**Hudson Monthly Meeting**

Dear Deb,

Yes, Spark arrived in our mailboxes yesterday and some of our members have read the piece. In fact, one member read some of it aloud in meeting this afternoon. As one person put it, our meeting seems to be grappling with the dilemma of whether to "divest" or try to affect change from within. Some feel strongly that to continue to support FUM and support change from within is the way to go, while there are others who feel as strongly that they want nothing to do with FUM as long as the organization has discriminatory practices. Yet others remain torn or have more nuanced ideas of what can or should be the approach to take. This issue and the related debate have cost us at least one member. We are a small meeting, so losing a member can have a significant impact. This is one of several difficult issues we have been discussing over the last few years that has been a challenge for us as a meeting. We understand that the process of discernment can be a slow one, and I believe that this will definitely be the case for us around this issue. In the meantime, we are hopeful that progress will be made with regards to the FUM personnel policy even if that too is a slow process.

Best,

Lisa

Lisa Edstrom
lisanedstrom@gmail.com

On Sun, Jun 12, 2016 at 5:39 PM, Deb Wood <dnbwood@aol.com> wrote:

Dear Lisa,

Thank you and Hudson Meeting for continuing your discernment around the Brooklyn minute and FUM personnel policy. Perhaps some have read the May Spark, including the column from Carol Holmes, who served FUM for a number of years.

Deb

-----Original Message-----
From: Lisa Edstrom <lisanedstrom@gmail.com>
To: Deb Wood <dnbwood@aol.com>

Cc: Clerk HudsonMeeting <clerkhudsonmeeting@gmail.com>
Sent: Sun, Jun 12, 2016 5:07 pm
Subject: Re: Nurture Coordinating Committee

Dear Deb,

Knowing that Summer Sessions is coming soon, I wanted to send you an update on where we stand with regards to this issue. I have been asked to report the following:

Hudson Friends Meeting has continued its discernment on its response to FUM's personnel policy and Brooklyn Monthly Meeting's minute. At this point in time we have unity on this being an issue of concern for our meeting and want to express that we are not passive with regards to this concern. We have varying opinions and see various ways to address this matter, and therefore do not see a clear path to take at this time. That said, we applaud, encourage, and support any efforts made by NYYM to affect change to FUM's personnel policy.

In Friendship,

Lisa

Lisa Edstrom
lisanedstrom@gmail.com

On Tue, Nov 10, 2015 at 2:48 PM, Deb Wood <dnbwood@aol.com> wrote:

Dear Lisa,

I understand your and Hudson Meeting's concern about the FUM personnel policy, and that it will take time for the meeting to come to a place of unity around this concern. This is not something that can be rushed. Several meetings have provided opportunities for Friends to share their thoughts and feelings outside of a business meeting, in an atmosphere where deep listening can take place. The responses need to be non-judgmental, with as much light as we can discern.

To date, I have received only one response from a monthly meeting, and Nurture didn't consider it at our meeting on Saturday. We will be considering this again at Coordinating Weekend on January 30. We don't envision a response to the yearly meeting until Summer Sessions.

Thank you for thoughtfully exploring this concern with Hudson Meeting.

Peace, Deb