



This is Station A.I.E.E.  
bringing you the  
latest news.

There has been a feeling among members of the engineering profession that an organization should be developed which could effectively represent all engineers on such problems as: the effects of labor laws on the engineer, education of engineers, state registration laws, economics, public relations and others. The form which this unity organization should take has been the subject of many discussions. Several forms have been proposed, but no one organization form has received the full support of the engineering profession.

To acquaint the members of the Pittsfield Section of the AIEE with the various proposed organization forms, the first meeting of the Section will be devoted to a panel discussion on the subject of-- "Unity".

The panel speakers will include Dr. Harold S. Osborne representing The Engineers Joint Council, Paul H. Robbins representing the National Society of Professional Engineers, and D. T. Langenwaller representing the General Electric Engineers Council. Mr. D. D. MacCarthy, a past chairman of the Section, will be moderator. All of these men have been active in the effort to develop a unity organization, and are well acquainted with the subject.

To stimulate discussion at the meeting, prepared statements by the panel speakers have been secured and are attached. Your committee feels sure that these statements and next week's meeting will be of interest to all within the engineering profession.

Tuesday, September 20, at 8 p.m. is the time, and the Stanley Club is the place for the first AIEE meeting of the 1955-56 season.



## U N I T Y

For many years there have been efforts within the engineering profession to develop an organization which could effectively represent all members of the profession in matters of common interest. Engineers in the Pittsfield area have had a prominent part in this activity.

Several times recently, the Executive Committee of the Pittsfield Section AIEE has been called upon to express its opinion on the preferred form of an engineering unity organization, or to lend its support to some particular plan.

The Committee favors the development of an effective unity organization, and believes that progress toward this end has been much too slow. However, it does not feel qualified to speak with authority for the membership of the Section on this subject, or to commit the Membership to any particular plan, without first taking measures to determine and to place on record, the views of the membership. Full support of the membership is considered to be essential to any real progress toward a successful Unity Organization.

Prepared statements by the three panel members are attached to stimulate discussion at the meeting, and to present their views to those of you who will be unable to attend. Following the meeting, questionnaires will be mailed to each member of the Section to place their views on record.

W. A. McMORRIS - Vice Chairman  
PITTSFIELD SECTION AIEE



## UNITY OF THE ENGINEERING PROFESSION

By Dr. Harold S. Osborne, representing the Engineers Joint Council

A few years ago, at the invitation of Engineers Joint Council, fifteen of the major national engineering societies of the country each appointed a representative to what has been called the "Exploratory Group to Consider the Increased Unity of the Engineering Profession".

This Group met a number of times throughout a two-year period and, working through sub-committees and as a whole, presented to the societies represented in the Group and to EJC two reports. These reports discussed the need for a unity organization, the problems involved in establishing it, and a number of specific proposals regarding forms of organization.

The conclusions reached by this Exploratory Group are best indicated by quoting the general conclusions from the final report, which were agreed to by all but one of the members of the Group. These conclusions are as follows:

1. It is desirable that the engineering profession establish a "unity organization" which will be able to advance the unity of the profession and the service of the profession to the nation.
2. The unity organization should be formed by the modification and development of a present organization or by the integration of two or more present organizations rather than by the establishment of an entirely new organization.
3. The unity organization should initially include the participation of a majority of the national engineering societies represented in the Exploratory Group.
4. There are a number of important questions regarding the form and activities of the unity organization and its relation to other engineering bodies on which there are differences of opinion within the profession. Accordingly, it is desirable that the unity organization be launched in the simplest possible way and that these questions be studied and determined by the unity organization itself rather than by the Exploratory Group or any other temporary group.
5. To bring about this first simple step the Exploratory Group recommends to Engineers Joint Council that it invite all constituent societies represented in the Exploratory Group to become constituent societies of the Council.
6. The Exploratory Group recommends further that, coincident with this invitation, Engineers Joint Council modify Article II-- "Membership" of its Constitution in such a way as to provide for membership on the Council by representatives of the constituent societies appointed or elected for the purpose, and to provide for a number of representatives from each society, ranging from



one to three. This recommendation is developed in more detail in Section B of this report.

7. The Exploratory Group recommends to the constituent societies of the Group that they accept the invitation of EJC and become constituent societies of that body.
8. Following these first steps, the Exploratory Group recommends that the enlarged Engineers Joint Council give further study to the matters discussed in Sections C, D, and E of this report and take appropriate action on each of these matters.

Following the receipt of this report, Engineers Joint Council approved it in principle and has taken some of the steps recommended by the Exploratory Group.

The enlargement of EJC which is recommended by the Exploratory Group was not of itself, considered by the Group to constitute the formation of the unity organization. It was the view of the Exploratory Group after full consideration that the formation of a unity organization would involve long consideration of many matters on which there was not general agreement, and that further work should be undertaken by an organization of authoritative representatives of the engineering organizations which might evolve into the unity organization. The most practicable first step in this process, it was believed, would be the expansion of Engineers Joint Council. The Exploratory Group reports invite the expanded EJC to proceed with the study of and action upon a large number of questions to be determined in developing a unity organization, which would represent adequately, the entire engineering profession.

The active discussion of the unity of the engineering profession over a considerable number of years has shown clearly that it is the desire of almost all engineers to have a unity organization. There is a wide divergence of view among different groups of engineers as to the form such a unity organization should take, and an inclination seems best to them. As a result, while progress is being made toward the achievement of a unity organization, it is slow.

Whatever form a unity organization takes cannot possibly meet the ideas of all. It is my own conviction that any form initially established will be modified with experience and with change in conditions and growth in activities of a unit organization.



## UNITY

By Paul H. Robbins, Representing National Society of Professional Engineers

Unfortunately, many of the discussions regarding organization of the engineering profession do not premise their considerations on some of the basic reasons for unity and some of the elements which should go into a unity organization to be effective in handling the objectives for which it might be formed.

The need for unity has been summed up very simply. It is to provide the engineering profession with a vigorous body for the most effective professional action. Professional action, however, means varying things to various individuals. It may mean concern with the economic status of the profession; it may mean ethical procedures; it may mean government liaison; it may mean legislative representation; it may mean enforcement of our registration laws; it may mean better education; it may mean concern for the utilization of engineers in the Military Services; it may mean a public relations program for the profession; or any one of a number of other specific activities.

But basically it has two meanings. It means improved public service (the hallmark of a profession) and it means greater recognition of the professional status of engineering. These two items have certain common distinguishing features. First of all, they apply not to any particular unit of the engineering profession--they are the concern of all engineers, whether they be Civil, Electrical, Mechanical, Chemical, Mining, or some other specialized branch. They apply to the whole of the profession irrespective of the type of engineering pursuit--whether it be in private practice, employment in industry, public utility, education, or government. The other common basis of this activity is that both the public service and the recognition of the profession are made up to a large degree of what the individual members of the profession do with respect to them. For neighbors and friends, the engineering profession is judged by their impression of each engineer.

Thus, this professional action can only be coordinated and stimulated by a unity organization. It receives its impetus and becomes effective only as the individual members of the profession will support it with their time and their money, and support it with their active participation.

Believing firmly in these principles, NSPE has stood out in these unity discussions for certain basic requirements. Among them has been the very essential one that the unity organization should be composed of individual dues-paying members. Recognizing from experience that these professional activities (legislation, ethics, public relations etc.) have their greatest effectiveness when implemented primarily at the local level, with coordination and further implementation at the state level and stimulation and activity from the national level, NSPE has stood staunchly for the necessity of organizing and integrating the engineering profession at three levels rather than at the national level only.

It has further said, and it knows from experience, that the unity organization must have authority to act and it must have appropriate financing. No unity organization can be successful if it is supported at the whims of various organizations,



either by way of financing or by way of participation in particular programs. NSPE has further said that we must decide who is to participate in this unity organization and limit it to qualified engineers. Experience of the past fifty years on professional matters has indicated the wisdom of these points of view. We can see the success of organizations in other professions and our own based upon these principles and we can note with pride the success they have attained.

#### THE UNITY PROBLEM

By D. F. Langenwalter representing the General Electric Engineers Council

The lack of unity in the engineering profession is a luxury we cannot afford!! The engineer lacks a recognized voice as well as a means of solving many of his professional and economic problems. A unity organization would do much to increase the prestige of the profession and would do much to improve the economic, professional and social status of the engineer. To be worthwhile, a unity organization should concern itself about and handle such problems as:

1. The effect of labor laws on the engineer.
2. The present Selective Service policy.
3. National security problems.
4. Legislation.
5. Gentlemen's agreements and freedom of employment.
6. Utilization of engineers.
7. Registration laws.
8. Education standards of engineers.
9. Engineering shortages.
10. Public relations.

These problems have been completely ignored by the too many individual technical societies which have considered only the technical side of the engineer.

The unity organization should be a "grass roots" organization with the operation financed by individual dues and an executive committee held accountable to the individual members. Also, the organization should be able to deal with legislative and other problems at the local, state and national level.



We feel that it is neither necessary nor desirable to start a unity organization from scratch. A close study of the existing engineering organizations quickly illustrates that the National Society of Professional Engineers is the only one that fits most of the basic structural requirements. It is presently constituted to act in most of the areas where one would expect a unity organization to contribute. We feel that the NSPE could and should become the unity organization. This can only come about when more and more engineers join it and give generously of their leadership and assistance.

The proposed plan C does not meet the objectives in that

1. It suggests a federation of the present technical societies. The unity organization would then be responsible only to the heads of the various technical societies--not to the engineer. Any technical society disliking a policy could withdraw, and simultaneously withdraw its financial support. Previous federations have died in just that way. Furthermore, since the technical societies receive a considerable amount of financial support from industry, it is difficult to visualize that all of the actions of such a unit organization would be strictly in the best interest of the engineer.
2. The proposed plan C limits the activities of the unity organization to technical advancement, civic interest, engineering education, and professional recognition. By comparing this small program with the one previously outlined, one can conclude that the program of plan C is inadequate.