



FROM THE EDITOR...

Permanence

For those of you who may have missed the few sentences in *C&EN* on the subject, I am happy to report that the Council voted to remove our probationary status at the Chicago meeting a few weeks ago. We are now *almost* a permanent ACS division. A procedural technicality prevented approval of our bylaws at that meeting, but this should be taken care of in due course, and in no way prevents us from continuing and expanding our programs.

I think we can all pat ourselves on the back for having forced removal of probationary status at such an early point in our existence. It demonstrates recognition of the dynamism and vitality of the division.

In the year and a half that we have been active, we have been responsible for several interesting and well attended sessions at three national meetings (New York, Dallas, and Chicago); we published several issues of the *Professional Relations Bulletin*; we established contact with other professional groups, including the Royal Institute of Chemistry and the Chemical Institute of Canada; we directly influenced professional relations activities within the ACS (for example, our efforts to have the Council Committee on Professional Relations strengthen the *Guidelines for Employers* was successful — our frequent contact with the committee helped to stress the need for such changes, while the specific revisions we proposed were seriously considered by the committee, with some adopted); and perhaps most important, we established ourselves as a potential focal

point for professional relations activities within the Society.

Dues Decrease

In these days of runaway prices, it is a very great pleasure for me to inform you that we have lowered our dues for 1974 by 20% — to \$4.00.

Our initial dues were set somewhat in the dark, knowing neither how many members we would get, nor what level of expenses we would incur. Although to a great extent expenses were to be tied to revenues, we did want to carry out certain activities, such as this newsletter, the quality of which was dependent upon certain minimum levels of income. With every indication that our membership will continue to expand, and with over a year of experience under our belts, we have decided to reduce our dues to a level more in line with other divisions.

We very greatly appreciate the support and encouragement given in the past by our charter members, and we urge all of you to use the renewal form in this issue of the *Bulletin* to send in your dues for next year, at the lower rate. This may also be a good time to get out and get some of your friends to join. The larger our membership, the greater will be our influence.

Content

There are three major articles in this issue. The first gives the ACS presidential candidates space to answer several questions asked by the *PR Bulletin*. Look these over carefully. We believe that the office of president of

the ACS is too important these days to be considered simply as an honorary position. As such, the views of the candidates should be given maximum publicity, especially when related to professional relations. When reading these statements, look for solid suggestions and a record of accomplishment in this area, rather than hot air. Then vote when your ballot arrives.

A second article describes the ACS Corporation Associates. Serious questions have been raised about the appropriateness of such an organization within a society of professional chemists and engineers. Dr. Ross presents the corporate side. What are your views?

Finally, we present an article submitted by an active member of the American labor movement. The question of unionization of chemists is one which seems destined for increased discussion and consideration. Certainly it cannot, and should not, be swept under the rug. Indeed, the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers Union (OCAW), which in the past has concentrated on organizing non-technical chemical workers, very recently established a professional division (no relation to ours!). Its executive director was quite visible at the Chicago ACS meeting.

The author of our article, Jack Golodner, is himself a professional, a lawyer by training. He presents his case very well. Would anyone like to present the other side? I would be happy to receive such a manuscript, so that we can begin a dialogue on this important subject. Or does everyone agree with Mr. Golodner?

(continued on back page)

Interviews with the Presidential Candidates

William J. Bailey – Bryce Crawford, Jr.

The recent severe employment problems of chemists can be looked upon as caused by either oversupply or underdemand. First, as an academic chemist, what do you think ACS should do to influence the supply of chemists (university output)?

Bailey: In the present political and economic climate there is undoubtedly an over-supply of chemists. Although there are many things that we can do to influence the political and economic climate to create higher demand for chemists, the success of these activities cannot be predicted with any certainty. Therefore, if we are going to err, it should be on the side of an under-supply of chemists.

Crawford: The ACS should determine facts and publicize them. We know that this will indeed "influence the equation" — witness the fact that present graduate enrollment ensures that less than 1500 fresh Ph.D. chemists will enter the market in 1976, as compared with a peak annual production of just over 2200 in 1970. This is the result of information given out to young students by the government and the universities and the ACS during the last few years. We will be producing fewer new chemists, and by the same token they will be high-quality new professionals by virtue of the greater selectivity. I believe an individual should have the right to choose his career, and if he has the ability should be able to develop himself and become a chemist if that is his desire. But he should be informed on career possibilities. Unfortunately manpower demands are almost impossible to forecast; but still current facts regarding employment on the one hand and supply of chemists on the other can be determined — as the ACS has been doing for years — and can be made known to help each individual in his choice.

How can ACS effectively stimulate higher demand for chemists, and what would you, as President, do to bring this about?

Bailey: While I do not think that the ACS should erect artificial barriers to prevent qualified people from becoming chemists, I do think that we should attempt to raise our standards. For example, I think that the ACS should accredit graduate schools in chemistry as soon as possible. This program should raise the level of graduate work in the same way that the approval of the undergraduate curriculum in chemistry was able to upgrade the Baccalaureate training. At the undergraduate level, I think that the ACS should try to identify superior students by a voluntary national merit examination. A realistic campaign to recruit only superior, highly dedicated students into the profession by publicizing and being candid about the current employment opportunities would be desirable.

Many things can be done to influence the demand for chemists, particularly the demand

influenced by governmental actions. Much of our unemployment and underemployment problems stem from the lack of a stable national science policy. A realistic national policy would have increased the number of post-doctoral fellowships when the number of industrial jobs decreased. I have advocated tax incentives for research for sometime, and was instrumental in the establishment of a Subcommittee on Governmental Research and Development Incentives of the Committee on Chemistry and Public Affairs. Again an ideal governmental policy would have increased research incentives when industrial programs decreased. A recent NSF study showed that investment in R & D gave an annual return to the gross national product of 30-50%, but that an individual company could not hope to recover more than 1/3 of this amount. Therefore, for a steady economic growth the government either has to pay for the research or make it more attractive for private companies to undertake research. In spite of this government spending for research has decreased from 2.7% of the gross national product in 1963 to 1.6% in 1970. Many of the problems facing the world today, such as the energy crisis, over-population, hunger, transportation, housing, health, pollution, all need technical solutions, many of which can be supplied by chemists. Therefore, the potential demand is there if our elected representatives can be convinced that the solutions can be obtained in a reasonable length of time with the resources that are available.

Thus, I think that the Society is missing a unique opportunity to be more active in public affairs, particularly in interaction with Congress and the Executive Branch of government. Although this is partially due to an insufficient staff for this purpose at Headquarters, it is also due to a reluctance on the part of the Society to do anything that could possibly be interpreted as lobbying. However, there are many things that we can do in this field without endangering our Internal Revenue status. At the Washington meeting, Congressman John Davis pleaded for help in formulating legislation and assistance from the members and local sections in convincing their Congressmen and Senators that proposed legislation was desirable.

I recently helped initiate a system of "Legislative Counselors" in which an ACS member, preferably a Councilor or Alternate Councilor, will be assigned as an advisor to each of the 536 Senators and Representatives in Congress. Each "Counselor" would be assigned to his own Congressman so that the question of lobbying would not arise. He would be expected to make personal contact with his Congressman and his staff, establish a rapport over a period of time, offer the resources of the ACS as help in solving legislative problems, and, on request, make known any official ACS position on proposed legislation. We should have letter writing campaigns on legislation vital to the chemical community

but this should be separate from these "Counselors" and would probably best be handled through local sections.

Crawford: The best way to help chemists coincides with a needed service we can render to the nation: to teach the public at large — and not only Congress and legislators — the facts that most of the important societal problems, including some of the panic-touched ones such as environmental pollution and medical advance, are essentially chemical problems whose answers can be developed only by the activities of chemists. For its own benefit, our society needs to support chemists wholeheartedly, all the way from their education through their employment — and retirement. ACS needs to do much more in an effective program of communication with the public. The ACS needs an articulate President who can effectively communicate with all segments of the government and the public in spreading our message. And we need more: the joint efforts of a large number of ACS members actively participating in such a program. I would try to spearhead and organize such a truly grass-roots effort.

In addition to more publicity, what should be done with companies whose treatment of chemists violate the ACS Guidelines for Employers?

Bailey: I think that the American Chemical Society could do a number of things for the ACS members that the American Association of University Professors provides its members. I think that we need a tougher set of guidelines, actually censuring companies that do not live up to them. I think that the ACS should keep its members informed as to their legal rights with respect to employment, particularly with respect to discrimination with respect to age, sex, or race. This should include maintaining a legal staff to follow legislation and court action in these very complicated fields, and to keep the members informed of any development. It should also maintain a legal defense fund and should take an active part in legal battles that might establish a legal precedent within the chemical profession in the same way that AAUP does in the educational field. A modified form of tenure and industrial sabbaticals would be desirable. The ACS should emphasize the positive by finding a way to recognize publicly companies, such as Goodyear, 3M, Lilly, Stauffer and Kodak, that managed to avoid layoffs. In enlightened self-interest they apparently decided that they would gain more in company loyalty, high morale, and increased productivity than they could possibly have gained by irresponsible shortsighted mass terminations.

Crawford: We need more professionalism in the sense of monitoring employment conditions and in the sense of educating government and society to their need for the work of chemists. I would not favor the ACS becoming a "bargaining agent." I would favor increased

development of guidelines for employment relations, monitoring, publicity and when appropriate formal censure — which the AAUP over the years has proved to be quite effective. In educating the government and its agencies, I would have the ACS become more active and vocal in informing government bodies of facts they need to know — and on which we can inform them.

The President is the only ACS officer elected by the full membership of the Society: recent elections have demonstrated increased member interest in the area of professional relations. Keeping both of these facts in mind, how can ACS electoral procedures be improved to provide maximum exposure of candidates' views?

Bailey: As the members have demanded that the ACS become more active in public affairs, public relations, and professional relations, the office of the President can no longer be an honorary position. Since only when the members are familiar with the record and views of the candidates, can they make an intelligent choice of the person who can lead the Society, communication is the key. As Chairman of N&E I helped initiate the list of questions for nominees, extended statements to include candidates for Director, broadened letters to the editor in C&EN to include campaign issues, initiated Meet-the-Candidates Night at national meetings, and this year got added coverage of the election in C&EN. Informal publications like this Divisional Newsletter is also a step in the right direction.

Crawford: I think the present situation provides good opportunity for any interested ACS member to learn the candidates' views. In addition to formal statements in C & EN, there will appear a long question-and-answer article in which Bill Bailey and I respond to questions posed by C & EN staff. The Committee on Local Sections Activities has secured from each of us a statement which is being made available to local section publications — and I hope they all use them. Several local sections have invited the two candidates to meet with the section for an expression of their views and discussion; and there will be a

"Meet the Candidates" occasion at the Chicago meeting. With all these exposures, and with the commendable election guidelines being proposed to the Council at Chicago, interested ACS member will know the candidates' views. The real question is whether enough ACS members will be interested! I certainly hope the 1972 total turn-out of voters in the presidential election will be exceeded: 35 per cent is shamefully and unhealthily apathetic!

Would you like to make any further comments?

Bailey: Professionalism means many things to many people, but all seem to agree that it involves responsible actions by both employer and employee. A management that retains an employee who is not doing an adequate job is doing a disservice both to the employee and to the company. Often the jolt of looking for a new job is just the incentive that he may need. Furthermore, a company that uses a dip in the economy as an excuse to let such an employee go, when it is nearly impossible to find another job, is acting irresponsibly. Until the ACS guidelines, which prohibit termination after 15 years service except for cause, can apply, I propose a modified tenure system in which all professionals with over five years service be given a five-year contract renewable every year to force management to make responsible decisions and give the chemists a sense of security.

Of course, to be treated as a professional, a chemist must act like a professional. Professionalism is a two-way street in which the chemist has a responsibility to his employer in the form of loyalty and maintenance of his professional competence at all times. Since professionalism, in itself, will not create any new jobs, we must undertake a vigorous program of Public Relations and Public Affairs to create a governmental and economic atmosphere in which the chemical industry and research will prosper.

To improve communication within the ACS I have consistently advocated increased contact between the Board of Directors and their constituents. I have pushed to have the number of Regional Directors increased to eight and

to have their regions, as closely as possible, coincide with the regions used for Regional Meetings, so that each Regional Director would have a convenient, natural grouping of local sections to which he can communicate easily. To increase communication between the Board and the Council, I have advocated that key members of the Council be ex officio nonvoting members of the Board and of selected Board committees. This year I helped originate the Director-at-Large forum with Councilors at the Dallas meeting and the Board-Council Mixer at the Chicago meeting.

Crawford: The "set questions" have highlighted our need for more professionalism with regard to employment relations (of course), to the stimulation of higher demand for chemists, to the education of the public on the need for chemists, to the determination of supply-and-demand factors and manpower needs, and — not least! — with regard to active participation by ACS members in ACS affairs.

In the limited space allowed, I will only mention one other area of service rendered by the ACS to the professional chemists: his need for continuing education and "awareness" and "up-dating" in his chemical know-how. Short courses, journals, magazines, CA are all useful services, some well-established and some newly developed, which must continue to be provided to the individual chemist. Recent impacts both of costs and of the "information explosion" have seriously jeopardized the effectiveness of these ACS services, and even threaten their continuation in any form useful to the individual chemist. A great deal of effort will be needed in the next few years to maintain these services, and input from thoughtfully interested ACS members will be essential, or we shall lose control of our own scientific and technical communication.

The times have brought concerns for the American people as a whole and for chemists as a profession: I believe we have opportunities to use the great resources of the ACS — and we do have great resources — in a constructive and progressive way, building on the strengths and achievements we already have.

RENEWAL FORM — DPR-ACS

I am a member of the American Chemical Society. Please renew my membership in the Division of Professional Relations. Enclosed is \$4* to cover dues through December 31, 1974.

*Make checks payable to DPR-ACS.

Save us
billing expenses.
Renew now!

Signature _____

Printed Name _____
Last First

Address _____

Join a
friend. Use
the form
on p. 6.

Mail to: Division of Professional Relations
American Chemical Society
P. O. Box 286
Rahway, New Jersey 07065

Save us
billing expenses.
Renew now!

Join a
friend. Use
the form
on p. 6.

Corporation Associates of the ACS

Alexander Ross, Chairman, Committee on Corporation Associates

Should the ACS, an organization of professional chemists and chemical engineers, have corporate members, even though the companies no longer have full member benefits including the vote (as they did from 1910-1951)? Some of us think not. Dr. Ross presents below the views of the Corporation Associates. What do you think? — D.C.

Although the Corporation Associates of the American Chemical Society have been in existence a good number of years, it is only recently that some questions have been raised concerning the nature of this body and its role in the ACS which is, after all, fundamentally an organization of professional chemists and chemical engineers. Furthermore the question has been asked whether, as representatives of corporations, the Corporation Associates have undue influence on the policies and activities of the ACS.

Although there have been a number of recent articles in the C&EN News describing the role of the Corporation Associates, some concerns expressed by members of the Division of Professional Relations indicates that a reclarification in the divisional bulletin might be worthwhile.

The Corporation Associates were originally organized in 1952 for the specific purpose of providing supplementary financial support for Chemical Abstracts and other fundamental ACS journals. For a number of years the Corporation Associates were a non-functioning body and merely contributed funds to the publication efforts of the ACS. Within time, however, the ACS realized that it was necessary to put the journal publication on a self-supporting basis and steps were taken to do this. By 1966 this goal had been more or less achieved and the original *raison d'être* of the Corporation Associates was no longer applicable. At this time the purpose of the CA was redefined. It was agreed that the group could best serve as an intelligent and sympathetic bridge between industry and the ACS. Representatives of the Corporation Associates generally have a good working understanding of both industry and the chemical profession and can readily serve to transmit information, complaints and advice in either direction. It was further felt that the funds of Corporation Associates could be used to finance other worthwhile endeavors of the ACS besides the publications.

Who are the Corporation Associates? There are currently over 200 U. S. corporations who maintain membership in the ACS Corporation Associates. Although a number of them are well known chemical companies, many of them are involved in various other businesses. The range includes companies in food, paper, automotive, oil, liquor, tobacco, rubber and other industries. The thing that they all have in common is their employment of chemists and chemical engineers. Each company as-

signs a representative to the CA. These people are primarily chemists and chemical engineers who have attained some level of responsibility for management of technical affairs in their corporations. Frequently, these are research directors or managers, technical information managers, etc. From among these representatives the Board of Directors of the ACS designates some 15 to serve on the Committee of the Corporation Associates, the guiding body for the group as a whole. It should be stressed that on the whole, the representatives of the Corporation Associates identify themselves as chemists or chemical engineers and as members of the ACS in their function rather than as spokesmen for their corporations. This is essential because the stated aim of the Corporation Associates is to find ways and means by which the corporations can assist the ACS in its functions.

Allocation of funds to ACS projects is one of the major functions of the Committee on Corporation Associates. Never in its history has the Corporation Associates been involved in the initiation of projects which it funds. Instead it awaits requests from the Board of Directors of the ACS and responds to these requests with allocations. In every such request, the support has been for ongoing ACS projects. Support from Corporation Associates has never been the determining factor as to whether a project should be undertaken or not. Over the years the Corporation Associates have supported the following projects: *Project SEED* — The ACS program that provides chemical training for disadvantaged persons, to help them contribute to society as technicians or specialists, has been supported with \$125,000. Additional funds have been expended on this program by Corporation Associates members contributing directly as individual companies.

Operation Interface — A project aimed at promoting effective communication between chemists in industry and chemists in universities, both faculty and students, has been financed by Corporation Associates to the extent of \$82,000 beginning in 1969.

Job-Wanted Advertisements in C&E News — The Corporation Associates have contributed \$35,000 for the cost of such advertisements. This was allocated after the board of directors of the ACS decided to carry out this project for unemployed members. They later came to the Corporation Associates for funds.

Chemistry and the U. S. Economy — A comprehensive study was carried out under the sponsorship of the ACS and the National Science Foundation. The publication of the report has been supported with a \$50,000 loan from Corporation Associates.

In addition to its function of supplying funds as described above, the Corporation Associates is striving to provide a communications bridge between management of the corporations employing chemists and chemical

engineers and the ACS. Thus, when the ACS Committee on Professional Relations prepared the "Suggested Guidelines for Employers" the Corporation Associates were able to supply advice on the best manner of handling these guidelines. At no time was there any attempt by members of the Corporation Associates to control this function or to soften the guidelines.

Of late, the Corporation Associates have been holding an annual meeting in the fall to discuss items of mutual interest to chemists and chemical engineers as professionals and to corporations interested in chemistry. Thus in November of 1971 a meeting was held on "Chemistry in Times of Change." At this meeting we explored the responsibility of the chemist towards industry and the responsibility of industry *vis-a-vis* the chemist. A varied panel explored the rights and needs of chemists and engineers from the point of view of industry, the ACS, professional associations (the American Association of University Professors and the American Institute of Chemists) and of professional unions (AFL-CIO) as well. This was an extremely interesting meeting which brought to the attention of the corporations some alternative ways of thinking about the professional needs of chemists in terms and in a form that was more impressive than anything that was done before. In December of 1972 the Corporation Associates meeting discussed, "The Role of the ACS and Industrial Research in the Evolving Federal Science Policy." Here again we tried to open a window onto the relationships between corporations involved in chemistry and the policies of the U. S. government.

In all of its activities, the Corporation Associates has frequently and openly published reports of their activities. These reports are available to interested parties from the offices of the ACS. The annual meetings are the only self-generated activities of the Corporation Associates. Otherwise they respond strictly to invitations and requests from the ACS to help in ongoing activities of the Society. Never has the Corporation Associates approached the Society with recommendations to initiate programs of interest to the corporations or in any way to modify their programs to please the corporations. Thus, the Corporation Associates is and remains a body aimed at the welfare and improvement of the ACS in the functions and roles assigned to it by its duly elected representatives. The Corporation Associates has no voice in any of the deliberations of the Council of the ACS or of the Board of Directors. It doesn't, as do other committees, even have a representative sitting on the council. Its function is as the name suggests strictly that of an associate. There are no plans to alter this basic relationship.

Why Chemists Should Belong to Unions

**Jack Golodner, Executive Secretary
Council of AFL-CIO Unions for Scientific,
Professional, and Cultural Employees**

In the midst of World War II — when the technical professions became overwhelmingly salaried rather than self-employed — when scientists and engineers and others in the technical professions began to see their work rationalized, bureaucratized and otherwise organized to suit the mass organization and displace the individual practitioner and small unit enterprise, Albert Einstein told the National Wartime Conference, "I consider it important, indeed urgently necessary for intellectual workers to get together, both to protect their own economic status and, also, generally speaking, to secure their influence in the political field."

As in so many other areas, Einstein was ahead of his time. Few others could see what he saw. Here we are, in 1972, still talking about how or whether the salaried scientist should organize — politically and economically, a matter which Einstein thought obvious, necessary — indeed urgent — in 1944.

Too often, I am asked to speak to groups similar to your own about our Council's position on such things as retraining and salary administration, layoff and rehiring procedures, pensions and their portability, sabbatical leave programs in industry, the government's role in stimulating employment and, unfortunately sometimes, unemployment in the technical professions.

All of these issues relate to the economic benefits and working environment provided today's salaried professional. Some must be resolved within the employer-employee relationship — others in the legislative forums of the nation. *All* play a part in determining the technical professional's status in our society and the wellbeing of his professions. But important as these issues are, more important at this stage, is the means by which they are resolved — and this involves the question of organization.

Assuming early vesting of pensions is desirable — and I believe it is — how will it be achieved? Will management voluntarily concede the value of such a program to the nation and professions and unilaterally adopt it? Or must the details be negotiated and formalized in a written agreement? If it is to be worked out in a binding agreement, who are the parties? Who represents the salaried scientists in such economic matters?

Or should government be urged to step in and regulate the private pension field? If so, where is the vehicle which will bring the chemists' message — despite competing employer interests — to the attention of Congress and the nation? In sum, there are solutions to the many problems facing the salaried chemist and his profession, at the workplace and in the political arena, but there must be a means for pursuing them; means that are realistic in terms of our post industrial age and the relationship it imposes on the professional; means that insure the independent autonomous participation of the

salaried professional in all decisions affecting his profession and his work. In short, there must be an organization that is of, by and for the salaried chemist that can serve, as Einstein urged, his economic and political interests.

Unions provide the vehicle, and collective bargaining and legislative action provide the method by which the salaried professional of today can, together with his peers, further his goals, on whatever issues, with his employer, the government and the general public.

Judging by its growing popularity among the several major professions, the union-style of organizing and addressing the problems of the employee-professional appears to be eminently suited to the situation in which the salaried professional finds himself. In the arts, on the nation's campuses and in our schools, in journalism, nursing, and government, the moving force in behalf of the professions is unionism. Today, close to 3 million professional people are represented by unions or organizations that follow the precepts of unions and engage in collective bargaining with the employers of their members. This number is almost half of all professional people eligible for participation in collective bargaining under present law.

Though unions and collective bargaining are well known in many professions, they are new concepts in the technical professions, so perhaps it will be useful to identify what a union is and what it does. I am well aware of the myths, half-truths, and the unsavory mystique in which unions are dressed by those who oppose them and those who are ignorant of them, particularly in the professional fields. But stripped of all the epithets, as well as the mystery and the romance, it is widely agreed that *a union is simply a continuous association of wage or salary earners formed for the purpose of maintaining or improving the conditions of their working lives.*

Now, you may say the American Medical Association and the Bar Association are continuing associations working to improve and maintain the working or professional lives of their members. But their membership is overwhelmingly self-employed — they are not salary or wage earners. The legal and medical professions are probably the last remaining "free" professions while most of our other major professions are, today, typified by the employed, salary earning practitioner. For this reason, associations such as the AMA and ABA cannot serve as practical models for other professionals. Their tactics and techniques for serving their members are effective but for the self-employed, not for the salaried professional.

The legal and medical professions have been able to maintain professional control primarily because the way in which the practitioners of these professions are retained — as self-employed entrepreneurs — provides them with the necessary bargaining power to

insist upon it. Furthermore, because their members are similarly situated vis-a-vis their clients and the public, they have been able to shore up this power by organizing fairly homogeneous, tight knit organizations that can police their professions and, in effect, confront those who would negotiate for their services with a monopolistic situation.

But today's salaried professional faces a vastly different set of circumstances and though his goals may be similar to the free professions, his methods must take into consideration a different work environment. For this reason, he is looking to organizations that acknowledge these facts in his professional life:

First, that professionals are no longer typically self-employed people enjoying a client relationship, but in the great majority are employed people trying desperately to preserve some of the attributes of the client relationship within an employer-employee situation.

Second, that there are essential differences of interest between those who employ and those who are employed.

Third, that the displacement of the classic client relationship by the employer-employee relationship coupled with the increasing size and scope of employing institutions has reduced the relative bargaining strength of the individual professional so that he can restore a measure of balance with those who employ him and those he serves only by organizing with his peers and negotiating an enforceable contract or code of professional work rules through the process of collective bargaining.

And fourth, the centralization of the American political system and the increasing influence of government at the workplace requires the professional to organize and seek allies on a national and even international scale in order to effectively participate in public policy decisions that may affect his career, his family and his profession.

I think we can all agree that the predominant working situation for the professional today is that characterized by the employer-employee relationship. To some, the employer has become the client. To others the employer is a third party intervening between the professional and the public he serves. In either case, the ability of the professional to control the nature and quality of his work and set his compensation in accordance with standards agreed upon by his colleagues is impaired.

Why is this so? Because as I stated in my second point, there is an essential difference of interests between those who employ and those who are employed, and an organization that is incapable of recognizing this cannot be effective in representing the salaried professional.

Now I know, as one who has been educated in the law and indoctrinated in the ways of the legal family, that there is a desire to

Unions — cont'd

think in terms of one big profession. Once a lawyer, always a lawyer, regardless of whether one is drafting briefs in a small backroom cubby hole or heading the firm. I am sure many chemists feel the same way. But, deep down, we know this to be a myth, at least insofar as a community of economic interest is concerned. The employer-lawyer must first of all worry about the firm's costs, payroll, taxes and its competitive position. The employee-lawyer cares about these things too, but he also has other concerns — his career status, his pay check, his costs of maintaining a home, educating his kids, etc. In law and in medicine, where professionals work in relatively small units and where mobility upward is great, wherever these concerns clash, they can be reconciled in one to one discussions or, at worst, they can be dismissed as only temporary differences because in most cases, they are.

But, a great number of professionals working for private institutions or government do not work in an environment where meaningful one to one relationships are possible and they will not move up to own or manage their own firm, business, agency or institution some day. Differences between their concerns and the employer's concerns are not temporary.

And it is nonsense to say that a professional with management responsibilities is capable of articulating and furthering the interests of the employee-practitioner because sometime ago he went to the same schools, read the same books and joined the same societies. Obviously, there are areas where his interests as a manager are in conflict with the employee's. The scientist as employer or manager and agent of the employer is a different man because he is in a different position from the scientist as employee and one should not presume to speak for the other.

There is nothing unprofessional about acknowledging that there are different and sometimes competing interests created in a profession by the employer-employee relationship. To the contrary, I believe it is unprofessional and damaging to our professions not

to recognize such conflicting interests. It is in the interests of a profession to see to it that differences between those who provide professional services and those that purchase them are not ignored but are properly heard and that procedures are developed for resolving conflict.

This brings me to my third fact of contemporary life facing the salaried professional and his organizations — the need to organize for collective bargaining purposes. The institution of collective bargaining carried on by free unions and free management represents one of the great social inventions of our time. Collective bargaining provides a system of due process for the resolution of differences between employees and employers. While associations of the self-employed, free professions can and do set fees and institute methods to safeguard the economic security and status of their professions by fiat, the salaried professional can find comfort and security only in an enforceable contract which he has bargained with his employer. Recalling Oliver Wendell Holmes' admonition that, "Freedom of contract begins where equality of bargaining power begins," he must negotiate collectively in company with his peers.

This is not to say that individual agreements are eliminated when salaried professionals bargain through their unions. Insofar as economic standards are concerned, several unions of professionals bargain only to establish *minimum levels* while individuals freely negotiate above the standard.

In their formative years, teachers, artists, journalists, and many other professions made the same mistake of trying to adapt the methods of the self-employed rather than the employed to their salaried situation. In time, they all learned that such methods were useless in their situation while the processes of collective bargaining were in tune with their real situation, and effective!

I have mentioned the increasing centralization of government and the need to develop a capability for coping with public policy matters on a national scale. I suggest that the

role of today's professional unions is to act as the vehicle for such lobbying efforts.

You may have noticed that unions — particularly AFL-CIO unions — can be pretty effective in this arena. The teachers, the actors, musicians, journalists and others have found that by climbing out of their ivory towers and ending their splendid but ineffectual isolation and by reaching out to other salary earners, and wage earners as well, they have been able to communicate their special position and win valuable allies as well as votes in the political game which is government.

In his relations with his employer, in his dealings with government and his efforts to communicate to the general public, the salaried professional finds that unity with his colleagues provides him with the strength of common interests. And through collective bargaining, he achieves an effective method of participating in the decision-making which affects his career, his profession, his working life.

The role of the professional union, like most unions, is to provide its members with the means to defend and enhance their status in a society that is becoming increasingly organized in the plant and nation.

As one observer put it, "The value of a union to its members lies less in its economic achievements than in its capacity to express their dignity. Viewed from this angle, employees — white collar, no less than manual workers — have an interest in union organization, however favorable their economic circumstances or the state of the labor movement, for at least two reasons. They are interested in the regulation of labor markets and of labor management because such regulation defines their rights, and consequently their status and security, and so liberates them from dependence on chance and the arbitrary will of others. Equally, they are interested in participating as directly as possible in the making and administration of these rules in order to have a voice in shaping their own destiny and the decisions on which it most depends."

APPLICATION FORM — DPR-ACS

I am a member of the American Chemical Society. Please enroll me as a member of the Division of Professional Relations. Enclosed is \$4* to cover dues through December 31, 1974.

*Make checks payable to DPR-ACS.

Signature _____

Printed Name _____

Last

First

Address _____

Mail to: Division of Professional Relations
American Chemical Society
P. O. Box 286
Rahway, New Jersey 07065

Divisional Elections

In anticipation of rapid acceptance of our bylaws by the ACS powers that be, we are going ahead with plans for election of officers. The current executive committee was appointed by the President of the Society to serve while the Division was on probationary status. Our proposed bylaws would expand the executive committee from seven to thirteen members.

We offer the following *preliminary* list of candidates:

Office	Candidate	Local Section
Chairman	Gordon Nelson	Eastern New York
Chairman-elect	Warren Niederhauser	Philadelphia
Secretary	Robert Olsen	North Jersey
Treasurer	Myron Linfield	North Jersey
Councilor (2)	Dennis Chamot	Delaware
	Norman Pinkowski	St. Louis
At-Large (7)	John Connolly	Dayton
	Stanley Drigot	Chicago
	Thomas Fitzsimmons	Omaha
	Esther Hopkins	Northeastern
	Louis McIntire	Sabine (Texas)

We invite other suggestions, especially to fill at least two more positions as Member-at-large.

Current DPR Executive Committee—

Thomas J. Fitzsimmons, Chairman

Gordon L. Nelson, Vice-Chairman

Norman Pinkowski, Secretary

Myron Linfield, Treasurer

Dennis Chamot, Editor, *Professional Relations Bulletin*

Warren D. Niederhauser

Robert T. Olsen

A Community Development Corporation for Entrepreneurial Professionals

Charles G. Arcand, Jr., President

Institute for Innovation and Development

The Institute for Innovation and Development is to be the first Community Development Corporation for entrepreneurial professionals. It will use a human definition of community. Its members will work in a participatory manner to start up innovative high potential ventures, as well as various income oriented low potential ventures as a means of survival. It is based upon the narrow definition of career progression now prevalent in industry, which according to the "principle of the cornered rat" ¹ forces individuals to start their own business as they have become "overeducated" for other meaningful positions. Such individuals may constitute the

new minority as ones whose "participation in the free enterprise system is hampered because of social or economic disadvantages."

IID is modeled after the Community Development Corporation movement in the United States. CDC's, some 200 in number, are located primarily in "ghetto" and economically depressed areas. IID will not be limited to any specific geographic area; presently we have concentrations of contacts in the following areas, and would welcome more: Boston, Albany-Schenectady-Troy, Seattle, New York City, Virginia-Maryland, and Columbus, Ohio.

Initially funded by memberships, IID hopes to get foundation and government money (NSF R&D Incentives Program; NBS Experimental Technology Incentives Program) to assist its members start ventures.

For more information, contact the author, at Institute for Innovation and Development, 338 Brandywine Ave., Schenectady, N.Y. 12307.

I. C.G. Arcand, Jr., "A New Role for the Professional Society — SBIC," *Chem. Tech.*, 1, 109, Feb. 1973.

Backlash

A suggestion has been made to the Council which would, if adopted, emasculate the powers of the President of the ACS.

Anyone who has spent a little time observing the inner workings of the Society knows that the real power, and the place where policy is set, is in the Council committees. At present, the President, immediately upon taking office, appoints about half the members of each of these committees, and the chairmen. This is, I think, a very effective way to get continual member input into policy making organs of our Society, because the President is the

only officer elected by the total membership.

The suggestion that has been made, and which will be voted on at the next national meeting in Los Angeles, is that a new Committee on Committees be established. It would have several duties, but one of its functions will be to have a veto power over presidential appointments to other Council committees (this isn't as bad as the initial plan; that one removed completely the power to appoint from the President, and gave it to this committee!). This would also be an elective committee, meaning that its members would be elected by the Council (*not* the general membership).

Again, if you have been observing internal ACS politics, you will know that the two committees which are now elected in that manner — Council Policy Committee, and Nominations and Elections — are among the more conservative. There is no reason to assume that this new committee would be any different.

This is an extremely important matter. Make it a point to discuss this thoroughly with your Councilors. This will be voted on in the Spring, but now is the time to start talking to your representatives that will do the voting.

—DENNIS CHAMOT

*Published by the
American Chemical Society*

P. O. Box 47
Wilmington, Del. 19899

Nonprofit Organization U. S. POSTAGE PAID WILMINGTON, DEL. Permit No. 35
