Sept. 29, 1989

Dear HRAAA Member:

As you know, we now have four HRAAA-backed Overseers: Gay Seidman, Consuela Washington, Peter Wood and Archbishop Desmond Tutu. And once again we are in the process of putting together a slate -- a process that in the past has been aided enormously by suggestions made by our membership. A subcommittee of the HRAAA Executive Committee (Chester Hartman, Ephraim Isaac, Joel Krieger and Nell Painter) has been charged with assembling a list of names, winnowing that list down to a manageable size, interviewing those on the "short list," and generating a slate recommendation for ratification by the membership.

What we need now is names -- of people who: 1) are electable; 2) would, if elected, make effective Overseers and forcefully advance HRAAA's concerns. While candidates need not be degree-holders from Harvard or Radcliffe, it's a good bet that such persons have the best chance of winning.

We are looking for both well known and lesser known folks, with of course the usual diversity by gender, age, race, geography, kind of work, etc. Scientists seems especially desirable at this point because of their virtual absence from the current Board. And names of any particularly attractive young people (say, classes of 1980 and younger) would be most welcome.

Will you therefore give this some immediate thought and return the attached form no later than Oct. 13. The process, as you can imagine, is time-consuming and we are committed to getting the slate recommendation back to the membership by early November. Feel free to propose your own name (in which case include a biosketch and statement of your background and interests and why you would make an effective Overseer). If you suggest the names of others, please provide as much information about them as possible and (if possible) how they can be immediately contacted.

Thank you for your continued help.

Sincerely,

Chester Hartman
for the HRAAA Exec. Comm.

P.S. As you know from Bob Wolff's last communication to you, as well as articles in Harvard Magazine, the University has revised the rules of the game so as to
make it far more difficult for petition candidates to succeed. There is some argument for running less than a full slate of five, which could increase the chances of electing those we have backed (that argument being that our candidates win via a combination of alumni/ae dedicated to our cause who will vote the straight HRAAA ticket plus quasi-sympathetic alums who will pick and choose from our slate and from the official slate -- so by running less than five candidates we can possibly increase the vote totals of those we do run; a counter-argument is that to run less than a full slate after having run full slates three straight years is a sign of weakness). If you have any thoughts about the wisdom, or lack thereof, of such a move, please give us the benefit of your advice.

Please return this form by October 13 to:

Chester Hartman, IPS, 1601 Connecticut Ave. NW, Wash. DC 20009

I suggest you consider the following for the HRAAA-backed 1990 Overseers slate (for each person, please put down as much information as you can about him or her and, if you know, how to make contact):

1.

2.

3.

Any thoughts/advice re the PS in our letter?