

Presidential Committee on Affiliation Report

COMMITTEE: Myrtis E. Hemdon. (Chairperson), Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio.
Nicolaas J. Moolenijzer, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque,
N.M.
Lome Sawula, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

PURPOSE OF THE COMMITTEE:

1. To study the problem of affiliation in general with other scholarly groups (AHA, ICSPE, HISPA, etc.).
2. To study the "approved AHA (American History Association) guidelines for societies who wish to affiliate with AHA," and to recommend action pertaining to possible affiliation between NASSH and AHA.

ACTIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND NOTES

I. QUESTIONS UNDER INVESTIGATION:

1. What should be NASSH's official position relative to affiliation with any group?
2. In view of the international structure of NASSH should it seek affiliation with another national association? If so, why?
3. What criteria should be established for NASSH's affiliation with another association?
4. What criteria should be established for other national or international associations who wish to affiliate with NASSH?
5. What constitutional changes for NASSH need to be made to allow for affiliation with other groups?
6. Should NASSH develop cooperative arrangements to exchange information and publications short of official affiliation?
7. What guidelines need to be established regarding cooperative arrangements to exchange information and publications between NASSH and other associations?
8. Should NASSH attempt to enlarge its influence through affiliations?
9. What are the advantages and disadvantages of an affiliation with a national association? . . . with an international association?
10. Can there be international involvement for NASSH short of affiliation?
11. In what way should NASSH become involved internationally without affiliation?
12. If NASSH desired international involvement, would affiliation with another international association be more desirable than non-affiliation?
13. Can significant involvement occur internationally for NASSH without an affiliation with one or more international associations?
14. Regarding the AHA guidelines, "AHA Relations with Affiliated Societies," would NASSH have any difficulty in satisfying the terms of affiliation with AHA? (See Document #1).
15. Are the AHA guidelines sufficiently spelled out to guarantee the existence of a mutual working relationship between AHA and an affiliated society?
16. What additional points need to be considered as part of any affiliation agreement with AHA?
17. If NASSH decided to seek affiliation with another national association, should it seek affiliation with AHA under the terms of Document #1?
18. Can significant involvement in AHA occur without representation in the structure of the Association? If so, in what way?
19. Regarding the ICSPE-NASSH Proposed Agreement are additions or deletions recommended at this time? (See Document #2).

20. Are the principles underlining the ICSPE Agreement basically sound?
21. How do the principles underlining the Agreement compare with suggested criteria for NASSH's affiliation with another international association?
22. Can the level of international involvement inherent in the document be achieved without an official affiliation with the International Committee of ICSPE?

II. *ACTIONS-DECISIONS REACHED:*

1. Agreed that affiliation with national and international organizations would be desirable as long as individuality and autonomy were maintained for all organizations so involved.

Comment: Affiliation can occur from two perspectives: (1) NASSH may wish to affiliate with another national or international association; and (2) other national or international associations may wish to affiliate with NASSH.

2. Agreed that cooperative arrangements between NASSH and other organizations would be desirable, and that such arrangements may or may not include official affiliation.

Comment: NASSH and/or other associations may wish to exchange information and publications with each other without official affiliation with NASSH. Official Affiliation between NASSH and other associations is not automatic and never guaranteed. It is quite possible that NASSH and other associations might desire affiliation but not according to established criteria for one or the other association. Cooperative arrangements between the two associations would be desirable.

3. Agreed that significant international involvement for NASSH can be achieved short of affiliation.
4. Agreed that affiliation with another international association would be more desirable than non-affiliation if NASSH desired international involvement.
5. Agreed that NASSH, if it so desired, would have no problem in satisfying the terms of affiliation with AHA, and it would retain its own individuality and autonomy.

Comment: Points 4 and 5 (Document # 1) offer possibilities for joint and collateral programs to coincide with the annual AHA meeting. There would apparently be no representation on the AHA Program Committee, nor representation in any other way within the structure of AHA. Final authority for AHA's Program would be vested in AHA, but an affiliated society would have full control and authority to organize its own program. Such "ancillary sessions" however would probably not be listed in the AHA's Annual Program.

It is apparent that AHA would always be in control of its own association and would allow affiliated societies to be in control of their own association. No society however would ever be an integral part of AHA. Perhaps the concept of "affiliation" should be far more extensive than that implied in Document # 1. Cooperative arrangements between NASSH and AHA could achieve the same result implied in Document #1.

6. Agreed that NASSH, in view of its international structure, should only seek affiliation with other associations which are truly international in nature.
7. Agreed that the principles underlining the ICSPE-NASSH Agreement are good, but several sections of the document need to be rephrased.

Comment: In order to fully understand the advantages and disadvantages inherent in this Agreement, it is imperative that a study be made of the full text of the Constitution and By-Laws of ICSPE and the appropriate documents governing the working group. The Agreement appears to provide NASSH with: individuality, autonomy, representation, and significant opportunities for international involvement.

III. *RECOMMENDATIONS:*

1. Strongly recommend that cooperative arrangements between NASSH and other national and international associations be established when such are mutually

beneficial to both parties.

2. Strongly recommend that changes in the Constitution and By-Laws of NASSH be made to allow for affiliation by other national and/or international associations.
3. Strongly recommend that NASSH establish criteria for affiliation with other national and/or international associations.

IV. *FUTURE CONCERNS:*

1. Clarification of concepts “affiliation,” “agreement,” “cooperative arrangements” in relation to other national and international associations.
2. Investigation into the “details” of any arrangements once NASSH is involved with another national or international association, (i.e., membership, papers, people, etc.)
3. Investigation into all international associations with whom NASSH might desire to affiliate before a decision is made to affiliate with ICSPE or HISPA.



The Statler-Hilton Convention Site in Boston