11 April 84

TO: Jim Sledd, Jim Kinneavy, John Ruszkiewicz, Maxine Hairston
FROM: Neill Megaw N.M.

After the plenary meeting of the Department was approved and most non-senators left, there was a long discussion about whether the Department should not be asked to vote by ballot on the EC/Senate document anyway. Fortunately, this was finally shot down too. In the course of the discussion, the Chairman said that, if the plenary session failed to come up with a plan, that would show that the protest of the 21 signing the petition was not supported by the rest of the Department and that, consequently, the EC/Senate motions would regain credibility and authority as the best we could arrive at together. (I will not attempt to clarify the reasoning involved here.) It seems only prudent to see now whether we can come up with something "positive"--now that we have been allowed to throw off the shackles of the EC/Senate formulation.

Attached is my first draft of a set of proposals. Before throwing them out to the Department at large, I thought I'd solicit reactions from the four of you, all clearly opposed to the EC/Senate motion but perhaps for sharply different reasons. Are these proposals strong enough? Do they cover the waterfront? Is there any chance they would win Department support?

I'd be glad to look at anything any of you may be drafting; I'm not locked on absolutely to this set of proposals. (I'm amused to see their resemblance to the "nonnegotiable demands" of the '60's. Perhaps that's not bad.)