

C
O
P
Y

1.3.27

September 8, 1954

To AIEE Representatives
and Alternates on EJC:

Our Board of Directors at the April and August meetings this year instructed us to work within EJC to attempt to bring about the evolution of a unity organization essentially equivalent to Plan C. This was one of the plans considered by the Exploratory Group and is very nearly identical to the GEEA plan published in Electrical Engineering, April 1953. This is the form of unity organization for which our membership indicated a distinct preference when certain samples of opinion were taken several years ago.

As a help in carrying out these instructions I have prepared the attached memorandum in an attempt to clarify and crystallize the position of the Institute in this matter. The memorandum brings together in one place in chronological order the pertinent actions of our Board, of the Exploratory Group, and of EJC with respect to the matter of individual membership in the unity organization. In preparing the memorandum I have confined myself as far as seemed reasonable to quoting or paraphrasing the various documents and minutes referred to.

It occurred to me that this summary might be of value to all of us representing the Institute on EJC. That is my reason for sending it to you. I should like to take this opportunity to make certain observations and to call attention to what I consider the most significant actions of our Board in this regard.

The Exploratory Group had under consideration four different types of unity organization, designated Plans A, B, C, and D. What we have today is essentially Plan A. However, a look at the diagrams accompanying the report of the Exploratory Group will show that it isn't greatly different from Plan D. I say this because if we had agreed on Plan D, the technical societies would undoubtedly have some sort of coordinating council similar to EJC. The principal difference is that now EJC calls itself the unity organization and does not recognize NSPE as such. Plan B is what we would have if the EJC constitution were modified to give the individual member a vote in the selection of officers and representation on the governing body. Plan C could be brought about only by getting EJC and its constituent societies on the one hand, and NSPE on the other, to agree to a merger.

In the January, April, and June 1952 meetings, our Board refused to have anything to do with the type of unity organization recommended by the Exploratory Group. However, at the very next meeting at Phoenix in August 1952 we accepted that recommendation subject only to a certain condition regarding proportional representation on EJC, which condition was accepted by the other societies. The report of the "Sunday Morning Committee" (January 1954) says that at Phoenix our Board "did not consider the modified EJC to be the desired unity organization. Rather it was looked upon as a possible vehicle through which a suitable organization might be developed". I can find nothing in the record of our Board's action to indicate that we took that position or notified EJC to that effect. On the contrary, the preamble to Proposal II, which was acted upon at Phoenix, states that it was submitted "as a first step toward establishing what in this report is called a unity organization with the understanding that the expanded EJC will be asked to study and dispose of the further recommendations made in the report of the Exploratory Group".

The expanded EJC did proceed to give consideration to the matter of individual membership but offered it in a form which was in fact no membership at all since it carried with it no right to vote, and that proposal has been rejected by the unfavorable action of AIME, SNAME, and our society. If agreement could be reached in EJC to add the right to vote to the proposed individual membership, the approval of such a plan would, as indicated above, transform the present setup into Plan B. We have a mandate from our membership and now we have specific instructions from our Board to work toward Plan C. As I understand the situation, therefore, we are not to propose any further consideration by EJC of the question of individual membership but rather we are to attempt to bring about in EJC a frame of mind which would be favorable to the consideration of a merger with the existing individual membership society, NSPE.

(over)

I shall be glad to receive any comments with regard to the above, and particularly to be set straight if I have in some way misunderstood the situation.

Sincerely,

/s/ W.J.Barrett

Copy to Mr. Monteith

Attached:

Memorandum

As a help in carrying out these instructions I have prepared the attached memorandum in an attempt to clarify and crystallize the position of the Executive in this matter. The memorandum outlines together in one place in chronological order the pertinent actions of our Board, of the Exploratory Group, and of EIC with respect to the matter of individual membership in the organization. In preparing the memorandum I have confined myself as far as seemed reasonable to stating or paraphrasing the various documents and minutes referred to.

It occurred to me that this summary might be of value to all of us representing the Executive on EIC. That is my reason for sending it to you. I should like to take this opportunity to make certain observations and to call attention to what I consider the most significant actions of our Board in this regard.

The Exploratory Group had under consideration four different types of unity organization, designated Plans A, B, C, and D. What we have today is essentially Plan A. However, a look at the diagrams accompanying the report of the Exploratory Group will show that it isn't greatly different from Plan D. I say this because it was agreed on Plan D, the technical solution would undoubtedly have some sort of coordinating council similar to EIC. The principal difference is that now EIC calls itself the unity organization and does not recognize EICP as such. Plan B is what we would have if the EIC constitution were modified to give the individual member a vote in the selection of officers and representation on the governing body. Plan C would be brought about only by getting EIC and the constituent societies on the one hand, and EICP on the other, to agree to a merger.

In the January, April, and June 1952 meetings, our Board refused to have anything to do with the type of unity organization recommended by the Exploratory Group. However, at the very next meeting at Phoenix in August 1952 we accepted that recommendation subject only to a certain condition regarding proportional representation on EIC, which condition was accepted by the other societies. The report of the "Unity Working Committee" (January 1954) says that at that time our Board "did not consider the modified EIC to be the desired unity organization. Rather it was looked upon as a possible vehicle through which a satellite organization might be developed."

I am first noting in the record of our Board's action to indicate that we took that position or modified EIC to that effect. On the contrary, the preamble to Proposal II, which was called upon at Phoenix, states that it was submitted "as a first step toward establishing what in this report is called a unity organization with the understanding that the expanded EIC will be asked to study and dispose of the further recommendations made in the report of the Exploratory Group."

The expanded EIC did proceed to give consideration to the matter of individual membership, but it did not offer it in a form which was in fact no membership at all. It merely asked us to agree to vote, and that proposal has been rejected by the constituent societies of EICP, EICM, and our society. If agreement could be reached in EIC to add the right to vote to the proposed individual membership, the approval of such a plan would, as indicated above, necessitate the passing into Plan B. We have a mandate from our membership and now we have specific instructions from our Board to work toward Plan B. As I indicated the situation, however, we may not propose any further consideration by EIC of the question of individual membership until we are able to bring about in EIC a form of unity which would be acceptable to the constituent societies.

- 2 -

ACTIONS RELATING TO INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP

IN THE ENGINEERING "UNITY ORGANIZATION"

On December 15, 1951, the Exploratory Group adopted a recommendation to be presented to its constituent societies and to EJC. The recommendation was that, as a first step, EJC be enlarged and that the enlarged EJC give further study to a number of important questions, and take appropriate action on each of these matters.

The report and recommendation of the Exploratory Group stated that "some form of membership of individuals is an important and perhaps necessary element of strength". In the Exploratory Group it had been agreed that "whether or not there is a later provision for individual membership, the constituent societies should initially control the operations for the unity organization". There was no definite expression regarding whether individual membership should be with or without vote, but one argument against individual membership, cited in the report, is "the possibility that the individual members as such would demand a voice in the government of the unity organization and that this might in the long run tend toward a reduction in the control of the organization by the constituent societies".

On January 24, 1952, this report and recommendation of the Exploratory Group was considered by the AIEE Board of Directors. In the discussion the consensus of opinion was emphatically in favor of a unity organization based upon individual membership, as that type of organization was strongly favored in our membership polls. It was

VOTED that the plan not be accepted and that Mr. LeClair continue efforts to bring about the formation of a unity organization based upon individual membership.

It was clear that the individual membership which our Board members had in mind was one with full voting privileges, consistent with Plan C.

The next day, January 25, 1952, EJC referred the report of the Exploratory Group to the constituent societies for study and report back.

At the request of Dr. H.S. Osborne the matter was again considered at the AIEE Board of Directors' meeting on April 17, 1952. It was

VOTED that the action on a unity organization taken by the Board of Directors on January 24th be reaffirmed, and that the AIEE representatives on EJC be so advised.

EJC, at its meeting on May 16, 1952, prepared for submission to the constituent societies, with recommendation for affirmative action, two proposals for amending its Constitution. Proposal I provided for permitting any Board member or officer to be elected as a representative of his society, in place of the previous practice of using past-presidents and secretaries. Proposal II was submitted to carry out the recommendation of the report of the Exploratory Group, in the direction of inviting other societies to join EJC, "as a first step toward establishing what in this report is called a unity organization with the understanding that the expanded EJC will be asked to study and dispose of the further recommendations made in the report of the Exploratory Group".

The AIEE Board of Directors at its meeting on June 26, 1952 at Minneapolis, with respect to Proposal I

VOTED that the proposed amendments quoted above be approved.

(over)

Proposal II was in two parts: (a) A request to indicate which among the other societies in the Exploratory Group should be invited to join EJC; and (b) Modification of EJC Constitution to provide for representation on council roughly in proportion to voting membership of the constituent societies. In the discussion it was brought out that action on the proposed invitations to other societies would be pointless unless we were in sympathy with the whole plan. The minutes also record the comment "Under the proposed changes, EJC would still be subject to the weakness that it could do something only after the approval of the member societies". This is a criticism which has been leveled many times at the federation form of unity organization. With reference to Proposal II it was

VOTED that the Secretary obtain pertinent sections of the constitutions and by-laws of the ten societies represented in the Exploratory Group, but not in EJC, and distribute the parts covering requirements for admission to voting membership to the members of the Board of Directors before the August 21st meeting; the present Constitution of EJC and the proposed amendments to be distributed also.

It was also

VOTED that Proposal II, Expansion of Membership of EJC, be tabled.

Mr. Fairman commented that "Only the Institute and one other society have mandates from their members to work for a unity organization with individual membership. The Institute cannot logically approve an amendment for expansion of EJC without careful consideration and submission to the membership. The members have been informed in recent years that no action on unity would be taken without submission of the proposals to the membership".

In accordance with the action of the Board at the June meeting, Mr. Henline on August 5th forwarded to members of the Board extracts from the constitutions and by-laws of the various societies, together with copies of the EJC Constitution and the proposed amendments. Incoming Board members were also furnished copies of the 1950 and 1951 Exploratory Group's reports.

At the AIEE Board meeting on August 21, 1952 at Phoenix, Arizona, after some discussion, it was agreed that the first step would be a determination of the acceptability of each of the ten societies represented in the Exploratory Group, but not members of EJC, by a study of their requirements for admission to voting grades of membership. Without any expression as to whether or not they should be invited to join EJC, it was

VOTED that the societies named below be considered to be engineering societies eligible for admission to EJC:

- American Association of Engineers
- American Society for Engineering Education
- American Society of Heating and Ventilating Engineers
- Institute of Aeronautical Sciences
- Institute of Radio Engineers
- National Society of Professional Engineers
- Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers

After further discussion of the other three societies, it was

VOTED that, with their present requirements for admission as voting members, the societies named below are not considered to be eligible for admission to EJC:

American Society of Refrigerating Engineers
American Waterworks Association
Illuminating Engineering Society

The second part of Proposal II, regarding representation on council roughly proportional to membership, was conditioned in its presentation to become effective only when four additional societies have accepted membership in EJC. The AIEE Board of Directors.

VOTED that the proposed amendment to Article II, Section 1 (a), in Proposal II be approved without any restriction as to whether or not other societies accept membership in EJC.

After further discussion of the desirability of inviting other societies to join EJC, it was

VOTED that, in the opinion of AIEE, the seven societies named above as considered to be eligible for membership in EJC are qualified for admission; the Institute concurs in negotiating with them, and will approve their membership, provided Article II, Section 1 (a) of the Constitution is amended as approved above.

The condition which we imposed, namely that proportional representation should be effective regardless of how many new societies join EJC, was accepted, and eventually several of the societies on the list were invited to join.

Proposal I having been approved by the required number of constituent societies, these changes were declared effective at the meeting of EJC on November 21, 1952. The proposed modifications under Proposal II were adopted as of December 7, 1952. These matters were reported to our Board at its January 1953 meeting and recorded in the minutes thereof. At a meeting of the Executive Committee of EJC on May 1, 1953 which was called for the specific purpose of considering those matters (including individual membership) recommended by the Exploratory Group for prompt consideration by the enlarged EJC, certain recommendations were prepared which were submitted to EJC on May 15th. Action by EJC at this meeting on these matters included the establishment of a committee to study the problem of affiliation with EJC of regional and state engineering societies and councils, and individuals.

The April 1953 issue of Electrical Engineering contained an article by three members associated with the General Electric Company offering "a new unity plan proposal" attributed to a committee of the Pittsfield General Electric Engineers Association. This plan which has since been referred to frequently as the G.E.E.A. Plan for Unity is essentially the same as Plan C, merely subdividing the governing body of Plan C into three parts, a technical council heading up the national engineering societies, a professional council heading up the state societies, and a board of directors composed of representatives elected from the two councils.

At the June 1953 meeting of the AIEE Board a recommendation was received from the Committee on Code of Principles of Professional Conduct that our Board lend its support to placing the G.E.E.A. Plan for Unity into effect. After a brief discussion, it was

VOTED that the recommendation be received and transmitted to the AIEE representatives on EJC for their information.

On November 30, 1953 President Robertson appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Professor F.O.McMillan to explore what our position should be within EJC on the subject of unity of the profession. He suggested that the committee review the report of the Exploratory Group and its recommendations, and see what action EJC has taken to implement these recommendations.

At the January 1954 meeting of the Board, Professor McMillan's "Sunday Morning" Committee reported that in view of the record of expansion to date, it appeared that EJC was not developing into the form of unity organization desired generally by engineers. The report stated that surveys of our membership disclosed that in their views, the most important basic requirements in a unity organization were that it should be based upon individual membership rather than a council of societies, it should be clothed with power to act promptly when required, and it should be adequately financed. The report also recited that in approving changes in the EJC Constitution to provide for its expansion (Phoenix, August 1952) our Board regarded the modified EJC not as the desired unity organization, but as a possible vehicle through which a suitable organization might be developed. The Committee recommended that the Board of Directors should insist that EJC immediately take steps toward the development of a unity organization based upon individual membership.

After considerable discussion, the wishes of the Board were embodied by Past-President Quarles in a resolution as follows:

- (1) The Board of Directors of AIEE endorses the report of the special committee to review the engineering unity achieved through EJC with certain minor revisions to be made by the Chairman in accordance with the consensus of the Board.
- (2) The Board instructs its representatives in EJC to reaffirm the position of AIEE in this matter, pointing out that the adoption of the present Constitution of EJC was the first step toward the achievement of the unity of the profession and that the time is now here to move ahead in this direction.
- (3) The Board of Directors, through its representatives on EJC, wishes to urge EJC to pursue and explore all practical means of bringing about the unity of the profession based on individual membership.
- (4) The report of the special committee as revised by its chairman should be put before the membership of AIEE by printing in Electrical Engineering under the by-line of the President of the Institute, and be released as of February 1, 1954.

The Board

VOTED to approve the resolution as stated by Past-President Quarles.

On January 29th the Executive Committee of EJC decided to handle itself the question of individual membership which had previously been referred to the Committee on Affiliation.

At another meeting on March 3rd, in which Dr. H.S. Osborne took part at the invitation of the EJC Executive Committee, it was agreed to recommend to Council on March 19th that individual membership should be voluntary, restricted to voting members of constituent societies, and without the right of individual suffrage.

At its meeting on March 19th, EJC authorized the preparation of an amendment to the Constitution to provide for individual membership on the basis recommended by the Executive Committee, such members to pay dues. This proposed amendment (Article V) appears with several others under date of April 6th as submitted to the constituent societies for their consideration. However, these proposals were not received in time to be considered by our Board of Directors at its meeting in Chicago the following day.

At its meeting on April 7, 1954 our Board in consideration of the reported action of EJC with respect to individual membership

VOTED to convey to EJC a complete exposition of the ultimate objective of AIEE in connection with individual membership and to instruct the delegates of AIEE to work for a plan including individual membership such as published in Electrical Engineering, April 1953 and referred to in the McMillan report.

On June 24, 1954 at its meeting in Los Angeles, the AIEE Board, considering the proposed amendments to the EJC Constitution,

VOTED to withhold action on Article V and subsequent articles until a future meeting.

At a meeting of EJC Executive Committee together with the Committee of Secretaries on July 8, 1954 it was reported that all of the proposed amendments to EJC Constitution had been approved by the required number of constituent societies except Article V (Individual Membership). This article had been approved by four, disapproved by two, and tabled by two societies (AIEE and ASEE). Since an affirmative vote of six societies is required for approval, the proposed amendment would be lost if final action by either AIEE or ASEE should be unfavorable.

At its meeting in Pittsburgh, August 12, 1954, the AIEE Board

VOTED to disapprove Article V entitled "Individual Members".

VOTED to approve the proposed Articles I, II, III, IV, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI (all except Article V).

The article numbers refer to the proposed amendments submitted to the constituent societies under date of April 6th.