American Institute of Electrical Engineers
33 West Thirty-Ninth Street
New York 18, N.Y.

Minutes
Committee Of The Whole
On
INTERSOCIETY RELATIONS

Board of Directors Meeting 6/28/56
San Francisco, Calif.

(Thur. 9:43 A.M. PDT.) ASSEMBLED at the call of Chairman M.D. Hooven

I. INTRA PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS: AIEE-IRE

President Hooven finds relations with IRE a topic of major interest throughout AIEE as evidenced by discussions in various committees and conferences at this convention. His survey of Board opinion reveals a range from "close cooperation" to "split entirely." The latter view is in the minority. There is a strong opinion calling for the discouragement of Joint Branches and vice versa. Likewise opinions differ on the encouragement of open and avowed "competition" as against "intense cooperation."

After this review of the results of the President's mail survey of Board opinion, the question of the Board's attitude toward relations with IRE in general was discussed as preliminary to consideration of specific aspects of it, such as Joint Student Branches.

(A) AIEE-IRE GENERAL POLICY ON RELATIONS

1) Aims and attitudes: President Hooven, responding to a question from the floor, gave as his personal observation that within IRE attitudes toward AIEE vary widely. One extreme takes the position that AIEE is so committed to an interest in power as to be unable to cope with the present growing predominance of member needs in science-based electronics and communications arts. Lacking appeal for the younger generation, AIEE will automatically pass out of the picture and leave the whole field of Electrical Engineering to IRE. There is also said to be an older group in IRE who prefer to emphasize radio and the earlier, more limited, objectives of IRE. Some responsible leaders, including some recent IRE presidents, hope for an eventual merger of the two Institutes and would encourage all possible present cooperation as a prelude. Others doubt that a merger is practicable and would accept "competition" as inevitable, but not uncontrollable. President Hooven said that in the light of his conversations with various IRE leaders he believes that their considered attitude as to ultimate aims would be to avoid splitting the Electrical Engineering profession and to work toward ultimate unification on some, as yet unspecified, basis.

The following opinions were expressed:

2) Merger can be achieved only after the ability of AIEE to compete effectively in the electronics and communications area has been demonstrated.

3) The effort to make such a demonstration would be widely interpreted as precipitating the undesired split and would lose friends and support for AIEE.

4) Attitudes within IRE include fear of being absorbed and dictated to by the older and bigger AIEE. It is alleged that AIEE is not cooperative because the committees through which cooperation should take place do not enjoy the proper sympathy and support of the AIEE Board of Directors for proposed cooperative activities.

(over)
5) That no program or plan for extending "cooperation" is at hand. It must be developed in steps as we proceed under the prompting of mutual good intentions.

6) Merger is not a realistic aim. The best that can be expected is good, clean competition.

7) Historically, the two Institutes have supplemented each other. If the present and future are viewed from the standpoint of functional rather than material and equipment interests the same might still be true. AIEE represents management, system planning, operation and the broader aspects of engineering; while IRE represents the physics, research, and electronic equipment detail interests and aspects of the communications field.

8) Members and students feel that AIEE is on the defensive. More aggressive action is called for.

9) Effective competition in securing the services of the best technical committee leadership and technical programs has been carried on between the two Institutes without excessive friction.

10) Better to approach the achievement of the original and continuing purposes of AIEE in serving the whole field of Electrical Engineering should not be looked upon as "competition".

(B) INFORMAL POLLS

At this point it was proposed and agreed that there should be informal polls taken to get a quantitative appraisal of the opinions of the "committee", consisting of 33 present and incoming Board members, as to questions of policy and procedure. The questions and the vote on each follow:

1) AIEE should take all reasonable precautions to avoid "splitting" the EE profession. Yes - 33, No - 0.

2) The ultimate aim of AIEE should be a merger with IRE into one Electrical Engineering Institute as opposed to an indefinite continuation of two separate societies. Yes - 31, No - 2. (Discussion indicated that "absorption" of one Institute by the other would never provide a realistic basis for planning.)

An invitation to explain the two negative votes brought comments from five members of the "committee". In summary these comments were: a) One third of AIEE members appear to be interested in electronics; all of IRE members are so interested. A merger is unrealistic. b) AIEE has plenty to offer as the "overall" professional electrical society vs IRE as a purely specialized technical society. c) AIEE publications in the newer fields are "second-hand"; articles have appeared elsewhere. The future lies in computers, nucleons, etc. and AIEE must cover these fields more effectively. d) 102/143 Branches are joint - "...... and a little child shall lead them." e) Merger should be sought by the junior society. This will happen only when the senior society makes it evident that it is capable of covering the whole field. f) The idea of a better job in electronics as an incentive to merger is wishful thinking.

3) As a practical step toward ultimate merger and the clarification of current relations AIEE should propose and seek a joint meeting of the Boards or Executive Committees of the two Institutes in the near future - perhaps at Chicago during the NSE. Yes - 14, No - 15. The negative votes were in part explained by the question, "What have we to offer at this time - simply notice that we are determined to do a better job in the electronics field with the purpose of inspiring them to seek a merger?" On the affirmative side, it was pointed out that merger talk should, at this time, be based on economics of operation, professional representation of individual members, elimination of duplication, greater strength and broader coverage for the members.
4) If there were no Joint Branches today, AIEE would, in the light of past experience, favor the establishment of this type of cooperation with IEEE. Yes - 15, No - 15

5) Taking the situation as it stands today, AIEE policy should be to encourage the establishment of new and additional Joint Branches. Yes - 9, No - 21.

6) The chairman appeared to find no dissent from his following statements: a) We are and should be in competition for members. b) We are and should be cooperating in technical meetings and activities. c) The formation of overlapping technical committees is a proper type of competition, since after formation they usually cooperate. d) In Standards, AIEE policy is now to take greater initiative and a more independent position in promotion and publication.

(c) SUMMARY

The chairman summarized the informal discussion of the "Committee of the Whole": We are in almost unanimous agreement on three points - a) Nothing should be done further to "split" the Electrical Engineering Profession, b) Our ultimate objective is a merger with IEEE. c) As a means of encouraging the achievement of that ultimate objective AIEE should do a better job in its service of all fields of electrical engineering. We are nearly equally divided in our concepts of the methods implementing these policies. (See also formal Board actions Item II (B) of the minutes of 6/28/55).

II INTERSOCIETY RELATIONS: EJC, ECPD, NSPE, etc.

(A) GENERAL STATEMENTS

1) Past-President Robertson stated the objective of this session of the "Committee of the Whole on Intersociety Relations" as the establishment of "guide posts" which could be used by a drafting committee to prepare a statement of AIEE policy to inform the membership and any affected organization of our position on these matters.

2) President Hoover reviewed the responses to his questionnaire to Board members as follows: a) Opinions divided. b) Many wanted to remain in EJC; some, "yes but with stronger interest in NSPE. c) A number wished to leave EJC. d) A number wished to support NSPE better. e) Some supported the "Morton Plan". f) A half dozen favored a resurvey of the situation. g) Previous poll of membership was taken before half of present members were in the AIEE.

(B) INFORMAL POLLS

1) AIEE believes that there should be unity of the profession with AIEE carrying the entire technical burden in the Electrical Engineering field. Yes - 33 No. - 0.

2) Past President Robertson proposed that AIEE examine the activities of existing bodies with a view to identifying those which should receive AIEE support. ARTICLE VIII paragraph 3 of the EJC Constitution was cited as providing that constituent societies may contribute to the support of EJC activities on a selective basis. As means of reviewing the activities of EJC, ECPD and NSPE and deciding which were suitable for AIEE endorsement and support; the committees of each society were listed in parallel columns as below and a vote was taken as to the suitability of the activity as represented by the committee. "$\times$" indicates a vote of "not suitable for AIEE support in this organization."

(over)
ACTIVITIES OF TYPICAL ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination of Scientific Activities (EJC)</th>
<th>Coordination of Educational Activities (BCPD)</th>
<th>Individual Membership (NSPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Employment Conditions - X</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>Education - X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Engrg. Sciences</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Honors for Engrs.</td>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>Young Engineers - X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. International Relations</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Employment Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Labor Legislation - X</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Salaries and Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Membership</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Engrs. in Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. National Engineers - X</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Engrg. Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nat'l. Engrs. Register</td>
<td>Practice of Engrg. - X</td>
<td>Ethical Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Nuclear Congress</td>
<td>Accrediting Curric.</td>
<td>Bd. of Ethical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Practice of Engrg. - X</td>
<td>OTHER BODIES</td>
<td>Nat'l. Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Recognition of Specialties</td>
<td>UET</td>
<td>Nat'l. Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Social Security Legislation - X</td>
<td>NSCBEE</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Special Surveys - X</td>
<td>ASHE</td>
<td>Prof. Soc. Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Nat'l. Water Policy</td>
<td>Conf. Bd. for Ind.</td>
<td>Chapter Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. UNESCO</td>
<td>AAAS</td>
<td>Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. World Power Conf.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Com. on Large Dams</td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Annual Gen'l. Assembly - X</td>
<td>Const. &amp; Bylaws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. EMC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) It was the consensus with regard to the above action that, in certain instances such as Special Surveys, when the subject matter is technical in nature surveys by EJC or a similar technical coordinating body are proper. When the subject to be surveyed is political or has to do with economic welfare and working conditions of engineers it is more properly the function of a body of the type of NSPE.
4) A statement of AIEE policy proposed by Past President Robertson follows:

"......to formally recognize and publicly say that AIEE feels that certain organizations are best fitted to carry on in a particular field and that these will get AIEE support both moral and financial ...... We feel there is need for a Technical Council but that it should confine its activities to purely technical matters, by this we mean such matters as are now handled by EJC and as were approved on the foregoing list (not marked "X"). We feel that such matters as concern the professional prestige, and the economic status of engineers, and legislative activities, should properly be in the province of NSPE. We feel that ECPD is the proper joint agency to handle and be concerned with the general field of engineering education and training; that ECPD will continue to receive active AIEE support."

It was further specifically recommended that: the foregoing discussion and analysis of joint activities serve for the guidance of a committee appointed to draft, for later Board approval, messages to our membership, to EJC and to others that may be concerned, such as NSPE or ECPD. These messages possibly to be different in each case. (Action was deferred for further consideration of the "unity problem.")

5) President Hooven asked for consideration of a broad aim. a) Do we want two "unity organizations": one purely technical, the other purely professional? or b) Should there be a bridging connection between the two? or c) One national society with a professional division and various technical divisions? These are Plans "B" and "D" of ten years ago.

Past-President Robertson's proposal was then further amplified as follows: "The ABA, as we have been thinking of it, may or may not be the ultimate solution that we want for the engineering profession. In spite of the fact that the ABA has its sections and the ANA has its scientific assemblies as a part of ABA and ANA, to handle the technical side of the profession, we know that not all of the technical and scientific medical societies are affiliated with ANA. The formation of a technical council in ABA introduces so many problems and personalities that I feel that probably we should delay the wedding of a technical council and a professional council into ABA until some time later, if at all."

President Hooven again asked if there were a desire to set as an ultimate objective one unity organization for engineers, which has been assumed to be an objective, or two separate ones. The consensus appeared to be that this question should not be answered at this time. It was admitted that this represents a retreat from the AIEE position of the last five years. It was,

VOTED that we adopt in principle and propose actually to support three organizations of this character. ("This character" to be inferred from B 2 above as modified by the elimination of activities marked X").

6) VOTED to request the President to appoint a special committee to draft, subject to Board approval, a statement to the membership and other interested parties setting forth the AIEE position as today determined. (L.P. Hickernell, Ch., M. D. Hooven, Elgin B. Robertson)

7) VOTED to request the President to appoint a committee to place before NSPE the suggestion that it make provision, for a period of years, to include in its membership unregistered engineers holding appropriate grades in those technical societies subscribing to the ECPD uniform membership grades.

8) VOTED to rescind the instructions to AIEE representatives on EJC under which they are required to work for the development of EJC into an individual membership unity organization.

(Thur. 3:55) COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON INTERSOCIETY RELATIONS ADJOURNED.