CAES.

Brown himself had previously drawn attention to the convincing case presented by my application. In his letter of July 6, 1988 to Brown, William Saunders, Group Managing Director of the Petroleum Corporation of Jamaica communicated my exposure to the activities of his group of companies: fuel ethanol manufacture, petroleum refining etc. as the inspiration for my application to the Advanced Study Programme in CAES. I had also held promising interviews with Alcoa Minerals of Jamaica Inc., and the Alcan Jamaica Company. I later approached the Jamaica Bauxite Institute where I had extensive discussions with Worrel Lyew You, Director of the Pilot Plant, Wallen Brian, Director of Research and Development, and Patrick Harris, Process Research Engineer. From these meetings I garnered technical information including implications for Control in the Bayer Process. In preparation for my work with Kramer, I also spent two weeks speaking with Chemical Engineers at the Ewarton Plant, Alcan Jamaica Company, in August 1990 before leaving for Cambridge.

The extent of Brown's displeasure suggested that he had somehow been personally disadvantaged

by my refusal to comply with his suggestions – an illegitimate agenda. The resulting strain and the debilitating effects of doing an impossible combination of courses led to a "C" in 6.001. My objectives would have been better catered to by the standards of a conventional degree programme. Contrary to the Programme's claims of in-depth intensive instruction, I received destructive advice. Instead of a programme tailored to my background, needs, and objectives, my participation in the research project – my central objective, was prohibited. Brown's efforts to block access to the project over IAP consumed my time and energies to such an extent that I was unable to do further work on 1.123. My progress in 10.95 was compromised by coercive efforts to discourage my aspirations, and because of the extenuating consequences of the fight to retain my funding. The programme that promised a return that greatly exceeded its cost had given way to a campaign to undermine my interests, of racial stereotyping to depict me as being lazy and a troublemaker, and to disable my progress. There is no way that the Institute can remedy my loss of time or atone for my academic regression, but it can annul my transcript, and reimburse my tuition of \$22,200, won after 2 years of struggle, so as to afford me another opportunity to fulfil my academic goals.

### **Waiver of \$6,442 debt**

In the academic year 1991 – 1992, I applied for and received a loan of \$5,300 to supplement funding for a graduate degree programme which never came into being. I also incurred a debt of \$1,142 for dorm fees. The sequence of events which occasioned this total debt of \$6,442 are described below.

In August 1991, my plans to apply to other programmes and return to Jamaica did not materialise. For example, The University of Stanford required proof of funding, and I would have needed an IAP 66 in order to re-enter the USA from Jamaica. I made several telephone calls to the OAS throughout August but failed to receive the documents awarding my fellowship extension until mid September.

I consulted Dean Levak during August about this unprecedented behaviour. Dean Levak suggested that the OAS was sometimes slow, but that the documents were likely to arrive in the first few weeks of the fall semester, that I would not be able to re-enter the country on my visitors visa for purposes of study, and that I should try to relax.

As Dean Levak had predicted in August, I was notified of my OAS fellowship extension in the

second or third week of term. Levak's predictive prowess was not surprising since the documents were deliberately drawn up for a degree programme and could only have been the product of an arrangement between the Institute and the Fellowships Division of the OAS. I remembered her consternation when I expressed my desire to apply to other universities and realised that the delayed arrival of my OAS documents did not allow me to apply for study elsewhere that term. I learnt from the ensuing conversations that I was being encouraged to submit an application to a degree programme quickly.

The events which followed were distressing. Enervated by the skirmishes of the summer, the fight to secure my threatened OAS fellowship, the struggle to live on scant earnings, the contention regarding supervision, the anxiety of an extended and abnormal wait for a decision from the OAS, the pressures of being deemed lazy where my research was concerned, I found it difficult to compile material for my application to the PhD programme.

I completed the application accompanied by a letter to the Committee on Admissions asking for an immediate response because of my unusual circumstances. I later wrote to Dr. Cortina asking him to release copies of my Fellowship applications of 1988 and 1990, references from the University of Aberdeen (Drs. Graham Hall, Stuart Dagger, John Pullham, and Professor R.V. Jones), as well as a copy of an article entitled " Note on My Academic Record" which discussed discrimination in the degree class awarded to me, and the general practice of discrimination in the Department of Engineering, University of Aberdeen. The article embodied the essential points made in my letters of April 20, and May 27, 1992 to Clarence Williams and Dean Perkins. Cortina did not respond. I also asked CAES to forward the above mentioned references and article to the Graduate office where they would accompany my application. Brown claimed not to have seen my references from Drs. Pullham and Dagger, although these were enclosed in the same envelope with Dr. Hall's letter by Hall himself (see letters to Ezekiel November 14, and 26, 1991). Brown also claimed to be ignorant of the article on my academic record referred to in my telefax message of July 7, 1988, although our conversations in September 1990 clearly indicated his knowledge of the information presented.

I had decided not to approach the University of Aberdeen directly for these references in the event that the Department of Engineering might have been inadvertently alerted. In order to discredit the grounds of my appeal to the senatus of that University, the Department heads of Engineering attested to incidents which were fabricated for the purpose of portraying me as belligerent. It would therefore not have been to my advantage to invite comment from the Department of Engineering.

By this time I was experiencing severe financial difficulty. During the summer I met with Jane Smith, the Associate Director of Financial Aid. I informed her that I planned to request a lumpsum payment of my allowance and/or an OAS loan, but that I was experiencing financial hardship and needed money immediately. I applied for an MIT loan of \$5,300 of which \$1,464 was released to me some weeks later. Dean Levak had asked me before whether Aspen Technology Inc. had paid me during the summer. Her suggestion that they may have done this as some form of internship seemed to be an effort to induce me to give support to her belief that I had been paid by Aspen Tech by attempting to legitimize the postulated employment as an internship. I advised her that having used up my stipend for July and August early in the previous academic year, I lived on \$50 -60 per week earned during the summer as a subject for an experiment run by the Sensory Communications Group in Building 36. Dean Levak evidently believed I was being dishonest. The signs of my financial destitution were obvious, accruing debt, inability to pay rent, inability to continue with orthodontic treatment etc.; yet these were overlooked in favour of preferred assumptions.

As in the previous academic year, I continued to live on my monthly OAS stipend of \$500. I made several telephone calls to Dr. Cortina, but was told each time that he was either out of office or unavailable. I communicated my dire financial circumstances, and my efforts to contact Dr. Cortina to Dean Levak, but she offered no solution. On October 8, I wrote to Dr. Cortina requesting a lumpsum payment of my OAS allowance. There was no reply to my letter, nor was Dr. Cortina available to speak with me despite the many messages left for him. On November 14, I wrote to Dean Levak exhorting her to bring the matter to Cortina's attention. I also wrote again to Cortina on November 14. Again there was no reply, nor was I allowed to access Cortina by telephone.

My letter of November 14 to Levak emphasized my income and earnings of the previous year and summer. Dean Levak seemed to resent my insistence that I lived on \$50 -60 per week earned during the summer as a subject for an experiment run by the Sensory Communications Group in Building 36. The reasons for her discomfiture were evident. The conception of the OAS document of August 29 1991 and its late arrival, had obviously assumed that I had been paid by Aspen Technology Inc. Since Dean Levak had complete knowledge of my arrangements with the OAS, she apparently had other reasons to disbelieve me. It was Levak's responsibility and that of the architects of the Arrangement with the OAS to investigate how they came to the understanding that I had been paid by Aspen Technology Inc. Clearly those answers could only be provided by Professor Evans himself and the Centre for Advanced Engineering Study.

My letter of November 29, 1991 to Dean Levak pointed out that Jane Smith had agreed to provide me with the rest of my loan, but the loan procedures would take weeks, and in the meantime, the

OAS had not replied to my financial distress. Although I had made it abundantly clear that I was enduring hardships, it was not until my e-mail message of December 11 to Professor Evans had been copied to Levak and Smith that I was able to collect \$3,836, the remainder of the loan. I ended the semester with a first time development of an acid stomach from eating little and irregularly. I sustained financial hardship because my communication and relationship with the OAS were inhibited.

I also tried to register as a special student. After the application had been submitted, Dean Perkins advised me to apply to the Department of Chemical Engineering as a special student so that I could be registered to continue my work in 10.95. Professor Evans supported my application in his letter of October 11, 1991 to the Director of Admissions. The Department decided to admit me, but Dr. Cortina of the OAS would not respond to my telefax message of October 15. I spent sometime pursuing this with James Galvin but did not succeed. The tuition was therefore not paid and I was unable to register.

My visa constraints required support from the OAS to continue with study at another university. The threats to my funding combined with Cortina's decision not to communicate with me inhibited the possibility for applying elsewhere. In any case, I was experiencing financial hardship and there was no money to pay for applications. I concluded that it was not the intention of the OAS to support my applications to other universities.

My confusion resulting from this powerlessness to summon any replies whatsoever, or support from the OAS with regard to either registration as a special student or supporting documents for my PhD application, or money, made it almost impossible to concentrate on my research effort. Even after my application was rejected Dr. Cortina claimed to be unable to provide me with a ticket to return to Jamaica and also reneged on his previous decision to despatch forms for the Rowe fund which would enable me to do so (see letter to Levak of May 11, 1992). In any case I had expected this since Dean Levak's suggestion that she would explore alternatives at MIT to the Rowe fund foreshadowed Cortina's decision.

When the application was rejected, I spoke with Clarence Williams, Assistant Equal Opportunity Officer and Special Assistant to the President. After one or two meetings, Williams suggested that I reapply to another area of the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, and after offering to handle my dispute with the University of Aberdeen, later advised me to accept the degree class.

I applied to MIT because I satisfy the Institute's interest in the best graduate students from universities, but also clearly because of the manoeuvring influence of the OAS document of August 29 1991. My intention to pursue research in Computer Vision, as well as my decision to reject the degree, were well established before the OAS document was drawn up. My acceptance to the University of Stanford **without degree conferment**, existed and was valid up to August 1991, but could not be reactivated since the delay of my funding documents denied me the opportunity of providing proof of funding. I was further offended by having my interests dismissed as being inconsequential. Where Williams' comments pertaining to my dispute with the University of Aberdeen were concerned, I was profoundly disturbed by an Office for Equal Opportunity that would seek to legitimize and therefore foster, organized, systematic racialism, the "cleansing" of ethnicity from the achievement of engineering excellence. I concluded that since this was contrary to Institute policy (to say the least), Williams could not have been in possession of the facts.

In my letter to Williams of April 20, 1992, I declined his offer to handle my dispute. Having failed to obtain supporting documents from either the OAS or CAES, I explained the facts of the dispute in my letter of May 27, 1992 to Dean Perkins. I had previously decided against asking Professor Evans to support my application since there was a clear conflict of interest between his Company's suggestions of employment and my intentions of entering a PhD programme. I decided instead to have references sent from Christopher Zacca, my former manager at Desnoes and Geddes Ltd., Jamaica, and Patrick McDonald of IBM UK, to demonstrate evidence of a capacity for research and independent work. I also wrote to Michael Behnke, Director of Admissions on May 21, 1992.

In my application to the OAS, I allowed for the opportunity to proceed with a PhD programme where I indicated " Possible progression to the PhD" in paragraph 1. It would have been myopic not to have done so. The vision of my academic pursuits was twofold firstly, completion of the Advanced Study Programme to equip me with skills essential for research and development engineering in the Jamaican environment, and secondly, (in some respects more importantly) completion of a PhD programme in Electrical Engineering/Computer Science where my academic strengths lie.

My sojourn in the Centre for Advanced Engineering Study was not intended to transmute my professional emphasis to the discipline of Chemical Engineering, but to effect a knowledge interface to surrogate elusive opportunities as a member of the multidisciplinary project teams characteristic of process plants. When I return to academic study, I intend to continue with courses in Control and Artificial Intelligence, in addition to course requirements which would lead to a PhD, in accordance with my agreement with the Jamaican Government. My desire to satisfy this

agreement, and my interest in including research in Computer Vision are neither mutually exclusive, nor incompatible.

It may be true that the level of research in PhD programmes does not always relate directly to Third World countries, but as a developing country we need our fair share of PhDs too. The programme I had designed would indisputably have incorporated a major relevance factor. The PhD programme would have satisfied a natural academic bent and would have left me suitably positioned to access opportunities to lecture at the Tertiary level.

1. Dean Levak's knowledge of the planned delay of my OAS documents in September 1991, and her suggestions to apply to the degree programme,
2. The OAS document of August 29, 1991, the Institute's invoice to and acceptance of tuition from the OAS for a graduate degree programme,
3. The OAS' knowledge of my application as a special student in the Department of Chemical Engineering (evidenced by my telefax message of October 15, 1991), and their decision not to endorse this application by not converting tuition paid for a degree programme to tuition for special student status,
4. The OAS' letter of November 12, 1991, written after my application to the PhD programme had been submitted, authorising my travel and re-entry to the USA, and 5) The decision to issue the loan of \$5,300 to support study in a graduate degree programme,

though not consummated by a letter of acceptance, nonetheless embodied a substantive prior decision to accept my application, a covenant of obligation, to allow me to further my academic pursuits as a graduate degree student. The rejection of my application contravened this covenant, suggested that my time was considered to be dispensable, compromised my physical and mental well being, and denied me the opportunity of funding, entering, and completing the Masters degree programme at Stanford.

The loan of \$5,300 was issued illegitimately, contrary to Institute policy since I was unable to register at the time of issue. Any obligations on my part to repay were effectively rendered null and void by virtue of this violation. Even without the legal indications of the illegitimate loan and the contravention of the covenant outlined above, the dictates of conscience alone demand that I be released from all obligations incurred for the academic year 1991 to 1992.

I have written to Geraldine Purdy regarding the loan. I should be grateful if you would advise her of your decision.

Sincerely,

**Adrienne G. Thompson**

Enc.

### **List of Enclosures**

1. Letter from Brown to Thompson – March 11, 1988;
2. Telefax message from Thompson to Brown – July 7, 1988;
3. Letter from Brown to Thompson – August 4, 1988;
4. Letter from Brown to Castro – September 28, 1988;
5. Letter from Brown to OAS - January 9, 1990;
6. CAES Advertising Brochure;
7. Fellowship Applications to OAS from Thompson/Jamaican Government - March 27, 1988 and January 18, 1990;
8. Statement of Purpose which accompanied 7;
9. Grant advice from OAS to Bursar's Office MIT – August 29, 1991;
10. Letter from Thompson to Brown which accompanied 11 – January 14, 1988;
11. Statement of Objectives, Application to CAES 1988-1990;

12. Letter from Brown to Monge – March 12, 1990;
13. Abstract "Chemical Plant Malfunction Simulation" - March 1, 1988;
14. Letter from Thompson to Grimson – January 20, 1991;
15. Letter Thompson to Brown – June 11, 1991;
16. Letter draft from Brown to Cortina – June 6, 1991, Handwritten corrections from Ezekiel attached;
17. Note from Brown to Thompson – June 11, 1991;
18. Letter from Thompson to Ezekiel – June 11, 1991;
19. Note from Thompson to Brown – June 12, 1991;
20. Letter draft from Brown to Cortina – June 13, 1991;
21. Letter from Brown to Cortina – June 18, 1991;
22. Telefax from Thompson to Nunez – June 14, 1991;
23. Note from Thompson to Ezekiel – July 30, 1991;
24. Note from Brown to Thompson – July 29, 1991;
25. Note from Thompson to Brown – July 31, 1991;
26. Letter from Thompson to Nunez – July 31, 1991;
27. Letter from Thompson to Cortina – July 31, 1991;
28. Letter from Evans to Ezekiel – July 13, 1991 (Evans was advised by Thompson);
29. Letter from Thompson to Chen – July 12, 1991;
30. Note from Thompson to Levak – September 11, 1991;
31. Memo from Thompson to Chen – October 23, 1991;

32. Letter from Thompson to Evans – November 8, 1991;
33. Letter from The University of Stanford to Thompson – August 10, 1988;
34. Letter Saunders to Brown – July 6, 1988;
35. Letter from Thompson to Williams – April 20, 1992;
36. Letter from Thompson to Ezekiel – November 14, 1991;
37. Letter from Thompson to Ezekiel – November 26, 1991;
38. Letter from Thompson to Perkins – May 27, 1992;
39. Letter from Thompson to Cortina – October 8, 1991;
40. Letter from Thompson to Levak – November 14, 1991;
41. Letter from Thompson to Cortina – November 14, 1991;
42. Letter from Thompson to Levak – November 29, 1991;
43. E-mail message from Thompson to Evans – December 11, 1991;
44. E-mail message from Thompson to Levak – December 11, 1991;
45. Letter from Evans to Behnke – October 11, 1991;
46. Telefax message from Thompson to Cortina – October 15, 1991;
47. Letter from Thompson to Levak – May 11, 1992;
48. Letter from Thompson to Behnke – May 21, 1992;
49. Letter from Cortina to Thompson – November 12, 1991;
50. Letter from Thompson to Purdy – January 25, 1993.