

To all network members: where go we?

A few days ago we had 15 members, and I have submitted the names of a few other individuals. We are fast approaching the original number stated, namely, 25. The question now comes up: what will we do with the 26th? And the 27th? Shall we relegate them to the waste basket -- explaining that we don't have room for them? Shall we commence a new network?

If we considered allowing greater than the number of 25 we might remember that according to the first letter we would duplicate enough for 25, and send them to newcomers as they became members of the net. Anything over the stated number might put some of us to an inconvenience. If we allow more than the 25 we might explain to the 26th and all over that that they might not receive the first communications -- the ones we wrote before we changed our minds.

The above is an example of how we now have things to consider -- as a group. The original idea was the idea of Harrison Fortune and myself. Those of you who are now networkers will have ideas of your own regarding this thing, and other things that will arise.

Therefore, do we continue as we are, having the coordinator chop off above 25, or do we reconsider the original premise?

And, for the purpose of considering things, do we all write our views in the next letter we write, which might be several weeks off, or do we have one central person who will serve as a 'view-taker' and give us the results of our collective views. I am all in favor of a 'view-taker' who will let us know.

For 'view-taker' I wish to submit the name of one Ernest Pope, 1005 Pierce Avenue, Madison, Tennessee. (That should be 1005 Pierce Road -- I just checked.) Questions may be numbered by the individuals presenting them to the group (this can even include the presentation of new members eventually if we so desire) and all views can be mailed to the view-taker, if we decide to have such a person. And, if we don't like the title of 'view-taker' let's call him something else.

Therefore:

M-101 - Shall we, or shall we not, have an individual to which we can all submit our views on any matter of 'policy' of our net?

M-102 - In the event that we have such an individual, shall we name E. Pope for the position? (E. Pope - you have only one vote if you do not decline.)

smith four december 1, 1952

H-103 - Shall we allow more than 25 members into our group, thus increasing our cost per correspondence -- but also increasing the amount of communication.

In view of the fact that we would have to agree to submit our view in order to have someone to submit them to, we have several choices of action. The first and most obvious is to do nothing. The second is to write our views in our next letter to the net. The third would be to write to me directly and tell me what you think of my ideas because, perhaps, you do not consider it worthy material for a network letter. Another would be to send your views to Pope. Well, as someone else probably said at some other time, the choice is yours.

#

P. S. Pope wasn't consulted -- it was my thought that if the majority of our group liked the idea we might prevail upon him to perform this noble function.

*enjoyed your communique --
hope there'll be many more --
maxine*