

AChemS: The Beginning

Maxwell M. Mozell and the Membership of AChemS

Clinical Olfactory Research Center, Neuroscience and Physiology Department, SUNY Health Science Center at Syracuse, Syracuse, NY 13210, USA

Correspondence to be sent to: Maxwell M. Mozell, Clinical Olfactory Research Center, Neuroscience and Physiology Department, SUNY Health Science Center at Syracuse, Syracuse, NY 13210, USA. e-mail: mozellm@vax.cs.hscsyr.edu

Abstract

This paper unfolds the events, the people and the times that led up to the founding of AChemS and fashioned its character during its early formative years. It describes the path over which AChemS came, going from the original assertions and denials for the need of such an organization to its later inception and nascent development. This narration highlights such topics as the debate over the need for AChemS, the role of National Science Foundation in the founding of AChemS, the derivation of the Association's name, the choice of Sarasota and the Hyatt House as the meeting site, the generation of the programs for the early annual meetings, the adoption of the bylaws, the process of incorporation and tax deferment, and the birth of the Givaudan Lectureship. Most emphatically highlighted, however, is the enthusiasm, commitment and hard work that the members of the chemosensory research community displayed in bringing AChemS to fruition.

I would like to begin by congratulating AChemS on its 20th annual meeting and by thanking its Executive Committee for inviting me to recall its early history.

The concept of a North American chemosensory society had been a topic of discussion as far back as my professional memories go, but to my knowledge, the first time it was formally raised during an organized meeting was at the chemical senses special interest group 'get together' during the 1975 meeting of the Society for Neuroscience. Several of the more senior members of the group (including Lloyd Beidler and Carl Pfaffmann) proposed such a society. They further proposed that an agenda focusing on its possible formation be drawn up for the next 'get together' of the chemical senses special interest group which would occur during the 1976 Neuroscience meeting to be held in Toronto, Canada. It became my responsibility to prepare this agenda to address the possibility of a new North American society. It became my responsibility because it had been the tradition to ask an investigator whose laboratory was in or near the city of the next Neuroscience meeting to organize that meeting's annual chemical senses 'get together'. In accordance with both the usual American grasp of Canadian geography and the general feeling that cities close to the Arctic Circle must be close to each other, I, in Syracuse, was asked to organize that event for the meeting in Toronto. I thought, however, that prior to drawing up such an agenda we ought to ascertain first whether a large enough segment of the chemosensory research community did, indeed, feel a need for this society. Accordingly, I prepared a

questionnaire of pertinent issues to be sent to the North American chemosensory research community.

A major problem in this initiative was determining who constituted the North American chemosensory research community. Obviously, there were the attendees of the yearly Neuroscience 'get togethers', and those mailing lists were acquired. In addition, mailing and attendee lists were collected from the Special Interest Group in the Chemical Senses and Ingestion of the Eastern Psychological Association (EPA) and from prior Gordon Conferences. In all, questionnaires were sent to 150 chemosensory investigators. One-hundred responses were received.

On November 8, 1976, I reported the poll results at the neuroscience 'get together'. Although on the surface these data seemed to show a clear win for having a society, with almost two to one in favor, neither I nor the other attendees felt that they constituted a mandate to found a society immediately. First, although 61% of the responders did see a need for a society, 34% saw no such need, and if that large a percentage, including many of the chemosensory community's most productive investigators, would not become involved, the possibility of success seemed severely compromised. In addition, a full one-third of those polled did not respond at all, suggesting an even further lack of interest. Finally, a significant number of the responders as well as non-responders, either by enclosed notes or telephone calls, argued that the chemical senses already had enough meetings (ECRO, ISOT, the Gordon Conference, and the chemical senses groups of the Society for Neuroscience and EPA) and did not need a new society to

sponsor yet more. Some eminent members of the chemosensory research community simply argued to enhance the presence of the chemical senses at the society meetings in which they already had some special visibility such as at the Neuroscience and EPA meetings. Other eminent members of the chemosensory research community thought that maybe something could be arranged under the auspices of ECRO, perhaps by holding ECRO mini-symposia in the USA or even establishing a US chapter of ECRO. Indeed, a number of contacts came from our colleagues in Europe expressing concern and even regret at the prospect of a North American chemosensory society. Consequently, the Neuroscience 'get together' of November 8, 1976 took no action on the issue of a new society and proceeded to hear papers presented by some promising young investigators: Drs Robert Contreras, David Hornung and John Kauer.

On the other hand, there were still those 61% of people, myself included, who felt that a chemosensory society on this side of the Atlantic was, indeed, needed. It was needed if for no other reason than to bring together at one reasonably accessible annual forum all those investigators who, though interested in the chemical senses, were approaching them with the precepts, findings and methodologies of different sciences and disciplines, e.g. physiology, psychology, neuroscience, chemistry, anatomy and health sciences. The chemical senses investigators coming from each of the different sciences and disciplines certainly had an opportunity to communicate with each other at their own parochial meetings, but there was little communication between the members of the different sciences and disciplines. (The proponents of a North American chemosensory society did acknowledge that the Gordon Conferences and the ECRO meetings were two exceptions to this parochialism in disciplines, but neither meeting was broadly accessible; the former occurred only once every three years and involved only about 150 quasi-invited participants whereas the latter were generally expensively far away.) This lack of cross fertilization was a key issue for one of the major, though rarely recognized, players in the history of AChemS, namely Dr James Brown of the National Science Foundation (NSF).

In 1976, while I was serving a term as a member of the Advisory Study Panel for Sensory Physiology and Perception at the NSF, Dr Brown was on the permanent staff of NSF as Deputy Division Director for Behavioral and Neural Sciences. Jim and I talked a great deal about research in the sensory systems with particular emphasis upon what Jim thought was a lag in the understanding of the chemical senses as compared, at that time, with our understanding of other senses, most notably vision and audition. As a loyal member of the chemosensory research community I, of course, disputed this contention, especially when it was being made at a major funding agency. However, we did agree on other points. In particular, we agreed that progress in the chemical senses would be significantly

abetted if we could facilitate communication among all those chemosensory investigators who, though studying the same systems, do their research from the pur- views of many different scientific disciplines. This could best be accomplished by establishing an interdisciplinary chemosensory society which ran meetings dedicated to the interdisciplinary study of olfaction and taste. However, as noted above, the 1976 survey showed, at best, only lukewarm enthusiasm for such a society in North America. Jim wondered whether the North American chemosensory research community would be more disposed to such a society if it could see itself as Jim saw it, i.e. as lagging behind the other sensory systems. Perhaps a self-assessment meeting of some representative chemosensory investigators would be helpful in this regard.

Although not wanting to acquiesce to Jim's assertion that the chemical senses were lagging behind, I did think it was worthwhile to go through a self-assessment exercise. Therefore, Jim and I agreed that after the impending completion of my term on the NSF Advisory Study Panel, I would write a grant application to NSF to support a conference to assess the national chemosensory research effort. This application was to be treated as any other application going through the peer review process. Therefore, the justifications for holding such a meeting, for the meeting's proposed participants, for the meeting's proposed agenda and for the meeting's proposed budget all had to meet, as every one of us is aware, some study panel's seemingly illusive standards for funding. At any rate, I did submit the grant, and it was funded.

The NSF-sponsored meeting entitled 'The Conference to Assess the National Chemosensory Research Effort' was held June 16 and 17, 1977 in Syracuse, NY at the Upstate Medical Center (now named the SUNY Health Science Center). The participants of the meeting in addition to myself were Drs Robert Barlow, Linda Bartoshuk, Lloyd Beidler, Robert Gesteland, Morley Kare, Frank Margolis, Steven Price, Gordon Shepherd and Roy Teranishi. These participants were chosen so that with a modest number of people, 'each wearing several hats', the conference would represent the various constituencies of the chemosensory research community, i.e. scientific disciplines, training lineages, conceptual frameworks, types of research institution and even national region. Dr Robert Barlow, a vision physiologist and the only non-chemical senses person, was included to offer a purview from outside the chemosensory community to guard against over-provincialism. He also was a member of ARVO (Association for Research in Vision and Ophthalmology), the organization and goals of which were similar to those I foresaw for any chemosensory society we might develop. I thought his experience in this regard might be useful, and that certainly turned out to be quite true.

Although not wholeheartedly embracing the concept that progress in the chemical senses had been unduly slow

compared with that in other sensory systems, the conference participants did agree that the chemosensory research effort did labor under a variety of difficulties. Among those listed were: (i) the poor appreciation, in both the scientific and non-scientific communities, of the importance and pervasiveness of the chemical senses; (ii) the difficulty in obtaining priority job positions for people trained in the chemical senses; (iii) the inherent difficulty of handling the chemical stimulus in a controlled fashion; (iv) an anxiety produced by the first cutback in the funding of research by the major federal funding agencies after years of consistent growth. It was feared that without a recognized society to speak for it, this cutback might affect the chemosensory research community more negatively than it would affect the research communities of the other sensory systems, several of which already had recognized societies; and (v) the poor communication among the various groups making up the chemosensory research community.

It is these last two identified difficulties that are most relevant to this history of AchemS. The fourth difficulty, really a potential difficulty, was important because ECRO, being European, would not be expected to have much weight in protecting the chemical senses in the American funding arena. I do believe that many of the early conversions to the concept of a chemosensory society on this side of the Atlantic was based upon this coincidental dip in federal funding and the anxiety it produced. As far as the fifth difficulty was concerned, just as Jim Brown and I had hoped, the report went on to say,

the chemosensory investigators coming from a particular basic discipline (e.g., physiology, psychology, chemistry, nutrition, ethology, anatomy, etc.) tend to restrict their communication to those chemosensory investigators coming from the same discipline. This, of course, limits the opportunity to evaluate the chemosensory information disclosed by one disciplinary approach in the light of the findings, constructs and technologies of other disciplines. Thus, productive leads might be missed whereas predictably non-productive investigations might be begun.

To counteract this disciplinary provincialism in chemoreception the conference suggested 'the establishment of an annual meeting specifically designed to attract a broad spectrum of scientists representing all those disciplines likely to contribute to the investigation of the chemical senses'. In suggesting this meeting the conference participants were careful to emphasize that 'its establishment should not be construed as being in conflict with the meetings of ECRO (European Chemoreception Research Organization) or as being a potential competitor in providing the services that ECRO has given the worldwide chemosensory community'.

Other suggestions of the conference which had a later

impact upon AChemS as we now know it included several that were influenced by Dr Robert Barlow's participation. For instance, the conference members suggested that the meetings of ARVO be used as a model in planning the projected chemosensory meetings. In addition to its broad-based appeal, particular aspects of the ARVO meeting which the conference thought ought to be emulated included: the year-to-year consistency of time and location, the travel attractiveness of the location and the setting aside of a reasonable percentage of time for a mixture of informal discussions, personal contacts and enjoyment of the venue.

Also in the conference report was a charge to me 'to investigate the feasibility of such a meeting', a charge which I felt I could depict to the chemosensory community as more formal and more authoritative than the one I was given almost two years earlier at the Neuroscience meeting. With this still rather tenuous mantle of authority, I again began to test the enthusiasm of the chemosensory community for an annual meeting run by a North American organized society. There were many phone calls and a number of mailings. The most memorable letter asked each chemosensory investigator, whom we could identify and reach, two all important questions: (i) Would you support such a meeting? (ii) Would you likely attend? The letter went to 263 people and 111 responded. Only eight of these responses were distinctly negative, whereas all the rest could be classified as enthusiastic to some level.

Although almost all of the 111 responses were quite supportive, I had to recognize that 152 genuine chemosensory investigators, including a number of recognized leaders in the field, did not respond at all. I was disturbed by thoughts of the poll taken two years earlier in which there was also a large group of non-responders and which may have thereby helped thwart the movement toward a North American chemical senses society. On the other hand, it was true that by this time in the process there were a number of colleagues who had become quite interested in the prospect of our own society, and who on a one-to-one basis gave the idea much appreciated support. Among these were friends from the Pfaffmann/Beidler lineage of graduate students and post-doctorate fellows (e.g. Bruce Halpern, Linda Bartoshuk, Charlotte Mistretta, Marion Frank), some of my past and current students (Bob O'Connell, Rich Costanzo, Dave Hornung, Steve Youngentob, Dan Kurtz) and a number of other friends, colleagues and associates who supported the idea of a society, some of whom, like Tom Getchell at NSF, happened to be at the right place at the right time. However, although 103 members of the chemical senses community and a number of my close associates seemed positively inclined toward a North American chemosensory society, I was still quite concerned about the depth and breadth of this support. Luckily, the next Gordon Conference for Olfaction and Taste, which was held every third year, was to occur during the upcoming

summer (July 1978), and it offered a reasonable opportunity to assess the chemosensory research community's sentiment for a meeting in the spring of 1979. It was also fortunate that the chairperson of the 1978 Gordon Conference for Olfaction and Taste was Linda Bartoshuk, who was a strong advocate for a North American chemoreception society. She unhesitatingly scheduled a meeting time during the Gordon Conference for an open discussion of this whole proposal.

It was not only to assess this sentiment that the Gordon Conference was important; it was necessary to go further than simply testing sentiment. That is, if a meeting was really in the offing, I had to start representing some formally organized group rather than just myself in order to be taken seriously enough to negotiate with any of the commercial interests needed for holding a meeting. This included hotels and, as I soon learned, chambers of commerce. It would also help to have some organization when applying to funding agencies for support—as would have to be done. Thus, the 1978 Gordon Conference was critical.

The Gordon Conference was in July and the best prospective time for a chemosensory meeting, as I learned from those colleagues getting excited about the prospect, was in the spring. Therefore, it seemed prudent for me to investigate hotels and dates prior to the Gordon Conference. I could then present what I thought were the best choices for the conference participants to accept or reject, if, indeed, they wanted a meeting at all.

Due to several coincidences, the choice of hotel was not difficult. Bob Barlow had already told me how satisfied the ARVO participants have been with the Sarasota area, and in particular how accommodating and facilitative the staff of the Sarasota Hyatt House had been. Since my in-laws at the time wintered in the Sarasota area, my family and I spent every spring vacation camping in the vicinity. It was no problem at all to arrange a meeting with the sales manager, a very pleasant and eager young man by the name of Charles Nottingham.

The Hyatt House in 1978 was quite new and had nothing between it and the beach, giving a beautiful view of the Gulf at some angle from almost all rooms. More important than the view, however, was the desire of its management to augment this new hotel's convention business. They parked my 26 ft trailer in the parking lot and put my family up for two nights in one of the suites of the Regency Club. I did explain to Mr Nottingham that at that time I was actually representing nobody, and I could not guarantee that a meeting would ever occur. However, he was apparently willing to take a chance and spent a considerable amount of time personally showing me the facilities and negotiating possible amenities, dates and costs, all of which I was soon to report at the Gordon Conference. It was at this time that I was also informed about how the Sarasota Chamber of Commerce might be helpful in getting the first meeting off the ground. Indeed, the Chamber did give much needed support for many small but necessary tasks such as

providing some personnel to help register participants, including the production of participant identification badges.

In a letter that was sent to the chemosensory research community immediately after the Gordon Conference (July 27, 1978), the events related to AChemS that occurred at the Conference were outlined. First and foremost, was the affirmation that a North American chemoreception society ought to exist, that this society should stage meetings and that the first meeting should occur at the Hyatt House in Sarasota on April 23, 24 and 25, 1979. Of just about equal importance was the appointment of a 'steering committee' to organize the program of the first meeting and bring it to fruition. The members of the steering committee in addition to myself were: Drs Gary Beauchamp, Robert Cagan, William Cain, Marion Frank, Robert Gestland, Bruce Halpern, Frank Margolis, Donald Mathews, Charlotte Mistretta and David V. Smith. From my own point of view the steering committee gave the whole enterprise substance and validity. I will always be, as all of us should be, indebted to these 11 colleagues. They took on a task that had no previous structure to use as a guide and which, after all their effort, might still have come to naught.

Another item of note in this letter was the use, for the first time in any document, of the words, Association for Chemoreception Sciences. Having used this name, I thought it necessary in the letter to specifically note that although it was my personal preference, just about everybody I consulted had a different, essentially unique, personal preference. However, for some of these other preferences I felt the acronyms would not give enough distinctiveness. For instance, the Association for the Chemical Senses would have the same acronym as the American Chemical Society. Other possible names might be too exclusive such as any that specifically state 'taste' and 'smell'. These might be interpreted by the uninitiated as including the chemical responsiveness of only the first and seventh cranial nerves. Actually, I was looking for a name that was inclusive and had an acronym that was not only distinctive but also 'classy'. The Association for Chemoreception Sciences (AChemS) seemed to me to meet all these requirements.

The July 27 letter also included an invitation to those who had not attended the Gordon Conference to volunteer for the steering committee. This invitation was made because we recognized that any steering committee emerging from only the participants of a Gordon Conference would likely not represent the total breadth of the chemical senses research community. As I recall, although there were several volunteers, none represented any overlooked groups, and it remained a goal in planning the upcoming meeting to reach out to other groups.

Another very important, but underplayed, event at this meeting during the Gordon Conference was a statement made by Lloyd Beidler. Through this whole process leading up to the formation of AChemS, I was somewhat

embarrassed by not involving Lloyd Beidler and Carl Pfaffmann to a more significant degree. After all, at that time they were probably the two most influential chemosensory scientists on this side of the Atlantic. They were both members of the National Academy of Science and what was left of the old guard in the International Commission on Olfaction and Taste (ICOT). They trained, in their laboratories, either as graduate or post doctoral students, a good proportion of the North American chemosensory research community of the 1970s. I, myself, was a Pfaffmann graduate and a Beidler post doctoral student. Although Lloyd and Carl had been very supportive and, as mentioned above, were among those who back in 1975 raised the question of a chemical senses society, one could wonder whether their international commitments and personal foreign friendships would hinder their ability to move unfettered in the AChemS direction. At the very least they might have to be diplomatically correct and thereby slow down the process. However, how could we seem to pass over these two major leaders without possibly piquing them and looking ungrateful and politically insensitive to others? Thus, when Lloyd stood up at the Gordon Conference and in typical Beidler brevity announced that he and Carl, though strongly supporting the concept of a North American society, should not play a major role in its formation, I was very much relieved. I am sure that, except for those in the Beidler–Pfaffmann connection, few people at the meeting recognized the need for, or the significance of, this apparently tangential public announcement. However, I have since often admired Lloyd's insight in this situation, and I have always been very appreciative of his publicly letting me off the hook.

With the Gordon Conference decisions, and especially with the new steering committee, the whole enterprise took on additional momentum. Several items had to be addressed immediately. Among the most important of these were: making final commitments with the Hyatt House, generating a program for the first meeting and procuring financial support for that meeting. The easiest of these to do physically, though not fiscally, was to make a contract with the hotel. All I had to do at this juncture was to sign a letter of 'definite reservation' which the Hyatt House had sent me. That is, I was to sign 'a definite reservation' for 100 rooms the nights of April 22, 23, and 24 and 50 rooms for the night of the 25th. I must admit that I approached this signing with some apprehension. It was true that the hotel people assured me that in their experience they had become accustomed to some variation in these 'definite reservations'. It was also true that after the Gordon Conference I represented not only myself but also a 'steering committee'. However, for a meeting that had never been held before the variation in reservations could easily have gone beyond the hotel's experience. In the same vein, how could I have expected the members of the steering committee, even if it did have some vague legal status, to take on an unexpected liability into

which I led them? I therefore told my two youngest children, who were still living with me, that in lieu of their college educations we might be spending four April days in Sarasota, Florida at a first rate hotel all to ourselves. I signed the copy and, having thus overcome my apprehension, I later brashly used my personal credit card for a number of other contractual arrangements.

Along with our commitment for 100 sleeping rooms came commitments from the hotel to us. We would get free of charge the Sara Desoto room North and South along with all the amenities needed to run scientific paper sessions. In addition, we would get free of charge the Pre-Function Lobby Area for our poster sessions and a large room for a banquet if we were to have one. Note that in this first year, and for that matter in several of the early years of AChemS, we ran the risk of sharing the Hyatt House conference area with the meetings of other groups. One year, for instance, we shared it with the Arthur Murray Dance Studios, complete with dance bands and a goodly number of ballroom-dressed middle aged dance enthusiasts. Although the sound proofing was actually quite reasonable, an occasional paper or poster was still presented to the background strains of a waltz or tango. In another year the other organization had as its entertainment a circus complete with elephants. Needless to say, this sharing of the facilities led in those early years to repeated negotiations with the hotel either to give us sole use of the area (even if we did use only one convention room) or at least choose more appropriately the group with which we must share.

Although we had signed the necessary papers with the hotel, there were still many hotel details that had to be addressed, e.g. coffee breaks, rooms for satellite functions, banquet menus and slide projectionists. Of particular concern was transportation to and from the beach. This was finally resolved through the intervention of the Chamber of Commerce, which prevailed upon the driver of a London-style tour bus to work on his day off. The steering committee was even more concerned that, even with their ARVO experience, the hotel's management seemed naive in some aspects of staging a scientific meeting. For instance, the hotel lacked boards for displaying posters and was unwilling to purchase the 20 we needed since there was no guarantee that we would be back in future years. They did offer several less expensive solutions such as purchasing 20 4' × 8' sheets of homosote (like drywall), each of which could 'be laid on an eight foot table the long way, making the poster area four feet off the table'. This problem was not really resolved until the following year for the second annual meeting when, through the efforts of John Caprio, Sid Mayer and Wayne Silver, poster boards were built to order at Florida State University, and thus the tradition of transporting the boards every year from their storage at FSU. However, after a great deal of hand-wringing, for this first meeting we succumbed to renting poster boards.

A second major task for the steering committee was to

generate a program for the April meeting, a bare 8–9 months away. In keeping with the basic objective of the meeting, the steering committee was committed to developing a program which would attract chemosensory investigators representing a broad range of disciplines and technologies as well as the perspectives of different laboratory settings (academic, industrial and governmental). There was, however, a potential problem in adhering to this commitment for breadth. Conceivably, some prospective attendees might find their own specific interests so thinly represented that it would not seem worthwhile to attend the meeting. Thus, the steering committee struggled with trying to identify program topics which would have broad appeal even to the non-specialist. It was hoped that this could be accomplished by several strategies, one of which was to include topics which, like pheromones, were considered particularly ‘hot’ back in the seventies, even gaining considerable attention from the lay press. Another approach was to take advantage of good old fashioned curiosity by including topics which, though quite relevant, were not in the everyday thought process of the mainstream chemosensory investigator. This could be done, for example, with a session devoted to the creation of new chemosensory products that would give insight into the research goals and procedures used in the commercial segment of our chemosensory research community. Most important in this process to make the program topics attractive to the non-specialist was the guideline agreement that, no matter what the topic, there must be a deliberate effort in each session to lead the non-specialist systematically and incrementally from the basics to the cutting edge. In addition, emphasis must be given to the contribution that the approach to any of the topics and the data it provides makes to our overall understanding of the chemical senses. In short, there was a perceived need to balance the desire for breadth in the program with its overall appeal.

In opting for the material to be included in this first meeting, the steering committee weighed several factors in addition to that noted above. Among these were: (i) the proven or potential impact of that material upon the study of the chemical senses; (ii) how recently that material had been adequately treated at other meetings attended by major segments of our projected membership; and (iii) which of the many special interest groups in the chemosensory community must be represented at this point in the development of this new organization to best ensure its success.

With all these concerns and issues the steering committee went about the business of identifying the topics and chairpersons for this initial meeting. The topics that were recommended emanated not only from the members of the steering committee but also from the chemosensory community at large. There was a rather hefty response to the call for topic suggestions which appeared in the letter to the community. With the constraints of time, several perfectly

appropriate topics had to be cut and put off to later years. Having identified the topics to be covered, the steering committee then identified the appropriate chairperson for the session covering that topic and confirmed that chairperson’s willingness to conduct the session organized under the guidelines noted above. Also due to the constraints of time, all the slide presentation speakers were to be invited. There was simply no time to call for and review volunteer papers. Instead, for those topics generated by the steering committee itself, each session was made the responsibility of one of its members who, with the advice and counsel of the entire committee and with varying degrees of input from its designated chairperson, organized the session and invited its speakers. For the topics approved by the steering committee from outside its own membership, the same procedure was put into place, but the session chairperson, who had originally suggested the topic, played a leading role in organizing the session and inviting the speakers. The sessions and chairpersons in the final draft of the program were:

- Biological Origins of Odors (Robert Cagan)
- Clinical Disorders—Taste (Charlotte Mistretta)
- Chemical Senses in the Selection of Foods and Regulation of Intake (Gary Beauchamp)
- Research Basis for the Creation of New Chemosensory Products (William Cain)
- Aquatic Chemoreception (Barry Ache)
- Insect Chemoreception (J. Frazier)
- Central Nervous System Processes in Gustation and Olfaction (chaired by Foteos Macrides and organized by Robert Gesteland)

The program booklet was prepared at no charge by the Duplication Department of the Upstate Medical Center, thereby making the State of New York an unwitting benefactor of AChemS.

Although forced by the time constraints to generate a meeting in which all the slide presentations were by invitation only, the steering committee still deemed it necessary to incorporate some mechanism by which investigators not invited to speak could still communicate their latest findings to their colleagues. Thus, two poster sessions were included in the program. They were put under the capable direction of Marion Frank, who received their respective abstracts, screened them and gave organization to their presentation. The committee felt strongly that these poster sessions should be given equal prominence to the other sessions, and accordingly scheduled them in their own time periods with no other events scheduled concurrently. Finally, recognizing that this new organization had to structure itself and elect its leadership, the steering committee set aside time for a business meeting.

Another major item that had to be addressed was funding to support the meeting. Although there was considerable

sentiment to hold the meeting even if support was not available, it did, indeed, seem risky. At particular risk were those invited speakers whom we wanted to attract to AChemS but who, though working, as we would see it, in some aspect of the chemical senses, did not themselves see it that way. That is, some did not see themselves as being in the core of the predominantly vertebrate-oriented, mostly academic, chemosensory research community. Others saw themselves as investigators in more traditional scientific disciplines (e.g. physiology, chemistry or entomology) rather than as investigators in the chemical senses. At any rate, seeking financial support certainly seemed advisable.

Since NSF had been so closely associated with this enterprise so far, we felt that we should seek funding from that source. Indeed, in answer to my letter asking whether people would attend a chemical senses meeting, David V. Smith, who was then the Rotating Program Director for the NSF Sensory Physiology and Perception Program, speaking for himself, gave a very enthusiastic reply, but also added for NSF, 'I would further encourage you to consider applying to our program for possible financial support for the meeting'. David, who later was a member of the steering committee, also noted that he would soon be replaced in his NSF position by Tom Getchell, who had all along been a strong supporter of the AChemS concept and who, within the bounds of propriety for his job, would likely be helpful.

By the time that the meeting's program had been far enough developed to begin thinking in concrete terms about writing a grant application, it was already October, and we were informed that we would be greatly stressing the NSF review process for an April meeting. We would have to submit no later than early November, which gave the steering committee one last opportunity, as a whole or partial group, to review the application at the upcoming Neuroscience meeting. At any rate, with each session chairperson writing a two or three sentence paragraph stating the intent of the session he/she had developed for the meeting, and armed with the report of the 1977 NSF-supported Conference to Assess the National Chemosensory Research Effort (outlined above), an application was written and submitted. It, of course, described the meeting's projected program and its prospective participants, but it also strongly emphasized the need and history leading to its proposal. Primary among the justifications was, as the 1977 assessment conference concluded, the need for a single, easily accessible meeting which could attract investigators representing all the different disciplines, technical advances and laboratory settings that compose the chemosensory research community. It was argued that this single multidisciplinary forum was crucial to forward movement in our understanding of the chemical senses, and the point was emphasized that the program proposed for this first meeting fully embodied this concept of a multidisciplinary forum. On the advice of the NSF staff, we asked for a budget of \$10 000, which 20 years ago

probably bought 2.5–3 times more than it does now. At any rate, although short of what we could have used, this amount seemed to fit what the NSF staff felt a fledgling organization with no track record should appropriately request.

The major problem for me in writing the proposal was to measure up to the NSF expectations. Obviously, the people at NSF (Jim Brown, Tom Getchell, Terry Dolan *et al.*) did want to fund us, but being true to their positions, they needed an application that would legitimately make it through their standard peer review process with a positive outcome. (I strongly suspect that some of you now reading this article were among the ad hoc reviewers for that application; I and the membership of AChemS thank you for the kind reviews you gave it.) On Tuesday, January 30, 1979, slightly less than 3 months before the meeting date, Tom Getchell informed me from NSF that the first annual AChemS meeting had been funded.

On December 6, as Chairperson of the Steering Committee, I sent out a multipurpose letter. First, 'on behalf of the steering committee, the session organizers, the speakers and the poster contributors' it invited the chemical senses research community to the 'first annual meeting of the Association for Chemoreception Sciences'. Secondly, the room registration cards for the hotel were enclosed with the letter, and the official rates of \$32 for a single and \$38 for a double were quoted. In addition, the registration fee was quoted at \$20. Thirdly, there was an extension of the deadline for the receipt of poster session abstracts. The reason for this extension was the fourth purpose of the letter, namely, to announce the NSF funding and to invite applications for support to attend the meeting.

The major criterion for this support was to be the applicant's active contribution to the meeting either as an invited speaker or by presenting a poster. The applicants were cautioned that the NSF funds were limited, being only \$10 000, so that their requests should be proportionately modest. We also pointed out that we were earmarking a portion of the money for graduate and post doctoral students, another reason for modest requests. However, it was clear as the requests came in that low budget was not the mainstream thought, and this led to what proved to be a most delicate and trying task. That is, recognizing that without the participants we would have no meeting and no AChemS, we literally had to judge each person's tolerance for cuts in his/her request as well as judge how important that particular person's contribution was to the success of the meeting as a whole.

After all this titration of money, personalities and potential impact, and with a great deal of trepidation that this whole house of cards was about to fall, we informed the speakers that they would receive only a fraction of their requests. I suppose in every movement there is a moment when the depth of its commitment comes forth, and this was that moment for AChemS. Almost to a person the speakers

individually responded that they would participate anyway. Apparently the idea of an AChemS had taken root.

During this same period, we received an offer of support from a most unexpected source which was welcome not only for its programmatic effect but also because of its immense morale effect. It gave us a signal that the AChemS concept was being appreciated by one of the constituencies whose years of experience we most fervently wanted to bring to this multidisciplinary forum, namely, the industrial constituency of the chemosensory research community. Quite unexpectedly, I received a call, and a later confirmatory letter, from the Associate Director of Research of the Givaudan Corporation, Robert E. Erickson, offering not only to support a keynote speaker with up to \$1000 for the upcoming meeting but, in addition, to continue this support annually for future meetings. In its offer the Givaudan Corporation gave AChemS free rein over all aspects of this keynote lecture, stipulating only that it be called the Givaudan Lecture. (For 20 years I never knew what connection Givaudan had to AChemS to prompt this very timely and welcome offer, but in a recent conversation I had with Tom Getchell in preparing this remembrance paper, I learned that in the late seventies Tom himself was receiving research support from Givaudan, and apparently he was the connecting link.)

In mid-April of 1979 the Mozell family set up its annual trailer campsite outside of Venice, the next major town south of Sarasota on Florida's Gulf Coast. This time, however, there was the excitement of the upcoming meeting. There was also some apprehension. As of mid-March the Hyatt House had received 50 reservations, only half of what we had reserved, and my credit card seemed somewhat smaller in my wallet. Nevertheless, excitement dominated over apprehension, and I eagerly looked forward to Monday the 23rd, when at 8:30 a.m., on behalf of the steering committee I would welcome my colleagues in the chemical senses to what for me had become a four year mission. I also looked forward to the previous afternoon and evening of the 22nd, when I planned to help with the registration process and join the registrants in savoring the seemingly fulfilled expectation of having our own society.

On the afternoon of the 22nd, as I was breaking down our campsite, I felt a pain in my right side at a sensory magnitude and persistence that I had never felt any pain before. A trip to the emergency room at the Venice Hospital yielded the diagnosis of a kidney stone and a sentence of remaining in the hospital until the stone was fully passed. Not only would I likely miss the beginning of the meeting but there was even the possibility that I might miss it entirely. This information was passed on to the steering committee, and as would be expected from such competent people, my absence had no effect on the orderly opening of the meeting. Nevertheless, I was determined to get to it as soon as possible. It might have been acceptable for Moses not to enter the promised land after years in the desert, but I was

much more commonly human. Therefore, in an as yet unpublished clinical approach, I took advantage of the stone's position (as shown on X-ray) at the end of the ureter poised to drop into the bladder. I drank a quart of water, and with none of the hospital's staff knowing, I jumped off the toilet, cover down, three times. The pain subsided and within an hour the stone was recovered in a strainer for viewing by the physician. I was discharged early on that morning of the 23rd and entered the promised land only a few hours late.

The meeting itself went quite smoothly, with the attendance of 174 scientists representing a variety of disciplines basic to the understanding of the chemical senses. Just about all the attendants who expressed their thoughts to members of the steering committee either at the meeting itself or in later conversations felt that, for an inaugural meeting of a new society, it was a success. Even individuals and groups that had earlier expressed some reservations became supportive. Dr David Ottoson, then president of ECRO, sent a very gracious letter citing the common goals of ECRO and AChemS. As another measure of success, AChemS even made a modest profit of \$2381.31 as reported after the meeting by Tom Getchell, the first elected treasurer. Furthermore, since a sufficient number of hotel rooms were occupied, my family could remove the hold it had placed on its consideration of the children's education.

The first Givaudan Lecture was not, as it is currently, the opening address for the meeting. It was instead delivered on the evening of the meeting's third day at a rather splendid dinner celebrating the inauguration of AChemS. The toastmaster for the evening was Carl Pfaffmann, and among his other pleasurable duties, Carl introduced his long-time friend and colleague, Dr Vincent G. Dethier, as the first Givaudan Lecturer. The title of Dr Dethier's lecture was 'The Odor of Sanctity and the Taste of Sin' which, not unexpectedly, made reference to his own work on taste fibers in the fly. His selection as the Givaudan Lecturer started a tradition of filling that position with people who, for one reason or another, were of interest to the chemosensory community but who were not likely to seek membership in AChemS.

A thousand dollars could reasonably be expected to cover Dr Dethier's expenses, including his stay for the entire meeting, which at that time was a requisite for accepting the call to give the Givaudan Lecture. Nevertheless, probably as a carry-over from everything else we were doing, frugality was the *modus operandi* even for the Givaudan Lecture. Instead of presenting Vince Dethier with a traditional professionally engraved plaque commemorating his presentation of the 'First Annual Givaudan Lecture', we had the friend of a graduate student, whose hobby was calligraphy, print out a certificate which was suitable for framing at K-Mart. I have many times since thought how we underspent this historical occasion and wished that we could somehow replay it with a token of appreciation more

befitting the occasion. Perhaps, by surfacing this issue in this narrative, we have a bit of a replay.

The one major disappointing element of the meeting was the cloudy and intermittently rainy weather, which kept the use of the double deck bus to a minimum. We also got introduced to an apparently annual event which, though actually benign, still rankled many of us. That is, just as our meeting was ending, people were arriving, seemingly in droves, for the ARVO meeting. ARVO, with its much larger attendance and longer history in Sarasota, generated much more community interest and activity. This included scores of signs and banners on the Sarasota streets, in all the hotels and restaurants and even in the airport, all welcoming the ARVO participants. This, together with the massive ARVO check in and relatively puny AChemS check out at the Hyatt House registration desk, gave me and others the feeling that we were slinking out of town before the onrush of ARVO's overwhelming entrance. However, thanks to our own perseverance together with ARVO's having outgrown Sarasota, we now leave, as chemical senses people should, with our noses held proudly high in the air.

The participants of this initial meeting enthusiastically voted at the business session to perpetuate the meeting as an annual event. In so doing they not only participated as scientists at a scientific meeting, but also participated as framers of a new association. They gave that association a provisional structure by establishing four committees and electing members to those committees. These committees and their members, with the chairperson named first, were: Membership Committee—Rose Mary Pangborn and Gary Beauchamp; Finance Committee—Thomas Getchell and Steven Price; Program Committee—Charlotte Mistretta, William Cain, John Caprio and Bernice Wenzel; Executive Committee—Maxwell Mozell and the members of the other committees. Each of these committees, as their names imply, focused on a particular imminent need of the new Association, namely, a need to define and augment our membership, a need to manage and increase our finances and a need to put together the next year's (1980) meeting. Another imminent need was to give AChemS a more permanent organization and structure by legally incorporating. Fulfillment of this need fell into the province of the overall committee, the Executive Committee, to which the other committees were to report. The Executive Committee was established as the chief administrative body of the Association, having ultimate responsibility for all the Association's affairs, and, as noted above, it was composed of all the members of the other committees together with myself as the Executive Committee Chairperson.

Following the inaugural meeting each of the committees began working in earnest on its special focus area. In this regard, I, with the blessing of the Executive Committee, took on as one of my special tasks the process of getting AChemS legally incorporated which, as I later learned, included the drafting of bylaws. The incorporation pro-

cedure was by far the easier of the two. I contacted my personal lawyer in Syracuse, E. Tefft Barker, a partner in the highly respected law firm of Hiscock, Lee, Rogers, Henley & Barclay. He agreed to charge us only a minimal amount for his services—not so much, I think, because I was an old client or an old friend, or because he liked academia or had a penchant for tastes and smells, but rather because he had a second home in Long Boat Key and felt somehow he was doing a civic duty. Through his direction, we moved for incorporation in the District of Columbia by completing and filing the required Articles of Incorporation. Since these articles had to be notarized, it was quite inconvenient to have members of the Executive Committee, other than myself, sign as one of the three required incorporators. However, Dan Kurtz and Steve Youngentob, both of whom were then graduate students in my laboratory, were able to fill that role according to the definition of membership specified at that time in the Articles. Thus, at the tender age of 22 both Dan and Steve were immortalized in the archives of the District of Columbia as two of the original incorporators of AchemS. Also immortalized in the Articles of Incorporation are the names of what the Articles call the initial directors, namely, Charlotte Mistretta, Bernice Wenzel, Gary Beauchamp, Rose Marie Pangborn, Tom Getchell, Steve Price and myself. On the 28th day of March 1980 the Articles of Incorporation were notarized and sent off to the Office of Recorder of Deeds, District of Columbia, Corporation Division. Seven months later, with a certificate dated October 20, 1980, the Association for Chemoreception Sciences officially became a non-profit corporation in the District of Columbia, an event that, with his name on the certificate, even came to the attention of one of the District's most noted personalities, Mayor Marion S. Barry, Jr.

In the Ninth Article of the Articles of Incorporation it is stated that the initial directors will serve 'until the first annual meeting or until their successors be elected', and the Sixth Article states that 'the directors shall be elected by the membership as set forth in the bylaws'. Because of these and other references to bylaws I took the lawyer's advice to start the unexpected task of writing bylaws with my only credentials to do so being a childhood visit to the National Archives in Washington, DC to see the original copy of the US Constitution.

This process began with procuring and reading the bylaws of societies having similar memberships and goals as AChemS. Among others, these included the bylaws of the ARVO, the Association for Research in Otolaryngology, the Society for Neuroscience and the American Physiological Society. The purpose was first to learn what the important points are for the bylaws of such societies and second to find out how these other similar societies treated these points. In addition, the lawyer kept me aware of what must be covered from a legal point of view.

To a large extent writing bylaws is a boilerplate task, but

there are a large number of choice points which require thought both philosophically and practically. For me the most engrossing choice points had to do with the organizational structure, i.e. the officers of the organization, their reporting relationship to each other, their duties, their tenure, etc. This is very important because over time the organizational structure of any society strongly influences its unfolding character. On the one hand, one wants some level of continuity in leadership, but on the other hand there must be provision for change at some reasonable rate. The three stage Executive Chairperson (Executive Chairperson-elect, Executive Chairperson, Past-executive Chairperson) seemed to offer this balance. It allowed the same person to influence the Executive Committee for three consecutive years: the first year while 'learning the ropes', the second year as the CEO and the third year while giving the Executive Committee the benefit of his/her experience. With half of the remaining members of the Executive Committee being biennially elected in alternating years with the other half, the Committee had a new mix of people every year but still maintained a modicum of continuity from year to year. (This mix was permuted even more by the one year term of the Program Committee Chairperson and the later amendment making the Treasurer's term of office three years, which is out of synchrony with the others.)

Yet another, somewhat tangential, positive result of this organizational structure was its guaranteeing that I, personally, would not serve in any of the Executive Chairperson posts more than one extra year (as Past-Executive Chairperson) beyond my then current one year term as Executive Chairperson. I felt strongly that my stamp on the fledgling association had, perhaps, already been too much and that it was time for the AChemS membership to put its collective imprint on the Association's further development. In addition, I was always sensitive to the possibility that AChemS could take on the appearance of a Beidler-Pfaffmann progeny club, and although I knew that with such numbers and such productivity this progeny would be quite visible in AChemS for some years to come, I felt I should not be a standard bearer for fostering that appearance.

Of particular interest in the bylaws are the two councilor positions on the Executive Committee. It seemed wise to have some people on the Executive Committee who, unlike the other members, had no other specific responsibilities, such as watching over the finances with the Finance Committee, developing the next meeting's program with the Program Committee or expanding the membership with the Membership Committee. Thus, these councilors would have no built-in commitment either to speak for any committee's particular interests or foster any of its particular projects. Presumably, these councilors could, on the Executive Committee, weigh each issue with but one constituency, the rank and file membership.

The target date for presenting a tentative draft of the

bylaws to the AChemS membership was May 7, 1980, the business session of the second annual AChemS meeting. It was important to have the membership accept an organizational structure at least tentatively so that elections could be held to fill the designated offices and committees for the following year. Thus, after a number of memos among the members of the Executive Committee for the purpose of fine tuning the presentation to be made to the membership, a summary of the bylaws, as developed to that point in time, was distributed to all the registrants for AChemS II. By straw vote at the business meeting the membership accepted, at least on an interim basis, the organizational structure laid out in this early draft of the bylaws. The membership of AChemS then elected its first Executive Committee in accordance with what would become its own duly processed set of bylaws. It was not until the business session of AChemS III (chaired on April 24, 1981 by Linda Bartoshuk) that a later draft of the bylaws, on a motion by Bill Cain, was 'overwhelmingly' approved by voice vote of the membership. AChemS was henceforth a fully authentic corporation.

However, although we were now fully recognized as a corporation, the Executive Committee and our lawyer were soon surprised that, in spite of Article II of our bylaws, which clearly states the purpose of the corporation and our incorporation category in the District of Columbia, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) did not recognize us as a *non-profit* corporation. From a personal point of view this was additionally disconcerting. By some unfathomable interplay of IRS rules, bank reporting requirements, corporative law and the Committee's own naivete in such matters, my personal tax return for 1979 (and I think also for 1980) included the tax for which AChemS was obligated as a profit making corporation.

Luckily for my tax returns, 1979 and 1980 were not great money making years for AChemS, but much more important than this personal issue was the fact that AChemS was indeed a non-profit corporation and should have been so recognized by the IRS. According to our lawyer's firm, such recognition during the late seventies and early eighties was particularly difficult to obtain because the IRS was trying at that time to clear up what it saw as years of abuse by corporations applying for non-profit status. Consequently, the IRS had become much more fastidious and persnickety in awarding non-profit status, thereby requiring much more documentation and greatly extending the length of the application process. In our own case the process dragged out until the end of 1984, through the chairpersonships of myself, Linda Bartoshuk, Gordon Shepherd, Bruce Halpern, Bill Cain and Bob Gesteland. There were repeated requests from the IRS for additional documents and information, almost as if every time we complied with some request they would add another. This all reached a climax during Bill Cain's term as Chairperson, and he has to be commended for keeping his composure as

he supplied the IRS with such items as membership directories, copies of newsletters, meeting programs, abstract books and the minutes of both the general business meetings and Executive Committee meetings. Perhaps, the most notable document that had to be sent to the IRS was an actual full page amendment to our Articles of Incorporation which was written by our lawyer and signed by Bill Cain. In essence, it stated that no one personally profits financially from the organization nor would anyone personally profit in the event that the organization were liquidated. In a letter dated December 3, 1984, Bob Gesteland, as Chairperson, received word from our lawyer's office that we had at long last been granted tax-exempt status.

In tracing the legal development of AChemS through the tenures of several Executive Committees, the other activities of the 1979–1980 Executive Committee were left behind. As noted above, this 1979–1980 Executive Committee was both the first elected at a real AChemS meeting and the first elected in accordance with the bylaws. This primacy gave to this Executive Committee a considerable amount of historical influence, since the way it interpreted its responsibilities and the culture it developed in carrying out its responsibilities became a model for later Executive Committees.

One of the major activities of this first Executive Committee was to produce the program for the second annual AChemS meeting, and the AChemS membership at the time must be congratulated for having chosen such an able colleague, Charlotte Mistretta, as its first official Program Chairperson. Charlotte, together with her equally able committee members (Bill Cain, John Caprio and Bernice Wenzel), went to work immediately after AChemS I to plan AChemS II. Perhaps the Program Committee's first decision was to recommend to the Executive Committee that AChemS II be held in the same location and at the same time as AChemS I. This recommendation followed an informal tour of possible hotels in the area by John Caprio. It was his observation that none of these alternatives had as suitable facilities for our type of meeting as the Hyatt House. However, it was possible that in future years we might, like several other societies, move to other locations. Therefore, the Executive Committee appointed a Future Locations Committee chaired by David V. Smith, who, working in Wyoming at the time, did not have a strong bias towards either coast and would probably unhesitatingly leave Wyoming for a meeting most anywhere. This committee polled the membership with a questionnaire which showed no overwhelming preference on location except to hold the meeting in a resort-type setting. On the basis of this poll the Future Locations Committee recommended at the AChemS II business meeting that, while AChemS was in the process of getting itself well established over the next 'three to four years', we should continue to meet in Sarasota in the late spring. It should be

noted that there was then, as there probably is today, a West Coast contingent of members who would have liked some respite from the long and expensive trek east. It does appear, however, that many of the decisions made in the early years of AChemS have become traditions. A late spring meeting in Sarasota has become one of those traditions broken only every twelfth year or so by a joint meeting with ISOT.

The overall plan for the meeting's program was, in Charlotte's own words,

to devote most of the meeting to the presentation of the members' own volunteer contributions. That is, the meeting was to grow out of the membership directly, since it is their Association. [However], to ensure an infusion of ideas and speakers from outside the usual taste and smell community, we thought that one or two invited-speaker symposia would be useful. [Furthermore], to meet the expressed needs of certain small groups to focus on techniques, one or two workshops seemed appropriate.

Since this Program Committee, and the Executive Committee in general, were committed to having the program grow out of the membership itself, there then followed a series of letters to all the known and prospective members (with the postage borne by the state of New York) soliciting abstracts for papers and posters, suggestions for symposia, and nominations for the Givaudan Lecture. The Program Committee then generated a program based for the first time upon total membership input.

The Program Committee received 99 abstracts for volunteer presentations. These first had to be grouped according to theme, and then the Committee had to decide whether a given theme group should be presented as an oral session or as part of a poster session. This decision was, of course, faced with a number of considerations and constraints, including: the number of abstracts composing each theme group, how well they related to each other and to the theme in general, a need for theme diversity in order to appeal as broadly as possible to the membership's many interest constituencies, and the limited length of the meeting. As if these constraints were not enough to severely limit the Committee's degrees of freedom in making its decisions, some volunteer presenters reduced what little flexibility was left even further by wanting to give *only* an oral presentation or *only* a poster presentation. Somehow Charlotte, Bill, John and Bernice were able to sort all this out and schedule five oral sessions, with appropriate chairpersons, totaling 35 papers: (1) Development and Plasticity in Chemoreception—Dave Moulton; (2) Early Events in Chemoreception—Inglis Miller; (3) Endocrine Factors in Chemoreception—Mike Meredith; (4) Invertebrate Chemoreception—Sid Mayer; and (5) Coding—Marion Frank. The remaining volunteer presentations were

scheduled for one of two poster sessions, during which, as in AChemS I, no other event was scheduled.

For the reasons given above, the program also included two symposia with invited speakers and, for the first time at an AChemS meeting, it included a couple of workshops. The Program Committee chose the topics for both the symposia and the workshops from the solicited suggestions made by the membership. Actually the workshops were originally proposed as symposia but the Program Committee, with the enthusiastic approval of the Executive Committee, thought workshops would add a new dimension to the meeting. For the two symposia, the Committee asked the people who suggested them, Mike Levandowsky and Dietland Muller-Schwarze, to organize them. Levandowsky organized 'Microbial Chemoreception' and Muller-Schwarze organized 'The Complementarity of Laboratory and Field Studies of Chemical Communication'. Likewise, Gordon Shepherd and Bob Gesteland were asked to conduct workshops on 'Intracellular and Extracellular Recording Techniques', and Frank Catalanotto was asked to conduct a workshop on 'Taste Testing in a Clinical Setting'.

The polling of the membership for the Givaudan Lecturer led to the nomination of Carlos Eyzaguirre, who was well recognized for his seminal work in recording from the arterial chemoreceptors of the carotid and aortic bodies. For me personally it was a distinct pleasure to renew an old friendship with a superb scientist and truly fine gentleman by having the responsibility, as Executive Chairperson, to invite Dr Eyzaguirre to be our AChemS II Givaudan Lecturer. For AChemS it was another step in the evolution, started the year before, towards having the Givaudan Lectureship held by a scientist of international stature who is outside of the core taste and smell research community. Also, as with the Givaudan Lecturer the year before, Dr Eyzaguirre was able to stay and interact with us not just for the period around his talk but actually for most of the meeting, a 'tradition' which has been only variously observed in subsequent years. In summarizing Dr Eyzaguirre's Givaudan Lectureship, it would have to be said that it successfully achieved and reinforced what the AChemS Executive Committee and the Givaudan Corporation had envisioned. One disappointment, however, was that it did not markedly attract to AChemS that group of scientists who investigate the internal chemoreceptors which monitor the chemical world inside the body. At any rate, with great personal satisfaction we could afford to present to this Givaudan Lecturer, unlike the previous one, a professionally scripted and framed certificate commemorating the occasion.

In summarizing the program of the AChemS II meeting, Charlotte raised several questions that every Program Committee and Executive Committee still ponders. For instance, was the meeting too busy, especially in regard to scheduling events like workshops for the afternoons? These

are then in competition with the beach and free time for informal exchanges. How could the people assigned to poster sessions be made to feel that their work was as important as those assigned to oral sessions? With volunteer presentations how can one assure enough breadth to cover the interest diversities of the several groups we would like to attract to AChemS? In particular, in spite of several approaches over the years to significantly augment the attendance of our industrial chemosensory colleagues, we never seemed to develop a program, as Charlotte noted for AChemS II, that fully sparks their interest as a group. Notwithstanding these and many other lingering questions, it was still certain that AChemS did hold its second annual meeting, this time completely member driven, and it was a success.

While the program for AChemS II was being developed and the bylaws were being drafted, other things of note were also happening. In February of 1980 I received a letter from Ira Hill, who was representing International Flavors and Fragrances, Inc. (IFF) in offering to support an award in honor of a highly esteemed late member of their staff, Dr Stan Freeman, whose untimely death occurred in March of 1978. This 'Stan Freeman Award' of \$5000 would be presented for the 'most original work in olfaction' on a once every three year basis for a total of four presentations. The offer also included an additional \$2500 to make the award event a 'gala one'. Although discussed at AChemS I, it was not decided until AChemS II to present the first Stan Freeman Award at AChemS III. Lloyd Beidler was asked to chair the selection committee for the award, and he accepted. As many of us know, the Stan Freeman Award was one of the highlights of several previous AChemS meetings, and we were pleased to help IFF honor Stan Freeman in this way. From a somewhat different vantage point, however, I saw yet another significance in IFF's offer. Here was a major firm in the flavors and fragrances business who, like the Givaudan Corporation, saw in AChemS an organization with which they would like to be associated. In Ira Hill's own words, 'It appears to me that the young and vigorous Association for Chemoreception Sciences represents an excellent multi-discipline forum for this award . . . ; [it] represents the largest gathering of major contributors to the field in North America'. At this early stage in the development of AChemS, it was important and heartening to get endorsements like this.

To continue the process of establishing AChemS more solidly, the Executive Committee gave special emphasis, along with the legal issues and program development discussed above, to consolidating and increasing both our membership and our finances. In both regards, AChemS elected just the right people, namely, Rose Marie Pangborn and Tom Getchell, as chairs of the Membership and Financial Committees, respectively.

The Membership Committee very early took the lead in defining the credentials for membership. This was somewhat

delicate since it would be embarrassing to disqualify people, such as some students, who, by participating in the early meetings, had already come to think of themselves as members. On the other hand, membership should require solid documentation of a prolonged active interest in the chemical senses. The credentials for membership were finally approved by the members as a whole at AChemS II and were subsequently incorporated into the bylaws.

To increase membership, Rose Marie started a campaign to publicize the formation of AChemS and call attention to its annual meeting among other scientists who might have an interest. She later stated that the 'Announcement' she circulated to a number of appropriate journals and organizational newsletters did attract a modest group of ardent new members. She also sent a copy to the ECRO Newsletter which was not only published but also enthusiastically welcomed by the then President-elect of ECRO, E.P. Koster. At the AChemS II business meeting Rose Marie reported that the number of dues-paying members totaled 253. Of these, 124 were from academic institutions, 41 from industrial enterprises, 33 from research institutes, 15 from the government and 40 were graduate students. A membership of 253 was not large, but, as my enthusiasm at the time allowed me to rationalize, it was only 10 short of the list of North American names I had culled two years earlier as being possibly interested in a chemosensory society. I never did try to compare in detail the names of the 253 members with the 263 names on the earlier list; I just enjoyed my fantasy about the meaning of the similarity in the numbers too much to dare putting it to the test.

Any new organization has to worry about finances, and again the AChemS membership made the right choice by electing as its Treasurer and Chair of the Finance Committee a truly superlative finance-worrier, Tom Getchell. Tom brought to the job not only the fiscal fastidiousness of the finest Certified Public Accountant but also a real understanding for how and to what this fledgling organization ought to commit its meager resources. In

addition, with little fund raising experience other than NIH grant applications, Tom turned out to be, for an amateur, reasonably facile in this regard. I noted above that he was likely instrumental in the Givaudan Corporation's offer of a lectureship back in 1978 before AChemS I, and now in 1980, as Treasurer, he was able to enroll R.J. Reynolds, General Foods and Ralston-Purina as corporate members at \$1000 each. Looking back, \$1000 from such giant organizations does not seem to be much, but with AChemS at that time being little more than a hope, we were thankful that we could get even that much. Indeed, this \$3000 was a little less than a third of the total AChemS bank account as reported in the minutes of the AChemS II business meeting. The actual amount in our account reported by Tom as of July 10, 1980 was only \$9736.83, but we were solvent!

From a personal point of view, AChemS II had a very special meaning. According to the bylaws I had to step down May 6, 1980 from Executive Chairperson to Past-executive Chairperson. It was true that in this latter role, according to the bylaws, I would still serve on the Executive Committee for an additional year and I would chair the next Elections Committee. It was also true that I was still putting the finishing touches on what was to be the final draft of the bylaws. Notwithstanding my few remaining responsibilities, the fact was still true that the baton had been passed. Although, as I said above, this was as it should have been, there was the traditional lump in my throat when, after about five years in pursuit of this goal, I turned the lead over to the next Executive Chairperson, Linda Bartoshuk. As I did so, however, I realized that with such people as Linda and her Executive Chairperson-elect, Gordon Shepherd, and all the other fine scientists and people in AChemS who could adroitly move into leadership positions, AChemS was in good hands. I believe that the real story behind the success of AChemS was, and still is, its members. You, its members, took the chance back in 1979 to come to Sarasota and it has been you who, ever since those early days, have tended the AChemS concept. I thank you all for the meticulous care you have given our Association.