

PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS

BULLETIN

Division of Professional Relations
Box 286, Rahway, N.J. 07065



DENNIS CHAMOT, *Editor*

No. 13
September, 1976

FROM THE EDITOR

Member Input

I would like to direct your attention to one of the questionnaires in this issue, the one for *you* to complete. The members of the Executive Committee (including yours truly) have tried to represent your views before various bodies in the ACS. We have, individually, spoken to a great many of you, and we feel we have a reasonably good idea of what your interests are. However, we would like to make sure we get your input on several major issues now before the Society. Hence, the questionnaire.

I would be most grateful if you would complete the form now (or a photocopy, if you want to preserve your Bulletin intact), and return it to me at the address indicated. Anonymity will be preserved, and the totals will be reported later.

Needless to say, any other comments you have would also be most welcome.

Layoff Reports

As you know, the Council Committee on Professional Relations (CPR) is the group that investigates layoffs of chemists. The standard procedure is a long one, and involves field work by ACS staff, discussion by a CPR subcommittee, then by CPR itself, reporting the results to Council at one of the national meetings, and finally, some time later, publication of the findings in *C&EN*.

These published reports have been models of objectivity and accuracy, but some powerful figures apparently object. At a recent meeting of the Society's Board of Directors, the suggestion was made and debated of requiring Board review of these reports before publication.

These layoff reports are the only visible response of the ACS to possible professional mistreatment of laid off chemists. They do not even amount to censure, as they are no more than reports of the fact of the case, good or bad.

CPR has always bent over backwards to be fair to the employers involved. Certainly, the general membership has been interested in these reports. I see no necessity whatsoever for

the increased delay that would occur if Board review were required. And I see no need for review of objective reports. Does someone want to prevent publication?

According to the minutes of the Board's meeting, the issue will be discussed again in December. The Board should not waste its time with this non-issue.

Publication Problems

The observant reader will note that this issue of the *Bulletin* is being mailed from the Washington area. Our experiment with Philadelphia printers had mixed results, mostly bad. We hope we will no longer have the huge delays experienced with the past couple of issues.

We plan at least one more *Bulletin* this year, with papers from the national meeting in San Francisco.

Commercial

Our division has come pretty far since its creation only a few short years ago. We now have about 550 members, a respectable showing compared to other divisions. But considering the broad nature of our subject area, many more ACS members should join. The more members, the greater the clout. Why not go out and sign up a friend?

—Dennis Chamot

SUMMARY OF TREASURER'S REPORT

For the year ended December 31, 1975:

Revenues

Division dues	\$2,089.00
Publications ¹	1,000.00
Meetings	668.82
Interest	182.53
Other	109.48
Total revenues	\$4,049.83

Expenses

Administrative	\$ 703.82
Meetings	578.96
Publications	1,917.79
Bank service charges	9.30
ACS loan ²	1,500.00
Total expenses	\$4,709.87
Net expenses	\$ 660.04

Assets

Cash	\$2,635.94
Less total liabilities	(-864.96)
Net assets	\$1,770.98

1. This is a one time purchase of PR Bulletins by the National Science Foundation.
2. This was given us early in the division's existence to help get DPR started, and has now been repaid to ACS.

THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL SCIENCE COUNSELOR PROGRAM IN THE CHICAGO SECTION

James P. Shoffner
Counselor, Chicago Section

In October 1973, Dr. William Bailey, who at that time was president-elect of the American Chemical Society, sent out a letter to all councilors and alternate councilors of the Society asking their participation in a Legislative Counselor program. Briefly, the aim of the program was to assign a Legislative Counselor to each of the Representatives and Senators in the U.S. Congress. The person so assigned would be responsible for passing on to the Legislator the official position of the ACS on public policy matters. He (she) could also speak to the legislator on other matters for which the Society did not have an official position but in these instances he would be speaking as an individual and not as a representative of the Society. There were other guidelines, but basically this was the essence of the program.

When I received the request as a councilor of the Chicago Section, I had to turn it down, since I was already a local section Legislative Counselor and chairman of a newly organized Chicago Section Committee on Chemistry and Public Affairs. However, Bill Bailey is a persistent, persuasive person and when he asked me to help him to get a program started in Illinois I agreed to do so. I felt comfortable in doing this for several reasons, despite the fact that I could not serve as a counselor. First, I felt that there were — and are — many positive aspects to the program and although the potential problems were many, the potential benefits were great. Second, as chairman of our local CCPA, I had already had some contact with legislators. I felt that I was obliged to contribute this experience to the new program. Finally, the CCPA was most likely to be an excellent source of counselors for the program. With the committee as a base, we would have a nucleus of active and concerned counselors with which to begin the program.

President-elect Bailey even gave me a title, Chairman of the Illinois Legislative Counselors. Actually, I was of very little help in what is referred to as downstate Illinois (generally considered to be all of Illinois that is not in the Chicago metropolitan area). But since the Chicago area contains more than half of the representatives and both Illinois Senators reside in the area, it was possible to help in the appointment of a majority of the Legislative Counselors from Illinois. With the new mechanism for the appointment of counselors as spelled out in the latest guidelines for the Science Counselor program, there is no longer a need for the overall role that I filled at the inception of the program. The program has undergone many changes since its inception, one of which was a name change. The original Legislative Counselors are now called Congressional Science Counselors and they will be referred to by that title for the balance of

this article.

By the time of the 1974 Spring national meeting in Los Angeles, most of the counselors were assigned to their respective legislators. Wherever possible a councilor or alternate councilor was assigned to the representative in his home district. In some districts, there were several volunteers and a choice had to be made among them. In some cases it was possible to make assignments in adjoining districts where there were no ACS members who volunteered as counselors. Eventually, all but three legislators from Illinois were assigned counselors.

We began very early to have meetings of the Illinois counselors who were Chicago Section members. The purpose of these meetings was to exchange ideas and information on how best to approach legislators, interact with their staff and in the beginning, review the experience of the Section CCPA in dealing with various legislators. Attempts were made to interact with downstate counselors and a caucus was scheduled for the Chicago National ACS meeting in August, 1975. None of these attempts were successful and I must conclude that interaction on a statewide basis is just not practical.

On the whole, I feel that our program in the Chicago Section got off to a good start considering the obstacles. There were several factors that we had in our favor. One was the existence of an active CCPA. The major factor was and still is the presence in the program of some dedicated individuals who brought with them a number of skills from previous experiences. Their consistent, aggressive work has led to the formation of cordial and productive relationships with their respective legislators. It is their story that I shall attempt to tell for the remainder of this article.

Dr. Carl Moore is the Congressional Science Counselor for Rep. Abner Mikva (D., 10th). He was originally assigned to Rep. Sam Young (R., 10th) and when Mikva defeated Young in the 1974 election he stayed on as counselor for Mikva. Dr. Moore has developed an excellent working relationship with Rep. Mikva. He has ready access to him either by phone or in person at his office when he is in the district. During one of his contacts, they discussed the Bauman amendment on Congressional review of NSF grants. Rep. Mikva was able to give Dr. Moore a copy of the Congressional Record showing his action in introducing a motion to table the amendment. He expressed concern to Dr. Moore that he had not heard from any scientists in his district concerning the bill and expressed a wish that scientists would contact him about any legislation pertaining to science and technology.

Dr. Moore brings an excellent background in his tasks as counselor. He has long been an advisor to the government of the village where he lives on matters relating to science and

technology. In this capacity he organized a panel of experts in various disciplines. So he is no stranger in interacting with public officials and this undoubtedly has helped him a great deal in establishing an excellent working relationship with Rep. Mikva. His advice and accounts of his experiences have been most valuable to the program.

Dr. Ellis Field was cited in C & EN for his accomplishments as a Science Counselor to Sen. Stevenson (D., Ill.). He has sent the Senator copies of all of the ACS official position papers along with a cover letter discussing the statement and pointing out salient features. The Senator has acknowledged receipt of the material, sometimes describing in his letters the specific actions taken regarding the legislation. Dr. Field has visited with either the Senator or his staff on several occasions while he was in Washington. His relationship with Sen. Stevenson has been and continues to be a fine example of the interaction of a scientist with a legislator.

Roger Harper worked in the successful election campaign of Rep. Russo (D., 3rd). Although Roger lives outside the 3rd district, his work in the campaign, the fact that he was a founding member of the Section CCPA, and his activities as member of many area political groups made him a natural choice to serve as the counselor to Rep. Russo. He has been asked and responded to requests for information regarding the ACS position on various legislative issues.

Stanley Drigot has had contact with the office staff of Rep. Yates (D., 9th) although he has not yet met the Congressman personally. Stan tells a story with an interesting switch. When a secretary in Rep. Yates office found out that Stan was a chemist, she asked him for assistance in finding a job for her son who at that time was completing a post-doctorate in chemistry. In most instances it is the constituent who comes to the legislator's office seeking a job or favor.

Many other Counselors have contacted their representatives with varying degrees of success. Having a successful relationship requires that the legislator be receptive to the idea of receiving scientific information and some of them are not. It doesn't mean that they are necessarily hostile; usually their attitude simply reflects a lack of awareness of matters related to science. I think that instances where we have already been successful in establishing fruitful contacts allows us to make several suggestions regarding how best to go about forming a successful relationship. They are as follows.

1. Do not be discouraged if your initial attempts to see the legislator are unsuccessful.
2. Form a good relationship with the staff. This is often a prerequisite to meeting

QUESTIONNAIRE

We want *your* views. Please return this form (or a photocopy) to Dennis Chamot, Suite 608, 815 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

I. ACS Structure and Activities

1. Are you aware of the suggestions for changing ACS structure that have resulted from the A.D. Little Study and associated Task Forces? Yes ___ No ___

2.a. The local section/division Councilor ratio is currently approx. 450/54. Should *divisional* representation be

greater ___ the same ___ less ___

2.b. If the ratio should be changed, which of the following systems do you prefer (NB – currently, each division has two councilors, regardless of size; the number of councilors for each section depends upon membership in the section, whether active or not):

___ A. Member may vote for *either* a section or division councilor, not both. Divisional representation to be based on size.

___ B. Member votes for both section and division councilors. Representation of each unit to be based on size.

___ C. As B, but limit to no more than one division.

___ D. As C, but have a constant number of councilors per division, greater than the present two.

3. There are currently Council committees that report to the Council, and Board committees that report to the Board. Should all be combined into joint committees, with membership from (and reporting to) both bodies?

Yes ___ No ___

4. Should the Council have the authority to overrule Board actions?

Yes ___ No ___

5. Do you favor a direct referendum system (vote by the membership at large) for overruling decisions by:

a. Council Yes ___ No ___

b. Board Yes ___ No ___

II. Professionalism

6. Are you familiar with the ACS Professional Employment Guidelines?

Yes ___ No ___

7. Do you have any suggestions for improving the Guidelines and/or making them more effective? Yes ___ No ___

If yes, please send comments with this questionnaire.

8. Are you satisfied with *C&EN* coverage of professional matters? Yes ___ No ___

9. Do you favor (check only one):

___ voluntary registration of chemists

___ mandatory licensing of chemists

___ unionization of chemists

___ none of these

10. Should "professional relations" be a part of undergraduate or graduate curricula? Yes ___ No ___

11. The *Professional Relations Bulletin* has carried articles on a wide variety of subjects. What would you like to see in future issues (old or new subjects)?

12. Do you favor increased ACS efforts with government in areas of professional concern to chemists? Yes ___ No ___

13. ACS testimony before Congressional committees, as well as other public statements on selected topics, are issued only by the Board. Do these statements of policy require broader input from the general membership, or is the current procedure (which usually includes selective input by committees and individuals outside the Board) satisfactory?

Currently satisfactory ___

Needs broader input ___

14. Layoffs of chemists are investigated by the Council Committee on Professional Relations, whose reports are then published in *C&EN*. Would you want these reports reviewed first by the Board (this has been suggested. See minutes of Board meeting for June 4, 5, 1976, no. 18). Yes ___ No ___

III. DPR

15.a. In the past, members of the DPR Executive Committee have endorsed two candidates for ACS Director, Warren Niederhauser and Gordon Nelson. Both have been active in the division. Should the Executive Committee formally endorse candidates? Yes ___ No ___

15.b. If yes, should they endorse candidates for President-elect of the ACS?

Yes ___ No ___

15.c. Should they endorse candidates for Regional Director, whether or not those individuals endorsed are members of the Division? Yes ___ No ___

16. How can this division be of greater help to you with personal professional development? _____

17. Do you have any suggestions for future symposia or other activities for this division? _____

18. Any other comments – _____

Name

Address

POSTMASTER: IF UNDELIVERABLE AS
 ADDRESSED, PLEASE RETURN TO:
 DIVISION OF PROFESSIONAL REALTIONS
 AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY
 1155 SIXTEENTH ST., N.W.
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

*Published by the
 Division of Professional Relations
 American Chemical Society*

Nonprofit Organization U.S. POSTAGE PAID Permit No. 23 Beltsville, Md.

OPEN THOUGHT SQUELCHED

The following column appeared recently under the above title, in the February 1976 issue of Industrial Research. We think the results are frightening enough to bear repeating, so they are being reprinted here (with permission).

FREE SPEECH in the laboratory and in the office seems to have its limits.

While nearly half of the 2,000 readers who responded to *Industrial Research's* November Opinion Poll Questionnaire, "how much free speech?", reported they could speak their minds about management without fear, and a third of the respondents indicated they felt their freedom of expression had increased in the past five years, responses to other questions in the questionnaire presented a different picture.

Expression of personal views has resulted at least once in being fired for 13% of the respondents. The obstacle to expression cited by the respondents most frequently was difficulty in reaching the appropriate people (24%).

1. Have you ever been fired as a result of expressing your views?
 Yes 13% No 87%
2. In your opinion, what is the most significant obstacle within your company to expressing your feelings about your job, company, or technical issues?
 Fear of reprisal from employer 14%
 Difficulty in reaching appropriate people who will listen 24
 Employment atmosphere that squelches expression of opinions 14
 All of the above 20
 None of the above 28

3. Can you speak your mind about management without fear of reprisals from your present employer?
 Yes 49% No 51%
4. Does your employer encourage you to speak out on issues?
 Yes 37% No 63%
5. Have you ever been given formal warning against expressing your opinion on specific subjects?
 Yes, clearly 14%
 Yes, indirectly 27
 No 59
6. Have you ever been blacklisted or reprimanded for your expressions by your employer?
 Yes 24% No 76%
7. If yes, what form did this take?
 Blacklisting 5%
 Warning from superior 29
 Harsh warning with threat of
 punitive action 14
 Loss of job status 14
 Demotion or reduction in salary 6
 Missed getting raise 18
 Termination of employment 9
 Other 5
8. Do you think the situation regarding freedom of expression has changed much in the past five years?
 Yes, better 32%
 Yes, worse 17
 No 51

SHOFFNER — continued

the congressman or congresswoman. Most of your contacts will continue to be with the staff even if you do meet the legislator.

3. Be as knowledgeable as possible about the legislator with regard to his (her) membership on committees and subcommittees, voting record, overall political philosophy, and attitude toward and knowledge of science.
4. When transmitting official policy statements, always send a cover letter giving an explanation of the policy statement.
5. Become knowledgeable and interested in politics and government generally. The most successful counselors seem to be those who have a long history of activity and interest in political and civic activity.
6. Wherever possible share information with other counselors. This may be done through organizing all the counselors in a region or Section as a caucus or committee or informal personal or group contacts. Contacting representatives can be a lonely task and it helps to know what others are doing.

These are but a few very general suggestions. In the final analysis, the building of a successful relationship depends on the complex interaction of a number of factors. On the whole, the establishment of the Congressional Science Counselor program must be considered as a very progressive step of yet unrealized potential. I am pleased to have had a small part in an experiment that has been successful in some of the goals that it was designed to accomplish. I am sure that with the base that has been laid down, it will be more productive in the future.