

Minutes according to the band recorder

INTERNATIONAL ERGONOMICS ASSOCIATION

Minutes of the Second General Assembly
on Friday, 25th September, 1964, at 6.15 p.m.,
Goldsaal, Westfalenhalle, Dortmund

A g e n d a

- 1 Chairman's Report
2. Treasurer's and Auditors' Report
- 3 Subscription fees for the period 1964 - 1967
- 4 New Articles
- 5 Election of the Chairman (besser President!)
- 6 Election of the Committee
- 7 Varia

FORSSMAN:

Ladies and Gentlemen!

I will declare the Second General Assembly of the International Association opened. You have all the agenda - it has been distributed - and also has been sent by the Secretary. Point 1 is the Chairman's Report. It is very short. You will maybe remember from the Stockholm meeting that we had this Committee for Check List. You have heard the result to-day which I think is an excellent achievement. What I would like to report to-day is that very unexpectedly we had a considerable sum of money left from the Stockholm Congress. This was because ~~that~~ we calculated our finances on a certain number, and we had more participants than we calculated. The organising committee at Stockholm decided to use that extra money in that way that we distributed 11 travel grants for Swedish ergonomist to attend the Second Ergonomics Congress in Dortmund, and then I handed over the other day the rest which is 2000 Swedish crowns, to the Secretary. This is, perhaps, the best

achievement I made as President.

I will now give the word to the Treasurer and Secretary for his report.

Point 2: Treasurer's Report

GRANDJEAN: Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ich habe Ihnen die Abrechnung und den Bericht des Treuhandbüros, das beauftragt worden ist, unsere Buchhaltung zu kontrollieren, im einzelnen nach Hause geschickt. Ich wiederhole hier deshalb nur ganz summarisch die Situation: Wir hatten ein Total von Einnahmen von

4.886,35 sfrs,

ein Total von Ausgaben von

3.879,75 sfrs.

und somit einen Einnahmen-Überschuss von 1.006,60 sfrs.

Dazu ist zu bemerken, daß wir eine gewisse Summe von den Organisatoren des Dortmunder Kongresses zurückbekommen werden, wahrscheinlich rund 2.000 sfrs, was ich ihnen vorgeschossen habe, und zu dem kommt noch der Betrag, der soeben von Herrn Professor FORSSMAN erwähnt worden ist, so daß wir dann heute ein Vermögen von rund 4.500 sfrs. haben.

FORSSMAN: Are there any questions concerning the Chairman's Report and the Treasurer's Report? keine Fragen

FORSSMAN: I would read to you the report of the Auditors, the Swiss firm SALLENBACH & JUDD. They say as follows: "Wir bestätigen Ihnen daher, daß die Buchhaltung korrekt geführt wurde und grüßen Sie, stets gerne zu Ihren Diensten, mit vorzüglicher Hochachtung...". This is the report from the Auditors.

I would then ask if there are any questions concerning the report of the Treasurer. Keine Wortmeldungen.

FORSSMAN: If not, can the General Assembly then release him from responsibility for this three years? I take it as yes. Thank you.

FORSSMAN: I will now give the word to Professor LEHMANN who will give a short report on the financial situation of the international congress in Dortmund.

LEHMANN: Meine Herren, Sie werden noch nicht einen "final report" von mir erwarten, denn wir werden wahrscheinlich noch einige kleine Ausgaben haben, die dazu kommen. Sie haben soeben gehört, daß wir mit einem Vorschuss von 2.000 sfrs angefangen haben, d.h. 1.600,- DM. Ich kann jetzt schon sagen, daß wir mit Sicherheit diese 1.600,- DM zurückgeben. Ich war mir darüber klar, daß die Kongressbeiträge, obwohl sie recht hoch waren, sicher nicht genügen würden, um die Unkosten zu decken, und hatte mich daher bemüht, weitere Mittel von deutschen Firmen, Verbänden und den Gewerkschaften zu bekommen und habe auf diese Weise einen Betrag von 23.550,- DM zusammengebracht. Durch Kongressbeiträge sind rund 35.000,- DM eingegangen, sodaß wir also ohne die 2.000 sfrs rund 58.000,- DM zur Verfügung hatten. Davon wurden ausgegeben:

für Drucksachen usw.	etwa 10.000, -
für die Dolmetscheranlage	14.500,--
für die Dolmetscher	12.300,--
für Mierte der Räume	6.000,--
diverse kleinere Ausgaben	5.000,--
Abendessen am 24.9. (Hälfte von Stadt Dortmund übernommen)	rund 5.000,--

Das sind Ausgaben von rund 53.000,--

Wenn hierzu für Dinge, die noch dazu kommen, 2.000,- DM veranschlagt werden, können wir also mit den 58.000,- DM mit Sicherheit auskommen und vielleicht sogar den Fundus der Gesellschaft noch um einige Mark erhöhen.

FORSSMAN: Are there any questions concerning this report?... If not, we will thank Professor LEHMANN for his efficiency also in this congress, and then we will go on. I would suggest for technical reasons that we change the order and will take the point "New

Articles" first and then No. 3. Kein Widerspruch.

FORSSMAN: I take it as yes. Then we have the problem of the new articles. I give the floor to the Secretary.

GRANDJEAN: Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ich bin als Sekretär in Stockholm beauftragt worden, die Statuten, die 1959 ausgearbeitet worden waren, zu erneuern und zu ergänzen. Dieser Auftrag war festgehalten im Protokoll der letzten Generalversammlung, das dann auch im ERGONOMICS publiziert worden ist. Ich habe mich in diesem Frühjahr dahintergemacht. Gleichzeitig hatte ich Gelegenheit, mit verschiedenen Mitgliedern des Committees und anderen Mitgliedern über die Neuorientierung und die Erneuerung der Statuten zu sprechen. In diesen Diskussionen kam nun mehr und mehr der Wunsch zum Ausdruck, unsere Gesellschaft, die bisher vorwiegend eine Gesellschaft aus persönlichen Mitgliedern war, zu orientieren in eine Gesellschaft, bei welcher die nationalen Gesellschaften das Hauptgewicht bekommen sollten, also in Richtung einer Föderation nationaler Gesellschaften. Ich habe dann, insbesondere anlässlich des Kongresses in Brüssel, der Société de l'Ergonomie de Langue Française, mit Herrn de JONG, Herrn WISNER u.a. Kontakt aufgenommen. In diesen Gesprächen sind wir zu dem Schluss gekommen, daß es wohl noch verfrüht wäre, eine ausgesprochene Föderation nationaler Gesellschaften zu machen. Wir hatten damals nur 2 solche Mitglieder; heute allerdings hätten wir 4. Es ist vielleicht zweckmäßig, daß ich Ihnen in diesem Zusammenhang, schnell sage, wie die Mitglieder-Zusammensetzung heute ist:

Die Mitglieder unserer Gesellschaft rekrutieren sich aus 21 Ländern. Die Gesamtzahl beträgt 173. Wir haben 165 individual members, also Einzelmitglieder, und haben heute 4 nationale Ergonomie-Gesellschaften als Mitglieder und 2 Organ isationen, also Institute, die unter dem alten Namen als associate members figurieren, = total 173. Diese Situation hat uns zu der Auffassung

veranlaßt, daß es verfrüht wäre, jetzt schon eine ausschließliche Gesellschaft nationaler Gesellschaften zu machen, weil dadurch sehr viele Länder, die keine Gesellschaften haben, nicht mehr dabei sein könnten und ihren Einfluss und ihre Möglichkeit zur Mitarbeit verlieren würden. Dazu kommt noch, daß es in einigen Ländern mehr als eine Gesellschaft gibt, in anderen Ländern wieder Gesellschaften, die nicht ausgesprochen ergonomische Gesellschaften sind, z.B. Arbeitsmedizin und dabei noch etwas Ergonomie machen, so daß wir also der Meinung waren, die Situation sei noch nicht reif für eine Föderation nationaler Gesellschaften. Auf Grund dieser Situation haben wir beschlossen, Statuten zu schaffen, die gewissermaßen einen Übergang schaffen von der jetzigen Situation der persönlichen Mitglieder zu einer künftigen Föderation. Wir wollen dabei dafür sorgen, daß die bereits vorhandenen ergonomischen Gesellschaften ein gewisses Gewicht bekommen in der Lenkung der internationalen Gesellschaft. Das ist die Konzeption und die Idee der Statuten, die ich Ihnen als Vorschlag vor einigen Wochen - vor 6 bis 7 Wochen - zugeschickt habe. - Dann haben wir eine Committee-Sitzung gehabt, in der wir nochmals diesen Vorschlag, den ich Ihnen geschickt habe und von dem ich sagen möchte, daß er in erster Linie von Herrn de JONG, von Herrn WISNER und von mir ausgearbeitet wurde, besprochen haben, einiges korrigiert und den Trend in Richtung einer Föderation noch verstärkt haben. Das Ergebnis sind die Vorschläge, die im Vorraum auslagen und die Sie alle bekommen haben (weitere werden verteilt). Das ist das, was ich zu sagen habe.

FORSSMAN: Thank you. You will understand that we have got only a few comments in answer to the Secretary General's letter. There are one or two from Mr. MURRELL, Professor BELDING which have now been included in the revised statutes which you have before you.

Thee

There is one more by Dr. SHACKEL which, as you see since it has been distributed to all of you, includes the ~~xxxxx~~ ^{state} where we are heading, but introduced this at once, that is the federation of societies without individual members. I think we have, therefore, three alternatives to decide upon to-day: first of all if we should keep the old Statutes of Stockholm. I suppose that it is the general wish that we should have new statutes. In this case we would have two alternatives to-day, the proposed statutes of the unanimous ^{which is now before you,} committee, and we have also the other alternative by Dr. SHACKEL. I will now ask for any comments, but I should like to remind you that if you raise any new proposals to-day, we cannot take them up but will refer them to the Committee, for it is impossible to revise statutes just here in the sitting, this must be prepared. It was also mentioned in the letter of the Secretary General that you must present your suggestions in advance, as has been done. If you have other suggestions I shall be glad to hear them, but they will then be referred to the Committee after the closing of the discussion. I will just have your opinion on these three alternatives. Any Comments?

Dr. SHACKEL: Do I understand you, Mr. President, that you are ruling that no amendments may be committed to the Statutes which we have just at this moment received?, as proposed from the Committee?

FORSSMAN: If you have amendments they will have to be referred to the Committee. Very formal amendments may be accepted, but otherwise if you go into details it will be a too lengthy discussion and then we will have to appoint either a special committee or you will have to refer them to the ordinary committee here. It is up to you ^{if you} will have a special committee on statutes. This is what was distributed and said to you in the Secretary General's letter.

SHACKEL: Yes, Sir, but I took the Secretary General's letter to mean that at Dortmund either the Statutes which he distributed with his letter or any other proposals which he received by the 31st of August could come onto the floor of this house, and nothing else at all. If this Assembly is being asked to accept some new Statutes not sent out to the members by post, but put before us now after writing two days ago, I think this is a variance with a sort of ruling which I took the Secretary General to have made in his letter.

FORSSMAN: I would like to explain to you that what was distributed by the Secretary General in his letter you have seen everybody. What is now in the new is in principle a few things. One is, as the Secretary General said, that we like to emphasize the trend to be more towards a federation gradually. Therefore we have reversed the order of organisations and persons. We put the organisations first and then the persons. That is just in the draft, but it shows the trend. We have then introduced ~~then~~ the system suggested by Mr. MURRELL on his voting system, which still make a further stronger trend for the federation, increasing the power of the federations for electing or designating (members in the Committee?) (nicht zu hören). So the main change here in the draft is the trend to strengthen the voting power of the federations or the society members according to the system which was prepared by Mr. MURRELL. This is the change. It is then up to you to say whether you want to have it, if you like to postpone the whole decision to later or if you like to take a decision to-day. I think it will be impossible to have any drafting done to-night. If you like to put any proposals, it is up to you; you can do so, and then it will be referred to a committee.

SHACKEL: What I am in fact asking you is that I would have thought the two correct proposals that are in form and in order is the Statutes which the Secretary General sent round at the end of July and any proposals received in writing by him before 31st August. I am asking you whether it is in fact in order that these revised articles should come before us without any of the members elsewhere as well as here having had time to consider them and to submit further amendments?

Dr. FLOYD:

~~xxxxxx~~ I want to say, Sir, that I am very glad that the Committee of the International Ergonomics Association has decided to move in the direction of a membership by societies and to diminish the individual membership. I think this is the right thing to do at this moment. I think we are moving in the direction that Mr. SHackel wants, and I would not like this meeting to be difficult for technical and legal points, when we had before us a clear indication that the Committee wants to move in a certain direction, but to go on, I would like to feel that we would go on just a little more quickly, and though you don't want to accept any amendments and drafting here now, because in general it is difficult, I wonder whether a very simple amendment to the papers that have just come before us would in fact achieve ~~it~~ very easily this more rapid movement towards societies: If instead of allowing a federated society to put forward 1 member into the Committee you allowed it to put forward 2, and you change it from 7 in article No. 6 to 14, then we should move rather more quickly, because as I see it, with the figures as they are now we should not get away entirely from individual membership until there were 20 societies, unless we change the articles again. With my suggestion I think we would move towards it at 10, and this would probably bring it about in a year or two; and if in this time we still need to have a small individual membership, I believe it would be better achieved by a slight amendment to the articles at that time to permit a continu-

ation of individual membership for a year or two longer. I believe this would meet the wishes of certainly myself and I think a number of other members of the Association. If this could be considered I would be very glad indeed.

FORSSMAN: Thank you, Dr. Floyd.

PREUSCHEN: Unabhängig von der Schwierigkeit, bei 21 Ländern und nur 4 Organisationen darauf die Satzung abzustellen, möchte ich vor dem Vorschlag von Herrn SHACKEL aus meiner Erfahrung warnen, und zwar aus einem ganz anderen Grund. Ich komme gerade aus einer Generalversammlung eines internationalen Verbandes, der 30 Jahre lang bestens funktioniert hat, aus Einzelmitgliedern. Dann haben wir vor 5 Jahren die Statuten mit den nationalen Verbänden gemacht, die ja sehr stark von der UNO propagiert werden. Wir haben seit dieser Zeit uferlose Schwierigkeiten, weil alle die Kollegen, die früher bestens zusammengearbeitet haben, jetzt nicht mehr Kollegen sind, sondern Vertreter eines nationalen Verbandes, Vertreter einer Nation. Wir haben gestern in einem 30jährigen Verband - es ist eine Schande, das zu sagen, - es nicht fertigbekommen, einen Präsidenten zu wählen, weil die nationalen Interessen und die nationalen Verbände nicht unter einen Hut zu bringen waren. Diesen Gesichtspunkt bitte ich sehr zu bedenken, und die Kombination von Einzelmitgliedern und nationalen Verbänden gibt einen sehr guten Ausgleich. Wohin man den Schwerpunkt legen will, mag die Zukunft bringen; aber man soll versuchen, bei internationalen wissenschaftlichen Verbänden die Person zu haben und nicht die Vertretung .

FORSSMAN: Are there other questions or comments?

SHACKEL: Mr. President! What the last speaker has said is exactly what I am anxious to avoid, because I have had just the same experience in the other associations in which I am involved. I want to

point out that at this moment this Association consists of 167 individual members and representatives of 965 at my reckoning individuals elsewhere in the world who are members of the at present - I forgot the correct word - associated members, anyway of the societies who do not even have a vote in the Assembly. Since the societies represented some 920 odd members they outnumber the individual members of this Association by something like 5 : 1. Now if - as it is, I think, inevitable - this International Ergonomics Association, or whatever the name becomes in the years to come, is going to speak for ergonomics at an international level, as presumably it does wish to, and probably it will be looked to speak for ergonomics at an international level, I think, Sir, it is unlikely that the various national societies will allow an international body to speak internationally in their name when they do not even have a majority of the voting either on the Committee or on the General Assembly. I am suggesting that in fact the move towards a union of societies ^s is inevitable in the end, and that unless one does it in one full sloop and one go, one does unfortunately arrive at the sort of difficulties which the last speaker just mentioned and which I also have experienced. My suggestions, my proposals, were in fact aimed to try to achieve that end in one sloop and avoid any difficult phase such as I have seen for six years in an other society.

FORSSMAN: Any further comments and questions? Mr. MURRELL!

MURRELL: As the author of the amendment which found its way into this final draft, I think I might explain that at the moment we have four societies actually attached to this Asso-

ciation, and I find it difficult to come to 900 members in those four societies, but there is a potential at the moment of probably another five, this would cover about 10 countries. Now this could by the next three years, if the remaining five join, bring the number of societies up to 9. But this would still leave some 15 countries who are here at this meeting without any representation in the Council or Committee of the Association. Now in the event that by next Congress we have 9 societies, there would be on the Committee 9 society members or federated members and 7 of the individual members, and this number of 7 individual members remains static until the number of society representatives reaches 13. Now if you feel that 7 is too many, all one has to do as an alternative to Dr. Floyd's proposal is to increase the figure 7, which appears in the rule, to 9 or 12 or any other value you like. If you increase it to 9, the number of individual member representatives will be reduced to 5; if you decide to increase it to 12, then the number ^{of who} ~~which~~ will remain static goes down to 2, ~~so that~~ up to the point at which there are 12 societies and 2 individual members, making 14, and then the number of society members, of course, will start to increase. So it is quite easy by merely altering 7 to a number slightly larger to more rapidly decrease the representation of individual membership, if this is held to be desirable; but the Committee adopted 7 because we felt that even when there are 9 national societies, there will ~~be~~ still be a very large area of the world unrepresented for quite a while on the committee of the national associations. But I don't think that we are to 7 by any means; it could be reduced to say 5 or 4 or 3 or 2, as the wish is of the Meeting.

FORSSMAN: I understand now that we have the proposal discussed if we want to stay on the old statutes (?), we have the Committee proposal with the amendment by Mr. FLOYD, on which I will ask you later, and we have Dr. SHACKEL's proposal. I just would like to ask you before if there are any further questions or comments.

BONJER: Mr. Chairman, I think in order to promote the decision to be taken by this Assembly, we might need some more information on membership. For that reason I would like to put two questions. The first question would be: What are the four societies which are already members? and the second would be: How many individual members out of the 165 are not covered by those four societies?

GRANDJEAN: Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Zu der ersten Frage: Die vier Gesellschaften sind die holländische ergonomische Gesellschaft, die italienische ergonomische Gesellschaft, die Société d'Ergonomie de Langue Française und die Japan Ergonomics Society. Was das an Mitgliedern daraus teilt, kann ich nicht sagen, etwa zwischen 100 und 200. Wir haben z.Zt. rund 165 Einzelmitglieder,

aus Schweden	26	diese gehören keiner Gesellschaft an,
aus Deutschland	7	keiner Gesellschaft
aus England	24	ich vermute, die meisten gehören der Ergo- nomics Research Society an, aber da diese bei uns nicht Mitglied ist, ist also kein Engländer in diesem Fall gleichzeitig bei einem "federated ergonomics member".
Frankreich	13	diese werden wahrscheinlich alle zu S.E.L.F. gehören
Holland	17	diese werden wahrscheinlich alle zu der hollän- dischen Ergonomischen Gesellschaft gehören

Alle anderen Einzelmitglieder gehören zu keiner Gesellschaft:

Schweiz	4	USA	28	Österreich	2
Dänemark	6	Norwegen	1	Israel	1
Finnland	6	Spanien	1	Polen	1
Südafrika	1	Argentinien	1	Italien	4 (keine G)
Japan	19	(diese gehören wahrscheinlich alle zu der japani- schen ergonomischen Gesellschaft;			
Belgien	1	Canada	1	Ungarn	1

FORSSMAN: Thank you. Dr. SHACKEL, please!

SHACKEL: Perhaps I could add to the answer: I understand that there are 125 members of the French speaking society by asking Dr. WISNER. I understand that there are about 140 members of the Dutch Society by asking Dr. LEOPOLD. I have only be able to estimate about 10 members of the Italian Society by reading their journal, and I asked Dr. OSHIMA, he told me that there are about 700 members in the Japanese Society. That's how I came to give that number of 965 I mentioned. I might add that if we add up the main ones that the Secretary General listed, Sweden, Germany, Italy, you get 119, so that 119 out of 165 are in countries which might be expected to join a union of societies. On the question of individuals who are members of the International Ergonomics Association but not members of their national societies, this is an eternal problem at an international level. That is the problem which causes the real difficulties, and the arguments in any international society when it tries to turn itself into a federation of societies when it has once been an effective society of individuals, and this is just that point which I am trying to avoid, Sir. I apologize for causing all the debate, all the paper work that people have had to read, and most particularly all the time that the Committee had to spend. I am trying, in fact, to encourage us all to do what is so often said to be impossible: I want us to learn from the experience of others. I think it is possible that the Committee may have underestimated the willingness of individual members to give up their membership in the general interest of the future of ergonomics at an individual level. The privileges of individual membership are not very high so far; in fact, I think the main privilege is to have saved 2 £ on the conference fee and having paid a membership fee of 3 £ to the IEA. There are the (im Sinne von compensations?) of having tried to lay the founda-

tion of an international organisation, and this is the real thing that people have done. But what I am trying to suggest is that in the end it is inevitable that we as a group should try to move, as you as a Committee have already said, into becoming a federation of national societies. I have seen this over 7 years in another body, and the trouble and discord it creates, and the speaker here has told you just the same thing.

FORSSMAN: You must have misunderstood me. There must have been a wrong (translation?).

SHACKEL: I beg your pardon. Certainly in the international federation in which I have been concerned there has been this problem, and it causes a lot of difficulties when you have individual members and try to move into a federation of societies unless you insist that there are no individual members in countries or areas where there is a society. It is to try and cut that Gordian Knot and to go the full stage without the discord that I am trying to achieve. I believe that we should in this discipline be able to learn from the experience of others; otherwise there is not much hope for us in this world, and I think it is just possible that the Committee may have underestimated the willingness of 165 persons to give up their individual rights and ask the Committee, to charge the Committee in fact, to go away from this meeting and reform this Association as a union in collaboration with the other societies. And if you are accepting amendments, as I infer now you are, - I have been trying to be absolutely strict on procedure, but you have said you would put in an amendment by Dr. FLOYD - in that case I would withdraw, if I may, the statutes that I have suggested and instead put a proposal as a compromise that the Committee should be charged to go away from this meeting and work on three principles:

1. the IEA is to be reformed as a union of societies
2. all individual membership ceases forthwith
3. the Committee is elected to plan the reforming of the IEA with the various societies and produce a set of statutes at the next international meeting on those principles,

and I believe, Sir, that in fact the individual members of this society are prepared to give up their position to do the best thing for the growth of ergonomics on an international level.

FORSSMAN: Would you propose your three points in writing, please. Are there any further questions?

CORLETT: I think, Mr. President, that there is a point in this, but can the International Society provide for individual members? Would it not be better indeed for the Association to actually encourage the local societies who could probably provide better service for individual members than an international organization? And if this is so, ^(why) then do we not take the bull by the horns and move quickly towards a federation? It seems to me that a delay will only produce additional difficulties in this matter.

H. DAVIS, Rochester (USA): The question I have, Mr. Chairman, concerns article 2, and I was wondering where in the first sentence it is stated: "The purpose of this organization is to bring together organisations and persons interested in the scientific approaches and problems of experimental psychology, anatomy and physiology applied to human work and its environment". I was wondering to myself: Is it an oversight that engineering was left out, or it is a deliberate Intention of the Committee? I was wondering whether those who drafted these articles are interested in ~~xxxxxx~~ attracting engineers to the International Ergonomics Association or whether this was an oversight or a deliberate attempt to leave engineering out of that paragraph? - So I must admit that I am biased, I am an engineer.

FORSSMAN: Thank you. Any further questions? Then the discussion is closed, and I would suggest the following procedure: to ask you if you like to keep those Statutes of Stockholm or to move on to change them. In case you like to move on to change them, we have

one other problem: we have then the Committee proposal which is the original sent out by GRANDJEAN with some modifications to move some proposals have been sent in by members. Then, after this has been decided, I will ask you on Dr. SHACKEL's proposal which is a separate one which does not refer to the two the change the articles here . It is a suggestion that the Committee should be charged with a certain job until the next Congress. . If this procedure be accepted Dr. SHACKEL?

SHACKEL: Just to test the feeling of the meeting: could I ask you before putting my suggested compromise, could I ask you just to put the full statutes simply because I went to the work myself in writing them, I would like to test the feeling of the meeting, if you would. Could I ask you to do as you suggested. Oh, I am sorry Could I ask you to do exactly as you suggested: first put the proposals as revised by the Committee, but then secondly I would like to know the feeling of the meeting and I would like the full statutes which I suggested to be put forward, in case, in fact, all the members here do feel, as I suggested, that they would like to go the whole hob (?) right now, and thirdly to put my compromised brief proposal. The only point I would ask as a point of procedure: Is it not correct the amendments to be put first? My amendments were amendments to the original proposal from the Secretary General.

FORSSMAN: I did not take your suggestion because you just withdrew it in the discussion. You are changing your mind again. I will stick to what you said about withdrawing your suggestion, but you are quite right that it is a little more formal that I will ask first if you will keep on those/statutes, then on the distributed, and then on the amended. Then I will ask on the amendment by Dr. FLOYD before I take the final one (M). This is the normal procedure for instance applied at the International Labour Office, and I think ~~xxx~~ ^{they} have got enough exper ience, ~~xx~~ ^{so we can} follow this. I will just

repeat, so it will be clear. I am very anxious that you all really understand what you are voting upon. I think this is the democratic principle.

First of all, I will ask you if you will stay on the old statutes of Stockholm or if you would like to have a change. If yes, if you will like to have a change, I will ask you on two alternatives: Grandjean's distributed proposal and the Committee Proposal which is supported by the unanimous Committee. You have then two proposals to choose between. In case you choose the Committee proposal, I shall ask you if you will change Mr. Floyd's figure 1 to 2, according to Floyd's suggestion. I should not have taken this on, but I think it is just a minor thing and simple, so it can be done here. Has this procedure been accepted? Keine Stellungnahme. FORSSMAN: I put it this way that it has been accepted.

FORSSMAN: Would you like to change the constitution of the Stockholm Meeting, or would you like to keep it? Those in favour of changing the constitution of Stockholm will please raise their hands!

in favour of changing	alle.
those against	keine
abstentions	keine.

It is unanimously accepted that the General Assembly has decided to change the Constitution of Stockholm.

FORSSMAN (ctd.): We will then have to ask you on the two proposals, the one distributed by the Secretary General and the other distributed now or yesterday by the Committee, supported by the unanimous Committee. Those in favour of the first Statute distributed a few months ago by the Secretary General, please raise their hands!

keine Wortmeldungen,

Those in favour of the Committee proposal distributed and available here, supported by the unanimous Committee, please raise your hands!

in favour	29
against	7
abstentions	7.

FORSSMAN (ctd.): I declare that the General Assembly has accepted the draft with 29 votes for, 7 against and 7 abstentions.

I will now ask about this one problem here: On page 2, article 5, § 4, it reads: "Each federated ergonomics society shall designate one member to the Committee." Am I right, Dr. FLOYD, that you suggest that this one should be replaced by two? (Zustimmung von Dr. Fl. und Diskussion über die mathematische Richtigkeit der Rechnung. Dr. FLOYD (kaum hörbar) schlägt wahrscheinlich vor, jetzt keine genauen Zahlen einzusetzen?)

FORSSMAN: Thank you. I would like to avoid having a night session and to have more mathematics included in the proposal, and I think we will just have these two. We can also do it that way that you can refer this problem to the Committee for mathematical studies. (erneute Diskussion).

FORSSMAN: Thank you. That will be simpler. These are then accepted, and I just ask you if you would like to speed up the trend for achieving the federation societies more than is here. Those ~~of~~ in favour of having a higher speed on this road, if you understand, please raise your hands!

in favour	25
those against, i.e. sticking to the suggestion	15
abstentions	9.

FORSSMAN (ctd.): I will then rule that the General Assembly has decided to ask the Committee to find until the next Assembly measures to speed up the change towards a federation.

SHACKEL: Can I propose another suggestion, that in view of the very considerable majority of the members already of the association represented by societies, a majority of 5 : 1, the Committee should be instructed in linking with that last, to see that at once there is a majority, however slight, of representatives of societies on the Committee.

FORSSMAN: We have just ruled and accepted the Committee proposal on this. We have then decided that we should speed up this, and I think that would be enough and would be included. You have those three points with which the Committee should be charged, you have formulated these three points?

SHACKEL: No, Sir, I gave you in writing an amendment to the earlier debate which you did not take first. That is finished and done with, I regret now. You did not take that amendment first, However, I can do no more about that. What I have just now said is a formal proposal that the Committee should be charged in speeding up the change-over, to recognize the fact that already the four members of the Association represent 5 times the number of individual members, and that there should be a slight majority on the Committee representing the member societies .

FORSSMAN: I am very anxious to ask you a question just to get this right. Zu SHACKEL: You propose that in the proposal we just accepted it should be said that the Committee should recognize the fact that the society members, i.e. members of federated societies, are more than the individual members and that there should be (I quote your words) a slight majority representing the societies in the

Committee? To-day? Einwurf von Dr. MURRELL.

SHACKEL: The Committee has just accepted that it will revise these rules in the light of Dr. FLOYD's proposal. That means doing some change to the mathematics, but in order to save the time of the meeting we all agreed that it should be left to the Committee to alter the mathematics. All I am asking now is that the alterations to the mathematics as an instruction to the Committee should put a slight majority in favour of the existing societies at once.

PREUSCHEN: Wir haben einen Vorstand gewählt und ihm das Vertrauen ausgesprochen. Ich sehe nicht ein, warum wir einem einzigen Mißtrauensantrag nachgeben sollen. Der Vorstand wird wissen, wie man einen Auftrag der Generalversammlung, eine Statutenentwicklung in eine bestimmte Richtung zu lenken, ausführen kann.

METZ: Le Comité de la Société de l'Ergonomie de la Langue Française m'a autorisé à vous faire savoir qu'il estime que dans l'état actuel des statuts qui viennent d'être adoptés, la représentation donnée aux sociétés d'ergonomie nationales ou régionales lui paraît satisfaisante, d'autant plus que par les des élections dans l'assemblée générale - je me réfère à la ligne 2 de l'article 5 - les membres et les sociétés peuvent intervenir également dans l'élection des membres du Comité qui ne sont pas désignés directement dans les sociétés ergonomiques. C'est pourquoi je pense que le souci de Monsieur Shackel d'assurer une représentation satisfaisante des sociétés d'ergonomie fédérées dans l'Association Internationale est satisfait, surtout si, comme c'est décidé à la suite de la proposition de Monsieur Floyd, nous changeons le nombre limite des membres désignés à partir duquel ce sera (oder cessera?) la cote (?) effectif du Comité.

FORSSMAN: Other questions or comments? The discussion is closed. I understand that there are two proposals from Dr. SHACKEL. One is that we should ask the Committee to change immediately to-day the

the majority of the Committee in trend of the societies. NO? Good. That cannot be done, as we just accepted. The other thing was that what we just asked the Committee to do until the next General Assembly was that they (the Committee) should see that this speeding up would create a slight majority representing societies. Is that correct?

SHACKEL: This would be done before the next conference though, ~~xxxxxxx~~ sometime over the next year I say.

FORSSMAN: Well, that would mean that we should call an extra General Assembly for changing the statutes?

SHACKEL: Are you saying that Dr. FLOYD's amendment would not be acted upon until a change of statutes three years from now? Is that how ~~xxxx~~ you will be taking his amendment?

FORSSMAN: Yes. If you will read the statutes please. We can change the statutes, but then should do it at an extraordinary General Assembly. This can be called, you can move that later.

SHACKEL: Well, I am asking you to tell me and the rest of this how you are interpreting Dr. Floyd's amendment, because I took it to mean that the Committee would revise articles 7's mathematics in the light of his proposal, so that the speeding up would occur not three years from now, but before that. That is how I took it.

FORSSMAN: I am sorry, I told you all ~~xxxx~~ and made it clear, I hope, that ~~xxxx~~ all we decided now on articles has been accepted and are now in operation. Dr. Floyd's suggestion was to charge the Committee and to prepare this to the next General Assembly, and I said: the next General Assembly. Do you, the members, would like to call an extraordinary meeting of the General Assembly? that is up to you, you can do it later, not to night, but later, by correspondence, if you like, and then this meeting will be organised by the Committee.

I will then ask: Dr. SHACKEL's proposal is that ~~xxxxxx~~ ^{there} ~~xxxxxx~~ in what we just asked the Committee should be included that when they studied these mathematics they should see that there will be a slight majority

of representing societies within the Committee. Those in favour of Dr. SHACKEL's proposal, please raise your hands:

in favour	12
against	21
abstentions	8.

The proposal is rejected by the General Assembly.

Forssman: We will now go on to the next point of the agenda: That will be Subscription fees for the period 1964 to 1967. I ask the Treasurer for his proposal:

GRANDJEAN: Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Wir haben das gestern im Committee besprochen und legen Ihnen folgenden Vorschlag vor:

individual members	wie bisher 40 sfrs für einen Zeitraum von 3 Jahren
federated ergonomics societies	1 sfrs per member per annum
affiliated members	100 sfrs for three years, wie bisher
subscribing members	500 sfrs for three years.

FORSSMAN: What do the federated society members pay now?

GRANDJEAN: 100 sfrs for three years.

FORSSMAN: You will notice that for individual members we have 40 sfrs now for three years. The Treasurer suggests the same. For the society members we have now 100 sfrs. The Treasurer suggests 1 sfrs per member per year. Affiliate members have now 100 sfrs for three years, this is suggested to be left unchanged, and for subscribing members 500 sfrs for three years are suggested. Are there any questions?

Dr. FRIEBERGER? How many affiliated and subscribing members are

there now?

GRANDJEAN: affiliated members: 2 subscribing members: none.

FORSSMAN: Any other questions? I will then take each case.

<u>individual members:</u>	40 sfrs for three years
	<u>accepted</u>
<u>federated ergonomics societies:</u>	1 sfrs per member per year
in favour	32
against	--
abstentions	11

I think this is such an important thing, I was very anxious to have your exact views here. The General Assembly has accepted the fee for ergonomic societies members: 1 sfrs per member per year. This is the proposal of the Treasurer, with 32 votes in favour, none against, and 11 abstentions.

<u>affiliated members</u>	100 sfrs for three years, unchanged
	<u>accepted.</u>
<u>subscribing members,</u> which we do not yet have,	500 sfrs for three years
	<u>accepted.</u>

Grandjean: In Zusammenhang mit dieser Angelegenheit sollten wir nach den neuen Statuten noch die Buchprüfer bestimmen, also die Treuhandgesellschaft, welche die Rechnungen überprüft.

FORSSMAN: We shall then come to the elections. Point 5 is the election of the Chairman and the General Secretary. Point 6 is the election of the Committee, and we will then also have the election of the two auditors. We will take first the Chairman. The proposal from the Committee has been distributed. The Committee decided to discuss this problem and, to save some time, has some proposals here. I will read them to you and will then ask if you have any more and then we

will take the vote upon them. The Committee proposed as President for the next period of three years Professor LEHMANN who is the Vice-President and the President of the Organising Committee of this Congress. (Acclamation). Are there any other proposals? I am glad to say that we have this decision unanimously and I would like to congratulate you and, of course, the Association.

LEHMANN: Thank you very much. I am ready to accept and I promise you to do my best. That is all I can say.

FORSSMAN: We have thought that I should conduct the meeting until its end, and then we shall have the changing ceremony to-morrow at the closing session.

We will have then the Secretary General, and the Committee proposes Professor GRANDJEAN, which has now worked hard as Secretary General for this period. (Acclamation). Any further proposals? I am glad to say this is unanimous. You have very hard work done through this three years, and I am sure that you will be of great value to the Association during the next three years ^{because of} your interest and ambition, to have this society well known over the world.

We have now the Committee. It should contain 14 members and the President and the Secretary. We have now four Society members, and they will designate one each. That will mean that we can have 10 seats left in the Committee. We can elect them now, the societies will designate their members as soon as possible, and we are anxiously waiting for their names. But there we will have now to elect 10 members of the Committee. The Committee decided and had proposed 10 names. It is up to the Assembly to suggest any more, and then I will put it to the vote. There is one principle which I know some of you are anxious it should be applied, i.e. the system of turnover, that some will stay on in the Committee and some will leave, so that we will have continuity and also we have gradually new Committee members. If you don't know, I will just read you the present

members first: myself as President, Professor LEHMANN (Vice-President) Prof. GRANDJEAN (Secretary General) BELDING EDHOLM FRIEBERGER DE JONG LUNDGREN METZ MCFARLAND MURRELL SMALL SCHOUTEN AND WELFORD. We have been informed that Prof. SCHOUTEN is ill and would not like to carry on his membership (in the Committee). I asked Prof. BURGER to thank him for his valuable contribution in this Committee and to convey to him our best wishes for an improved health. This is the background of our suggestion, that we shall have continuity and turn-over. Any further suggestions ?

Dr. FRIEBERGER is proposed. Any further proposals? The discussion is closed. I suggest that you will hand in the names here. There should be 10 names. You can hand in this list and can delete names and can add the name of Dr. FRIEBERGER, if you like. Would you accept that the Secretary General will act as a controller of the votes? Thank you.

In the meantime I shall ask for your attention for the election of two ~~aux~~ auditors. In the old statutes it has been done by the Committee, but I think it is not perhaps appropriate ^{that it} should control itself. Therefore it is up to the General Assembly. The Treasurer has, however, selected the professional auditors Sallenbach & Judd in Zurich who have revised and controlled the finances of the Association. This is the Treasurer's suggestion concerning auditors. Do you have any more suggestions concerning auditors? If not, can we then accept and elect Mrs. Sallenbach & Judd in Zurich as auditors of the Association? Thank you.

FORSSMAN: Would you permit that we take Point 7. I have a few other problems to present and also ask if you have other problems, while we collect the votes.

BURGER: Mr. Chairman, I should like to propose to the General Assembly that the Committee for the Ergonomics Check List will be ordered to continue the work in that respect that it will take care of all the remarks that have been made, make all the corrections they want, if

possible do some field studies and present ~~xxxxx~~ to the next meeting a new list with the necessary corrections, and comments.

FORSSMAN: Thank you, Professor BURGER. Any comments to this suggestion? I think we are then very glad to accept this proposal of Professor BURGER that the Committee on Ergonomic Check List should continue their work and report till the next International Congress.

FORSSMAN: I have another problem, that is concerning the next international congress. The International Ergonomics Association has had three invitations, one from the Ergonomics Research Society to have it in England, the other one from the Netherlands to have it in Leyden, and the third one to have it at Zurich, an invitation to be issued by Professor Grandjean. The Committee is very grateful to have these three invitations and has decided to accept with gratefulness the invitation of the Ergonomics Research Society. This is the situation, and I am very glad that the Chairman (of the ERS) is present here. Would you like to say a few words, as the American say?

Dr. RUFFELL SMITH: We in the Ergonomics Research Society are delighted to have this opportunity of organising the next meeting in England. We are not yet certain as to the exact place where we should be able to hold it, but we shall be able to make this decision fairly soon. I shall let you know when this is done. Thank you very much.

FORSSMAN: Thank you. Are there any further questions or other problems you would raise at this General Assembly? If not, we will just wait for the controlling of the votes.

PREUSCHEN: Darf ich diese Pause benutzen, dem scheidenden Vorstand unseren Dank zu sagen? Es ist nicht einfach, eine neue Gesellschaft in den ersten Jahren zu betreuen. Wir haben gesehen, daß die Ansichten über die zweckmäßige Zusammensetzung einer Gesellschaft sehr auseinandergehen können. Wir sollten die Gelegenheit benutzen, nicht nur dem scheidenden Vorstand für die Arbeit zu danken, sondern wirklich die Delegation des

Vertrauens, die jede Vorstandswahl bedeutet, unterstreichen, um dem neuen Vorstand Mut zu machen, in den nächsten drei Jahren die Gesellschaft weiter zu entwickeln und zum Erfolg zu bringen. Applaus.

FORSSMAN: Ich danke Ihnen herzlichst. I have just one more point. Perhaps I can take it now, and that is just to thank the Committee members, but I am glad that Professor Preuschen did it in such a nice way. I would like also to thank you all for the confidence you had in me as President, and you know the German definition of a Professor who is a man of an other opinion, and certainly you are very well qualified as Professors, but I am very proud as President that we have achieved to-night real unanimous decisions. I thank you very much for your confidence. It has been a pleasure to act here for three years, and I know that you will have a very competent President now, well-known internationally in this field, and you also know his efficiency from the way he has organised this congress.

LEHMANN: Nachdem Herr Preuschen sich nur bei dem Vorstand bedankt hat, bleibt mir erfreulicherweise noch die Möglichkeit, mich ganz persönlich bei Ihnen zu bedanken für Ihre Tätigkeit als Präsident, eine Tätigkeit, die mir ein Feld geschaffen hat, auf dem es, hoffe ich, mir möglich sein wird, weiter fortzuschreiten.

FORSSMAN: Thank you. Please, Secretary General!

GRANDJEAN: Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Gewählt sind die folgenden 10 Herren:

ASMUSSEN	%	41	Stimmen
Belding		42	"
Griew		42	"
Haider		34	"
de Jong		43	"
Lundgren		43	"
McFarland		42	"
Metz		42	"
Murrell		43	"
Rohmert		38	"

Nicht gewählt: Frieberger 17 Stimmen.

FORSSMAN: You have heard the names of the Committee. Any further questions for to-night? If not, I will thank you very much for your attention. The session is closed.