THE INSTITUTE OF ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONICS ENGINEERS, INC.

TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES BOARD

COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF TECHNOLOGY

Columbia University
Mudd Engineering Building
Conference Room, 1306A

January 19, 1980

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

1. Call to Order and Attendance

Acting Chairman Unger called the meeting to order at 10:30 AM. Present for all or part of the meeting were:

Stephen H. Unger	Frank Kotasek
J. Malvern Benjamin	Gerald Rabow
R.J. Bogumil	Anthony D. Robbi
Hans C. Cherney	Richard Tax
Irwin Feerst	Don Wilson
Richard F. Koch	Irving Engelson (IEEE Staff)

2. Approval of Previous Minutes

The minutes of the November 17, 1979 CSIT meeting were approved.

3. Award Account

ACTION Engelson

Stephen Unger reported that the previous account discrepancy was due to an accounting lag in crediting a $300 contribution. The account balance is now about minus $150. Irving Engelson is to obtain a written statement. No answer has yet been received from Eric Herz regarding resumption of solicitation.

4. Response to Criticism of T&S

EXHIBIT A
MOTION ACTION Engelson, Kotasek, Balabanian

In response to the criticism of T&S indicated in Exhibit A, the following motion was made and approved: That Irving Engelson send the relevant portion of the TAB minutes to Frank Kotasek, and that Kotasek together with Norman Balabanian make an appropriate reply to the criticism of T&S.

5. CSIT Charter

Approval of the CSIT Charter was tabled at the December 7 meeting of TAB because of the "open membership" expressed in paragraph 2.1.2. A motion made by Gerald Rabow to amend paragraph 2.1.2 as follows was approved by a vote of 6 to 2:

MOTION

Member-at-Large: IEEE members of any grade who are subscribers to the CSIT publication and who (a) are serving as CSIT officer, sub-committee chairman, editor, or at any special task approved by CSIT, or who (b) are active in CSIT after having previously served in such a position.

ACTION Rabow — Secretary Rabow is to inform George P. Rodrigue of this amendment. In the discussion of this paragraph, it was generally agreed that the intention remains to encourage maximum participation in CSIT work and meetings. The amendment was designed to overcome, in the least obtrusive manner, the previous flaw that CSIT meetings could be subject to take-overs by outsiders.

6. Choice of Chairman

It was stated by Chairman Stephen Unger and accepted by the Committee that the procedures for choosing a chairman for the coming year would have to be in accordance with the prospective CSIT Charter, which calls for the submission of three names to the TAB Chairman, who will then select one of them as CSIT Chairman. It was agreed to designate the names submitted as first, second, and third choice respectively, and to have separate, successive elections for the three spots.

Stephen Unger was nominated and approved by acclamation as the first choice.

Frank Kotasek was nominated and approved by acclamation as the second choice.

R. Jeff Bogumil, who indicated that he preferred the third slot, was nominated and approved by acclamation as the third choice.

ACTION Rabow — Secretary Rabow is to transmit these choices to George P. Rodrigue.

7. Making CSIT a Society

MOTION — Following an extensive discussion, a motion that it is the sense of CSIT that we want to become a Society was approved by a vote of 6 to 1. The arguments in favor of becoming a Society included more control of our affairs, security against attempts to abolish us, more prestige, the option but not a requirement to publish Transactions, and that conditions have changed so that previous reasons against becoming a Society are no longer valid - with income from T&S and minimal expenses, we would not be financially vulnerable as a Society, and it is no longer the case that we would be the only Society to cut across disciplines.

The topic of how and when to proceed was next taken up. The first step is to collect at least 100 signatures on a petition; Stephen Unger suggested we should try for 1000 signatures to be properly impressive. Frank Kotasek then introduced a draft petition, Exhibit B. It was felt that the draft needed revisions, such as indicating that the proposed society was being converted from CSIT, telling that we were dealing in a different way with topics listed which are in the domain of existing societies, and eliminating such buzz words as arms race and nuclear proliferation. Some members felt than since the petition could set the tone of the new society, more time was needed to think it through, and approval should be postponed to the next meeting. Most members felt that time was critical because of the annual change in TAB membership, and that it would be unwise to incur a two-month delay.

EXHIBIT B

MOTION The following motion was hence approved by a vote of 6 to 2: To approve the wording of the petition, after revision by a committee to include the changes suggested in the discussions. The committee is to consist of Frank Kotasek, Irwin Feerst, Richard Tax, and Stephen Unger.

ACTION Kotasek, Tax Feerst, Unger The revised petition should be distributed to the CSIT members as soon as possible.

8. CSIT Roster

It was agreed that attendees Irwin Feerst, Richard Tax, and Don Wilson should be included in the CSIT roster, and that Stephen Dobrow, Peter D. Edmonds, Michael M. Kutcher, Michael Pessah, Paul Russo, and Larry L. Stine should be deleted from the roster.

ACTION Engelson

9. Suran's Testimony on Energy

Chairman Unger reported the following chronology: He had drafted a letter of correction to be sent by Suran to the House Committee, sent this letter to Suran, but got no response. He thereupon contacted Leo Young, who was initially receptive to sending a modified version of the letter, but subsequently changed his mind in order not to get into a fight with Suran. (The matter was not presented at the December TAB meeting because Mal Benjamin was unable to attend).
Unger suggested that CSIT might send a letter to Congress such as that of Exhibit C.

EXHIBIT C

The following motion, made by Mal Benjamin, was subsequently approved by a vote of 8 to 0 with 2 abstentions:

MOTION To send to the appropriate body of Congress the IEEE position papers on energy, with an explanation of the reason, after one more contact with Leo Young to try to get him to send the letter.

ACTION Unger The letter would be sent by acting Chairman Unger. It should also be put into T&S and the Institute. Further, in the questions put by T&S to candidates for IEEE office, appropriate questions relating to this matter should be included.
The possibility of CSIT instituting charges against Suran before the IEEE Member Conduct Committee was discussed. It was pointed out that, because of the confidentiality provisions, conduct charges could only be made by an individual and not by a body such as CSIT.

10. Proposal on Energy Conservation

Gerald Rabow pointed out that he had included a written description of his proposed Energy Conservation Project for CSIT in the announcement package for this meeting. As one part of such a project, he then suggested the following CSIT conservation activity: promoting the training of engineering students as "House Doctors", through which CSIT might have a significant impact on our energy situation and on the status of the engineering profession. A description of this proposed activity was distributed at the meeting and is included as Exhibit D.

EXHIBIT D

11. Age Discrimination

The following motion, proposed by Irwin Feerst, was approved by a vote of

5 to 2: That CSIT urges the IEEE Publications Board to forbid placement, in any IEEE publication, of employment advertisement that has actual or implied age discrimination. The secretary is directed to so inform Ted Brown, Chairman of the IEEE Publications Board.

ACTION
Rabow

12. Other Business

It was suggested to Irwin Feerst that he write an article on "diploma mills" for T&S.
Irwin Feerst thinks that the IEEE request to seal IEEE records subpoenaed in connection with his small claims suit is a freedom of information issue, and that CSIT should look into it.

13. Other Announcements

Chairman Unger announced that T.L. Hewitt was calling a meeting in the D.C. area. Unger also reported that he had met with Edmonds and Bodner, but had no progress to report here.

14. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held at Columbia University on Saturday, March 15, 1980, at 10:15 AM.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 PM.

Gerald Rabow, Secretary
February 17, 1980

THE INSTITUTE OF
ELECTRICAL AND
ELECTRONICS
ENGINEERS, INC.

345 EAST 47th STREET, NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017

EXHIBIT A

TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES BOARD

CHAIRMAN-TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEES ADMINISTRATION
G. P. Rodrigue
(404) 894-2944

December 18, 1979

PLEASE REPLY TO:
Georgia Institute of Technology
School of Electrical Engineering
Atlanta, GA 30332

Professor Steve Unger
229 Cambridge Avenue
Englewood, New Jersey, 07631

Dr. J. Malvern Benjamin
Cardiassist, Inc.
167 Old Belmont Avenue
Bala Cynwyd, PA., 19004

Dear Steve and Mal:

The TAB OPCOM on December 6th recommended approval of the CSIT charter with the following amendment:

> 2.5.3 The Newsletter shall follow normal journalistic standards in terms of fair, accurate, and balanced presentation. In addition, the Newsletter as an IEEE publication, has a special responsibility for maintaining technical accuracy in its articles.

This statement was prompted by comments that recent Newsletters contained articles/ editorials that were not entirely factual and that letters written to the Newsletter had been edited before printing and accompanied by excessive rebuttals by the editor. These criticisms are similar to some charges made against the Institute in the past.

The CSIT Charter that was proposed for action at the December 7th TAB meeting was tabled and will have to be considered at a later meeting. The point of contention was the "open membership" expressed in paragraph 2.1.2. This came under heavy fire and would have prevented passage. I believe that a solution might be found in replacing that membership classification by something like:

> 2.1.2 Elected Members: Eight IEEE members of any grade who are elected to membership on the Committee by mail ballot of subscribers to the Newsletter. This election shall be conducted in the fourth quarter of each calendar year. The CSIT Chairman shall appoint a nominating committee by March 1 of each year. This Committee shall solicit nominations and publish in the Newsletter a slate of 16 nominees. The eight nominees receiving the largest number of votes shall be the elected members. In the event of a tie, the CSIT Chairman shall cast a deciding vote.

In other words, something like an elected ADCOM....treating your Newsletter subscribers as members....might be a salable commodity.

I mentioned to Mal that CSIT might consider moving ahead to form a Group or Society to overcome the constant criticism that it lives off of G/S funding, while carping at their technology. The Engineering Management Society might be used as a

model of sorts, and your Newsletter subscribers could form a nucleus of membership. I'm enclosing some pertinent sections from the IEEE Constitution and Bylaws.

The CSIT proposed revision of Policy Statement 14 was made a discussion item by TAB OPCOM. The feeling of those at the TAB meeting was that while some modifications might be in order, it was too early for action. Some time should be given to work with the present system. An assessment of it could better be carried out after such a trial period. The CSIT recommendations will be passed on to Don Brereton and others involved with this Policy Statement.

The CSIT Position Statement on "The Application of Systems Engineering to Societal Problems" was not approved as an IEEE Position Paper by TAB OPCOM and TAB. It was noted that TAB approval is not required, but rather the approval of the TAB Chairman (who admittedly has in the past solicited TAB's approval). Dr. Hogan did not attend these TAB OPCOM and TAB meetings. The sentiment expressed by those at the meetings was that -

a.) timely need was not seen in this case

b.) the purpose of the paper was well served in its present form as an IEEE Entity Statement

c.) not all entity statements should become IEEE Position Papers.

These are, I'm afraid, very abridged versions of relatively lengthy discussions. I'd be glad to discuss all this at greater length by telephone sometime when it is convenient. Please ponder the CSIT membership question, and let me know how you feel about it. The next TAB meeting is February 15th in Houston, Texas, and the deadline for material will probably be around January 7th. Please have CSIT develop a slate of nominees for Chairman (as though the Charter were working). Bob Larson has been named IEEE Vice President for Technical Activities for 1980, and he has asked me to continue in this role for another year.

Sincerely yours,

G. P. Rodrigue,
Chairman,
Technology Committees Administration

GPR:sr

Encls

cc: Mr. Irving Engelson
IEEE
345 East 47th Street
New York, New York, 10017

EXHIBIT B

draft

F. Kotasek
1/18/80

PETITION TO FORM AN IEEE ~~GROUP ON TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIETY~~ SOCIETY ON SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF TECHNOLOGY

The undersigned IEEE members (above student grade) hereby petition the Executive Committee of the IEEE to authorize the formation of a Professional ~~Group~~ Society on ~~Technology and Society~~ Social Implications of Technology as described below.

The purpose of this group is to promote among IEEE members a sensitivity to the impact of their technology on society, to develop means to predict and evaluate that impact, and to enhance the engineer's and the public's understanding of the benefits and costs of technological options.

Some pertinent topics are environmental quality, energy policy, effects of information technology on privacy, application of systems engineering to societal problems, the arms race and nuclear proliferation, effects of automation on life and work, implications of bioelectronics and medical technology, engineering ethics and professional responsibility, role of government in research and development, and the engineer's application of ~~his~~ technical knowledge to community affairs.

These purposes shall be pursued by encouraging research and study, by the publication of the resulting reports and treatises, by the holding of meetings for the reading and discussion of papers, and by any other activities necessary, suitable,and proper for the fulfillment of these objectives. In keeping with the broad interests implicit in the purposes of this group, papers and articles shall be comprehensible to the non-specialist reader engineer.

Signature Name (please print)

.....

.....

draft 1/18/80 EXHIBIT C

LETTER TO CONGRESSIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS RE SURAN TESTIMONY

Honorable _____
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman _____,

On 11 April 1979, Mr. Jerome J. Suran, who was then president of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), presented testimony intended to represent IEEE's position on energy policy to the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the House Appropriations Committee. However, as a consequence of the short interval between invitation and presentation, Mr. Suran's testimony failed to reflect IEEE's official position accurately. In particular:

(1) The emphasis on nuclear energy appeared almost to exclude all alternatives.
(2) No mention was made of energy conservation, which, according to official IEEE policy, "should be given the highest national priority in energy planning."
(3) Also inconsistent with IEEE policy was the discounting of solar energy as a significant resource.

The enclosed complete set of officially-adopted IEEE energy policy statements (particularly those on conservation and solar energy) may help to give you a more accurate view of IEEE's position on energy. These have been approved ~~by the IEEE Energy Committee and have been (or are in the process of being) endorsed~~ by the IEEE Board of Directors.

Sincerely yours,

Stephen H. Unger
Chairman, IEEE Committee
on Social Implications of Technology

Copies to Committee staff

enc: complete set of IEEE Energy Statements and Policies

EXHIBIT D

CSIT Conservation Activity - Energy Conservation House Doctor

One activity which CSIT might try to promote is a course to train engineering students as "house doctors" to advise home owners on appropriate energy conservation measures for their houses, and to implement simple fixes. (Figures of 15 - 20% fuel savings without loss of comfort have been quoted for such fixes, and an overall savings from retrofit of as high as 75% [1] .) The availability of a sufficient number of such "house doctors" (we may want to come up with a better name) appears to be a key requirement to realize a large potential for energy savings. In addition to helping solve the energy problem, such training for many or all engineering students would have the following benefits:

1. Even if the opportunity to practice "house doctoring" never materializes, such a course would be worthwhile on its own merits for learning interdisciplinary engineering and as an introduction to social implications of technology.

2. If the opportunity to practice does come about (and I believe that it should, and probably will), then students would have the opportunity for part time or temporary work, that is relevant, toward financing their education. Note that if the energy savings are to be realized soon, then the peak need for this occupation would be for relatively few years.

3. There would probably be some demand for this service for a longer period, thus providing back-up employment for engineers, and hence a stronger economic position for all engineers.

4. Having this service provided by engineers or prospective engineers will (if properly provided) enhance the profession, giving opportunity for direct contact between engineers and the public.

Gerald Rabow
January 13, 1980

[1] Marc H. Ross and Robert H. Williams, "Drilling for Oil and Gas in Our Buildings", Report PU/CEES 87, Center for Energy and Environmental Studies, Princeton University, July 17, 1979.