

1.3.55

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERS  
33 West Thirty-ninth Street  
New York 18, N. Y.

M. D. HOOVEN  
President



Public Service Elec. and Gas Co.  
Newark 1, N. J.  
Tel. Market 2-7000

May 10, 1956

Board of Directors  
American Institute of Electrical Engineers

Gentlemen:

On April 12 I sent to each of you a request to do some thinking on AIEE's relationships with EJC and IRE. Two thirds of you responded, many of you with very interesting letters. I promised a brief review of the results of the correspondence. In order to be quite objective about the interpretation of the letters, I assigned the review task to my new secretary, who has been with me only a few weeks. Her comments, unedited, follow:

AIEE RELATIONSHIPS WITH EJC

The majority opinion of the Board of Directors was definitely in favor of AIEE's remaining in EJC, although none of the Board expressed complete satisfaction with the accomplishments of EJC thus far. Most directors thought of EJC as being a good agency for coordinating the national activities of all of the engineering societies, and they urged that AIEE stimulate more effective action to this end in EJC. Those Board members who recommended that AIEE withdraw from EJC wrote that in their opinion EJC was a waste of time and money because it was doomed to die anyway of the same disease that finished AEC.

About one third of those replying advocated that AIEE give NSPE both moral and financial support, suggesting that NSPE might offer a better unity plan than EJC or that NSPE might oppose the formation of unions for



engineers. Most of the directors felt that they and the majority of the members of AIEE endorse the Walter Morton Plan or Plan "C". The few people who voiced any opinion on a possible resurvey of AIEE membership on the question of unity were evenly split in their thinking.

#### AIEE RELATIONSHIPS WITH IRE

The Board's comments concerning IRE showed an even division of opinion as to whether AIEE should concentrate on cooperation or competition with IRE. There seemed to be no middle ground. Many directors thought that AIEE should work harder, especially in the field of electronics, where IRE is strongest. Several stated that they believed that any alienation of IRE now might endanger AIEE in the future when IRE might outnumber AIEE. More and better advertising was a frequent suggestion for a remedy for AIEE's member-recruiting problem. Board opinion was also about half and half on the subject of encouraging or discouraging AIEE-IRE Joint Student Branches.

So much for an outside comment. The following is my own: I should be more concerned by the apparent wideness of the split of opinion on both these subjects if I did not know the group so well. In each case the split in opinion is only a split on means to obtain a desired end upon which all correspondents are unanimous. For instance, in the EJC correspondence, those who favored severing relationships expressed that thought in the hope that unity of the profession could thus be more rapidly obtained than to take the opposite path of cooperation. In the IRE correspondence there was a similar unanimous desire for avoiding a permanent split in the electrical engineering profession. Those who favored extreme helpfulness to the younger society hoped thus to win them to further consideration of unity; those who suggested healthy competition hoped thereby to obtain a better bargaining position for unification.

If possible, I should like to devote some time at San Francisco to discussion of AIEE's position on these problems.

Yours very truly,



M. D. Hooven

MDH:AF