



remarks from the chair

#### PROGRESS REPORT

Following several favorable votes on the IRE-AIEE consolidation, your Operating Committee became concerned early in February with the effect of the merger on the unique relationships of the SF and LA Sections, the 7th Region, and WEMA through Wescon. The adjoining joint statement from the two Sections was sent to President Haggerty at the same time that he requested representatives of the Sections, the Region, WEMA, and Wescon to meet with him in Dallas.

San Francisco was represented there by John V. N. Granger, whose report on the Dallas meeting follows. Dr. Granger had previously expressed his personal skepticism in a letter to the national president. Haggerty's reply, excerpted herewith, has considerably allayed concern about the consolidation.

Members are urged to study this exchange and to note that the Principles of Consolidation and related material will appear in March Proceedings, followed by the new Constitution and Bylaws and a good deal of correspondence in the April Proceedings. About ten days later, the San Francisco Section will meet, on April 26, to provide a forum for full discussion before mailing their ballots prior to July 1. All of the material quoted here will be available in full mimeo form from the Section office.

*Stanley F. Kiesel*

—STANLEY F. KAISEL  
CHAIRMAN, SAN FRANCISCO SECTION

144 NS14  
FY1  
per our conversation  
Rec'd

Joint statement to IRE National President P. E. Haggerty  
from Los Angeles and San Francisco Sections

The following points require further clarification to permit a satisfactory resolution of the merger question.

1) **Information.** Up to the present time, information presented to the general membership is not adequate to permit a sound judgment regarding advantages to the IRE, its members, or to the engineering profession, of merger with the AIEE.

2) **Timing.** Since the general membership will not have the proposed articles of incorporation, including the constitution and bylaws, before the contemplated voting period, and since major membership areas have not had representation in formative discussions, it is recommended that members not be requested to vote until a draft of the proposed articles of incorporation, including the constitution and bylaws, has been made available for their review and comment for at least 90 days.

3) **Representation.** We recommend that the present eight-man merger committee and its study committees be increased to represent properly a true cross-section of the major activities and memberships of the two societies.

4) **Special Problems.** The merger committee should give detailed consideration to the specific problems resulting from the merger relative to each section and region.

A) **Wescon.** For example, the Los Angeles and San Francisco Sections have a long-standing history of Wescon co-sponsorship resulting in extensive and complex legal and operational interrelationships and obligations which must be recognized and preserved with minimal modification to preserve our equity in participation and benefits and to avoid the introduction of any element of conflict or incompatibility with our co-sponsors, WEMA and the Seventh Region, IRE.

B) **Boundaries.** Regional boundaries should be established to provide for representation in relation to membership population as well as geographical location on a consistent basis.

C) **Local Operations.** Other problems include consideration of professional group symposia and conventions, operation of section business offices, publication of Section magazines and bulletins, and impact of merger on Section finances.

2-26-62

Haggerty, in wire of response to query  
by WEMA President William J. Miller

NO DISCUSSIONS TO DATE HAVE CONTEMPLATED INTERFERENCE WITH PRESENT WESCON APPROACH OR PROCEDURE FOR WHICH WE HAVE HIGHEST ADMIRATION. BELIEVE YOUR CONTRACT ACTUALLY WITH LOS ANGELES AND SAN FRANCISCO SECTIONS RATHER THAN SEVENTH REGION. MERGED SOCIETY WOULD, OF COURSE, HONOR CONTRACTUAL COMMITMENTS BOTH SOCIETIES.



Bruce Angwin, Walter Peterson, and I, representing Wescon and the Los Angeles and San Francisco Sections, met in Dallas with President Haggerty and 7th Region Director Reynolds to discuss at very considerable length the various points raised in the joint memorandum. Haggerty impressed us all with his objectivity and sincerity, and with the amount of careful study he had given to every aspect of the proposed consolidation. Taking points of the memorandum in order, Haggerty's principal comments follow:

1) **Information.** Information to the membership before ballots are mailed will include: Principles of Consolidation, Constitution, Past President Berkner's three letters, Haggerty's letter of February 5, a digest of the open panel discussions at the New York Convention, and four or five of the principal critical letters received, together with Haggerty's replies.

2) **Timing.** Principles of Consolidation will be published in March Proceedings. This is the significant statement of the proposal since the Constitution is purposely broad. If the schedule described in Haggerty's letter of February 5 is adopted by the two boards, ballots need not be returned until 60 days later.

3) **Representation.** If the Board adopts the Principles of Consolidation on March 8, the eight-man merger committee will be increased to fourteen members and the study committee on meetings will be increased to include Wescon representation.

4) **Special Problems.**

A) **Wescon.** The IEEE would accept the contract responsibility as regards Wescon now held by the IRE. The IEEE would embody the same principles of local autonomy and self-determination that characterize the IRE, and would encourage, in every possible way, the present IRE sponsors to carry Wescon forward in partnership with WEMA. IRE legal counsel is reviewing the Wescon agreements to ensure against interference with Wescon.

B) **Boundaries.** Haggerty recognizes that the present IRE situation, where one regional director represents 22 per cent of the membership in the case of the 7th Region, is inequitable and is willing to recommend a change in boundaries. On the course of intensive discussion on this point, the group present agreed that, in their personal view, the close community of interest of the 7th Region, particularly as regards Wescon, outweighed purely numerical considerations and that boundaries should not be changed. It was pointed out also that historically (and at the present) the proportion of the directors at large resident in the West was great enough to more than redress the per-capita balance of representation.

C) **Local Operations.** On the final point, Haggerty was aware of, and sympathetic to, these special problems. Again he pressed the fact that the structure of the IEEE was deliberately set so as to continue the same degree of local autonomy now enjoyed by the IRE sections, regions, and professional groups.

One other agreement was developed, which is of specific interest. In connection with its regular meeting of March 14 in Los Angeles, the Wescon Board has invited the principal representatives of its sponsor organizations (WEMA, the Los Angeles and San Francisco Sections, and the 7th Region) to meet with it to review Wescon's own studies of the detailed problems of policy and operation that might be created by consolidation. If, after this meeting, we wish further discussions with the merger committee, or its study groups, prior to the New York Convention, Haggerty will arrange this.

In summary, I am personally convinced that our special concerns and problems are recognized and understood, and that Haggerty and Reynolds are in full sympathy with them. While it is clear that many problems of detail are left to be worked out, I am confident that nothing in the intent or the conclusions of the merger committee will stand in the way of success.

3-1-62

Quotes, heavily edited because  
of space, from Dr. Haggerty's  
letter to Dr. Granger

145

The question of whether or not a consolidation of IRE and AIEE is, in principle, a desirable move from the IRE standpoint is indeed for us the fundamental question. The results of deliberations can be summarized as concurrence on the part of the representatives of both IRE and AIEE that consolidation was desirable, in principle, if suitable mechanisms for consolidation could be settled upon.

While once IRE and AIEE had relatively little overlap (with AIEE concentrating on power and telephone communications and IRE on radio and what has come to be known as electronics), this is no longer true. There is simply no longer a way of dividing the technological content of electrical engineering between AIEE and IRE. We have approximately 6000 common members, but AIEE has an increasing number of members belonging only to AIEE, but interested primarily in the technological areas IRE has long considered its own. Out of IRE's 217 student branches, 128 are IRE-AIEE student branches. Of 61 national technical meetings sponsored by IRE's professional groups in 1961, AIEE was cosponsor of 22. It becomes difficult indeed to decide to whom magnetohydrodynamics, applied plasma physics, fuel cells, and automatic controls belong. Most of us came to the conclusion that the course of events in our profession was such that the overlaps would go on growing and that the amount of time to be spent in coordinating and cooperating in IRE and AIEE affairs would grow increasingly over the next decade.

If IEEE can provide a stronger unifying force than the IRE and the AIEE can separately, then probably this is the controlling and dominant factor in determining the propriety of the merger of IRE and AIEE. If a merger can be accomplished in accordance with the Principles of Consolidation then IEEE will be a stronger unifying force than the two societies are separately.

The IEEE will have as least as much flexibility and viability as has the IRE.

Your national officers and directors could not hope, if they spent full time from now until January 1, 1963, to resolve the multitude of differences and details which exist at the local level. We must assume, and I think it is reasonable to do so, that the same local groups which have created the strong local organizations can and will solve these problems, given a modest amount of time to do so.

2-24-62