Dear [Name],

Jarad Macutto and I spent the September of Dec. 14 discussing the History Committee's interim story assignment to me in the Executive Committee, I agreed to start attending the record-keeping and acting as a "focal point" for collecting recollections of the discussions leading up to the decision, and efforts culminating in its implementation, and the results of five years experience as IEEE.

As I told you, I said when I responded to your suggestion that I undertake the task, I felt rather ill-equipped for it. First, I taught no film history. But more importantly, I was not personally party to any of the deliberations of the 5 and 14 men on the committees and their 2-man Task Forces. I don't recall having seen any of their papers, except six or so far as they became part of the published record.

When I cleaned out my files before leaving the office, Dr. [Name] and the librarian carted nitrostorage Chernobyl, Box #2, 131 on a trolley labeled "Murray Papers." At first I was doubtful, however, that these included much...
Left a copy of the list of contents of the five cartons in storage with your kind. No I got further with this—may decide the issue than than your lump.

other than published material I still not be glad to accept your offer. Mr. Batt had now to me of what in pertinent material I might

forward from your files. If this could include pertinent excerpts from the Board minutes of the two sessions, it might be useful.

In addition to the minutes record, Mr. Batt and I thought it would be desirable to seek correspondence with the major participants in the decision and the implementation, personal recollections of the hopes, doubts, differences, and compromises that they experienced.

By way of further preliminary outline, Mr. Batt and I arrived at the following:

1) The purpose of this project as enunciated by the Executive Committee. To educate the young-to-learn remaining doubts and fears. To clear up misunderstandings so revealed by correspondence and conversations—no? This is, of course, for the guidance of the project rather than for more, perhaps, than an introductory statement in the article.

2) Early history of the founding and development of the two organizations.

2.1) Statistical membership, meeting, publication, technical and standards.
2.2) Similarities and differences in organization, philosophy, procedures.
2.3) Headquarters occupied.
2.4) Affiliations with other organizations.

3) Cooperation and conflicts.
   3.1) Early suggestion for merger.
   3.2) Pathways and canceling technology.

4) Beginnings and various tables.

5) Studies leading to Direct Reorganization, recommend.

6) Discussions leading to submission to board, ballot.
   6.1) Direct Reorganization Panel.
   6.2) AIEE Writer Writing Panel.

7) The ballots and results.

8) Implementation.
   8.1) Legal incorporation.
   8.2) Constitution and many Bylaws drafts.
   8.3) Regions, Sections, Branches, chapters.
   8.4) Staff, space, records.
   8.5) Publication.
   8.6) Differences and compromises.
9) The Results

Financial
Technical
Organizational

Procedure in preparing for writing:
1) assimilate published material
2) Review Board minutes
3) Review 8- and 14-Man Inactive Reports and 2-Man Task Force Reports
4) Ask for introspective comment from leaders and an evaluation of results. This might be handled by submitting an outline of the proposed article and asking for contributions as suggested by the outline.

In view of my limited facilities and an inherent lack of readiness with a color paper, I think I shall need quite a bit of staff assistance. I also feel it is essential to have a complete outline since the design has come up a year ago, when I had six months in New York with little to anticipate. I shall appreciate your comments on the outline and procedures proposed.