

Just a few of the comments received so far about the BSS Council's refusal to return Christopher Daniel's Books; some are already published some are anonymous

Never before in the history of the society have members felt forced to ask that their comments be kept anonymous because they are afraid of a backlash from the Council. How sad is that? That never happened in Christopher's day so why should it today?

It could have been so easily avoided from the outset if the slightest modicum of common sense had been used to address the problem.

I feel deeply ashamed that the council is treating Chris Daniel, an eminent member, co-founder and President in such an appalling and shabby manner.

The overly officious Secretary ... would countenance absolutely no discussion about the matter [at the AGM]

I find myself saddened and embarrassed by the insensitive actions of the Council

I wholeheartedly concur
[with Patrick Powers' letter on SunInfo].

There seems to be something fundamentally wrong with the running of the BSS.

This is no way to run a Society.

We have seen a significant number of Council members leave after acrimonious disputes.

If these deposits were truly gifts to the Society, free of any encumbrance, then why is there not a single document to that effect?

Why did the Society tell the membership in their statement that went out in June that it would be unlawful to dispose of any assets when it most certainly is not?

I am appalled that your statement in the June mailing wrongly informs the membership that the Council is powerless to dispose of any society property.

This whole episode is deeply troubling

...making it more fully known that a number of facts had not been fully communicated by the Council to the full membership of the BSS.

Part of Christopher's work for the BSS was to make his own property freely accessible to the membership by way of the then new Reference Library. It is shameful that after all he has done for the Society he should be treated like

In my line of business this is known as *Adolescent Management*

It is important for the Council to consider the consequences of their actions. If Christopher does not have his books returned to him, what society member - or other potential donor - will ever consider depositing their collections - either of books or of dial records - with BSS?

It seems to have escaped the notice of the Council that the word *donation* has more than one meaning.
The word is also applied to the action of making a contribution.

Follow the story and see the letters on www.bit.ly/suninfo

Why did the Council's statement to the Membership not disclose the fact that the original Librarian has stated that they were a loan?

No deed of donation of Christopher's books exists. The absence of such a document does not equate to ownership by the Society.

It also beggars belief that no attempt was made to meet personally with Christopher as soon as his request was received and it is nothing short of a disgrace that his selfless devotion to the cause of dialling in the British Isles should be repaid by the present cheap attempt to claim the ownership of his books by what some might well see as the use of wilful blindness.

[At the AGM] it was also noticeable that the Chairman appeared taken aback and uncomfortable that these facts had now been made public!