



NEWSLETTER

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF PROSTHODONTISTS

AN ORGANIZATION OF SPECIALISTS
DEDICATED TO SERVING THE PUBLIC

ISSN 0736-346X

COLLEGE TO VOTE ON F.P.O.

Dear Members of the American College of Prosthodontists:

We are about to vote on one of the most crucial issues the College has faced since its founding — whether to remain in, or to withdraw from the Federation of Prosthodontic Organizations (FPO). As voting members of the College we have the right to vote on this important issue. But along with this privilege we have the **responsibility** of becoming knowledgeable, informed voters. This special edition of the Newsletter has been published to help us become better informed. Please take the time to read the various points of view presented. If you have any questions, call your officers, Executive Councilors or those who have contributed to this issue of the Newsletter, but please **be informed** when you vote.

My View: An Open Letter

Please allow me the opportunity to review the current status of the relationship between the College and the Federation of Prosthodontic Organizations and then to share my perspective on the vote to withdraw from the FPO.

Changes have evolved in our relationship with the FPO over the past few years but the most significant changes have occurred since Cosmo DeSteno's President's Message in the September, 1987 Newsletter. The most recent changes were the approval of the following resolutions by the FPO Executive Committee on February 19, 1988. Please take the time to carefully review the two resolutions.

RESOLUTION 1

Resolved, that the FPO designates the ACP as the representative of the specialty of prosthodontics and the Sponsoring Organization of the American Board of Prosthodontics

EDITOR'S COMMENTS

The purpose of this special edition of the Newsletter is to explain to the members the nature of the question that is to be voted on and to permit some pros and cons that members have expressed to be shared with all the voting College members.

Your Editor has compiled the letters as received and is printing them without editorial comment or correction. Only one letter favoring withdrawal was submitted, and it appears as written. Liberty was taken, in the interest of brevity, to shorten several letters favoring remaining a member of the FPO. Nothing affecting the meaning was altered.

It is the desire of the Editor, on an issue this important to the future of the college, to remain neutral. The most important point is to allow the members to speak and, once spoken, to proceed with the vote. Let the members vote!

(CONTINUE FROM COLUMN 1)

within the structure of the FPO and in cooperation with the other member organizations, and be it further

Resolved, that representation and sponsorship be accomplished through the following mechanisms:

- FPO/ACP Council for the Affairs of the American Board of Prosthodontics administrative and financial support provided by FPO
- FPO/ACP Council for ADA and Interspecialty Affairs administrative and financial support provided by FPO
- Equal representation in Interspecialty Group President and President-elect of FPO and ACP
- FPO/ACP equal responsibility for defense of the specialty and be it further.

Resolved, that upon approval of this

(CONTINUE NEXT PAGE)

South Carolina Responds

Dear Ken:

Enclosed is a letter to the Editor regarding the FPO issue that I hope will be published in the coming Newsletter. It is the only letter you will receive from our section.

If there were not two sides to the issue, then it follows that there would be no need for a vote. I appreciate the opportunity to express an opposing view.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Strohaber, D.D.S., M.Sc.
President

South Carolina Section, A.C.P.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

I would like to offer my views as an individual regarding the College vote to withdraw from the FPO. I feel compelled to do this for several reasons. First, my perspective is somewhat unique. Second, I am goaded by the subtle and not so subtle pressures being applied to those of us who oppose the FPO. Third, when we all think alike, perhaps no one is thinking very much. Fourth, younger members are largely unaware of the issues that spawned the College. Fifth, Noel Wilkie touched a nerve when he mentioned the "good old boys" in the February Newsletter.

I was a graduate student under Carl O. Boucher as the FPO was developing; and then was a resident under College founder Tony De Bello as the ACP was being organized. Thus, I was privy to what both sides were saying at the time, both publicly and privately.

Publicly, the FPO was touted as a forum through which a fragmented discipline could lobby for prosthodontics with a unified voice. While this logic sounded impeccable to nearly everyone, there was more to the story. The real question has always been — lobby

(CONTINUE ON PAGE 3, COLUMN 3)

(CONTINUE FROM PAGE 1, COLUMN 2)
resolution by the FPO Executive Committee, necessary revisions and additions to the FPO By-laws be developed in preparation for a vote by the FPO House of Delegates at its September 1988 meeting.

RESOLUTION 2

Resolved, that an FPO/ACP Council for ADA and Interspecialty Affairs be established. Purposes of the Council shall be to monitor all activities of the ADA and specialty and interspecialty organizations which have an effect on the specialty of prosthodontics; to discuss, prepare and submit a position, when appropriate, on proposed policy, resolutions or reports of external organizations or agencies; to review or to prepare position papers, documents or resolutions to be forwarded to proper agencies or organizations within or outside the ADA; and, for purposes of completing its duties, to convene as often as deemed necessary by a majority of Council members, within the approved budget, and be it further

Resolved, that the FPO/ACP Council for ADA and Interspecialty Affairs be composed of the following voting members: The FPO and ACP Presidents, two representatives selected by the FPO Officers Committee and two selected by the ACP Executive Council, and be it further

Resolved, that the Council have the following consultants: President of the American Board of Prosthodontics, one ADA Delegate selected by the FPO Officers Committee and one selected by the ACP Executive Council. The FPO/ACP Council may request additional consultants as it sees a need, and be it further

Resolved, that upon approval of the resolution by the FPO Executive Committee, that the necessary revisions and additions to the FPO By-laws be developed in preparation for a vote by the FPO House of Delegates at its September, 1988 meeting.

(Please note in both resolutions that FPO By-laws changes will have to be approved by the House of Delegates in September, 1988. If the ACP membership votes against withdrawing from the FPO, and in September, the FPO House of Delegates fails to approve the required by-laws changes, such action will be reported at the October ACP Business Meeting and the floor will be opened to discussion on the question of withdrawing from the FPO.)

Benefits of Sponsorship of the Board

The FPO has been the sponsoring organization of the American Board of

Prosthodontics since 1972. Sponsorship of the Board has been the major point of conflict in our relationship with the FPO and is the issue usually raised in debate concerning withdrawing from the FPO. However, there seems to be confusion concerning the implications of sponsorship so I will share my understanding of this issue. There are three principal benefits to being the sponsoring organization for the Board: (1) the ability to nominate and elect members of the Board; (2) direct communication to and from the American Dental Association regarding issues of importance to the specialty and discipline; and (3) representation of the specialty of prosthodontics in its interrelations and interactions with other specialty organizations.

A common misconception is that the sponsoring organization can dictate how the Board examination is structured and conducted. All specialty boards are independent entities who meet the guidelines of the American Dental Association and who answer only to that organization.

The FPO Council for the Affairs of the American Board of Prosthodontics was established approximately five years ago following negotiations between the College and the FPO. The Council has three representatives from the College, three representatives from the FPO and one representative from each of the following organizations: the Academy of Crown and Bridge Prosthodontics, the Academy of Denture Prosthetics, and the American Academy of Maxillo-facial Prosthetics. The Council maintains liaison with the Board, evaluates nominees for election to the Board, conducts the election process, and can make suggestions relative to the certification process. But it is the members of the Board who make the decisions concerning the Board. Since the Council was established, four members of the Board have been elected by the active Diplomates of the Board. All four were the nominees of the ACP, so we have, in fact, been nominating and electing the members of the Board. We have ample representation in the Council, and Bob Sproull, a past President of the ACP, is Chairman of the Council. The change made to the Council for the Affairs of the American Board of Prosthodontics in **Resolution 1** is that it will become an FPO/ACP Council rather than an FPO Council.

The second benefit of being the sponsor of the Board is having direct contact with the ADA and its Councils. In the past, the College has been

frustrated by not having direct access and at times has felt that the specialty was not adequately represented. This has been addressed by two recent FPO resolutions. The first was passed at the September House of Delegates meeting in which the FPO Central Office was directed to refer issues concerning the specialty to the College. This referral is occurring on a regular basis. The College is providing input and has been able to make important appointments. The other resolution was approved at the February FPO Executive Committee meeting. (**See Resolution 2.**) The new FPO/ACP Council for ADA and Interspecialty Affairs will provide the College direct access and input on issues related to the specialty of prosthodontics.

The third benefit to a sponsoring organization is the direct interaction with other specialty organizations. Two years ago the ACP was granted representation in the Interspecialty Group, an organization of ADA approved dental specialties. The Group meets twice each year and addresses issues of mutual concern. **Resolution 1** provides the College representation in the Interspecialty Group equal to that of the FPO.

Another recent resolution changed the method of allocating representation in the FPO House of Delegates. (See latest Newsletter.) Representation is now directly related to the amount of FPO dues paid by members of each organization. The College now has the opportunity of obtaining a large percentage of the total vote, if our members pay their FPO dues.

Effect of Recent Changes

So how have the recent FPO changes affected the College? We now have the benefits of sponsoring the Board albeit we share some of the responsibility with other FPO organizations. In areas in which we share responsibility, we can have a considerable impact on FPO positions through the size of our vote in the House of Delegates. We are now in a position to provide strong leadership in the FPO. We are now in a position to interact with other specialties on an equal basis. We are now in a position to ensure that our specialty will be represented by specialists and that the concerns of specialists are heard by the ADA.

My Perspective on the Vote to Withdraw

Through actions of the September, 1987 FPO House of Delegates and the February, 1988 FPO Executive Committee, we are on the threshold of

achieving the number one goal of the College: *"To be the accepted, recognized authority in the specialty of prosthodontics."* From my perspective we have reached the point where leaving the FPO would not be an appropriate decision. Admittedly, I have not always felt we should remain in the FPO, and spoke on the floor of an ACP Business Meeting several years ago urging our members to withdraw. It was my feeling that the ACP could not reach its goal of becoming the representative of the specialty until it became the sponsor of the American Board of Prosthodontics and assumed the College would have to withdraw from the FPO to obtain sponsorship. The way in which this goal can be achieved is far different than we envisioned at that time — *being the sponsoring organization of the Board* within the structure of the FPO. (See Resolution 1.)

The College has hundreds of enthusiastic and willing workers who can contribute to making the FPO a more effective organization. We should not relinquish our current position by voting to leave the FPO, but rather should remain in the FPO and provide the direction and leadership that the College is capable of providing.

Some of you may not agree with my point of view and some of you may not understand the need for the College being involved in the "politics" of interacting with the ADA and other specialties. The College, the specialty organization in prosthodontics, must provide leadership in combating those forces inside and outside dentistry who are trying to stifle or totally eliminate prosthodontics as a specialty. A large organization of generalists, the Federal Trade Commission, and the insurance carriers are among those who have raised issues that must be addressed by our specialty organization through interaction with the ADA and the other specialty organizations.

There may be some merit to the point of view that if the ACP withdraws from the FPO, the FPO will collapse and the only logical sponsoring organization would be the College. The problem with that point of view is time — the time it would take for the FPO to collapse and the time required for the ACP to achieve sponsorship. The FPO could continue without us for several years, probably in a weakened and ineffective condition, making effective representation of the specialty and the discipline impossible. The FPO would probably survive for several years because we would have hardened our opposition to

the extent they would expend considerable time and effort to oppose the College.

Please keep in mind that to become the sole sponsor of the Board, we would have to convince the Council on Dental Education of the ADA that either they had made a mistake in recommending approval of the FPO as the sponsoring organization last year, or that the FPO no longer meets the requirements of a sponsoring organization. Once this was accomplished, we would have to convince the ADA House of Delegates as well. At the same time we would have to prove that the College meets all the criteria for sponsorship. The leaders of the ADA have a strong, comfortable working relationship with the FPO, so it is doubtful we would receive much support from them. The mechanism for approval of a sponsoring organization and approval of a specialty are interwoven. Any attempt to prove that the FPO should not be the sponsoring organization would open to scrutiny the specialty as well. We should avoid opening prosthodontics to another evaluation when the process has just been completed. It could take several years to obtain sole sponsorship considering the way the approval process occurs in the ADA. During the ensuing turmoil the specialty of prosthodontics would be fair game for those who oppose our specialty and the College would be entirely without representation within organized dentistry.

Those of you who feel the College should withdraw from the FPO, please reconsider that position as I have. What will be gained by withdrawing that has not been achieved or can not be achieved by staying in? Even if your expectations have not been completely fulfilled, do not set aside the progress that has been made.

This is the time for the College to provide the strong leadership our specialty needs now! **Rather than taking revolutionary action by withdrawing, allow the evolutionary process to continue in which the College is assuming its rightful role as the leader of the specialty.** We are now in a position to provide that leadership from within a restructured FPO. **Please vote in opposition to withdrawing from the FPO.**

Thank you for considering my point of view.

Bill Kuebker

(CONTINUE FROM PAGE 1, COLUMN 3)
for whom in prosthodontics? Those who started the Journal and the Board saw the handwriting on the wall. They realized that as the number of Board Qualified and Certified Prosthodontists grew, discontent with the Academy of Denture Prosthetics controlling the action was also growing. So, the FPO was formed and organized in such a manner that the "good old boys" essentially maintained control under a different banner.

Dissatisfaction among trained prosthodontists continued to mount. The major organizations had fixed numbers of members and new prosthodontists often waited years before being permitted to join one. They could go to meetings as guests if they had a "grandfather" to sponsor them. In short, they felt like second-class citizens, even after playing all the required games. Our founding fathers were great men that accomplished much; but they neglected to free the "slaves" they had created.

The College sprang to life because the status quo was unacceptable. The College and the FPO were antagonists from the beginning because the College represented a threat to the "good old boys" dominion; and because the FPO could not provide specific representation for the trained specialist. Eighteen years have not changed the problem or the adverse relationship; nor is some new treaty of coexistence likely to be a solution in the future.

I have listened and read with interest the arguments against withdrawing from the FPO. Only a couple merit comment. Those who have demanded a vote only after the electorate is "informed" should be ashamed of themselves. History is filled with Stalins and Hitlers who have demanded "informed" electorates. Over half the world population is enslaved today by similar thinking leaderships. That is not the way of a democracy. Two questions make the problem clear: Informed of what; and by whom?

Others have argued that the question of control of the Board is the major issue, and that this issue has now been defused. The Board issue has never been my chief reason for boycotting the FPO, even though the College today has the only legitimate claim to it. My major issue has been the fact that never in my specialty career, regardless of how much I spent on organized dentistry, have my dues dollars in any

organization bought exclusive specialty representation like that enjoyed by all of the other major specialties. The College remained my only hope. If that hope is dashed now when the fight is all but won, will I have any need to belong to just another nondeductible prosthodontic fraternity?

The FPO cannot represent the specialist while at the same time representing the interests of its generalist members. How can we logically fit in the same bag? Can we allow the FPO to become our Trojan horse? Is it the specialist or the generalist who gets his money's worth from the FPO? Several organizations have already answered the latter question: Neither! The doomsayers predict dire consequences if the College does not agree to coexist with the FPO; but we must elect not to continue to be led like sheep. We now have the numbers and the talent and the interest to cause a new, enlightened prosthodontic phoenix to arise from the ashes of the FPO.

We have waited eighteen years for the simple right to vote for the College to fulfill its rightful destiny. That right has been repeatedly opposed and challenged and delayed until finally the time has come. Let's not waste this moment and vote for more of the same. Regardless of the personalities and egos involved, all prosthodontists deserve, and could profit from, specific specialty representation for some of their organized dentistry dollars. And despite the reluctance of the Executive Council, I have faith that they will be equal to the task of leading us to a brighter future.

In conclusion, permit me the license to alter slightly the words of John Stuart Mill: 'Prosthodontists may want representative government, but if, from insolence, or carelessness, or cowardice, or want of a public spirit, they are unequal to the exertions necessary for obtaining it; if they will not fight for it when it is directly attacked; if they can be deluded by artifices used to cheat them out of it; if by momentary discouragement or temporary panic or a fit of enthusiasm for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet of even a great man, or entrust him with powers that enable him to subvert their institutions, in all these cases they are more or less unfit for liberty and unlikely long to enjoy it.'

Robert Allen Strohaber

Executive Council Favors Remaining In FPO

by James Fowler

At the last Executive Council Meeting held at the Executive House in Chicago, Illinois on February 21-22, 1988, President Kuebker addressed in his report the issue of withdrawal of the College from the Federation of Prosthodontic Organizations.

For those of you who may not be familiar with events leading up to this latest action by the Executive Council may I briefly summarize the situation.

At the Annual Session Business Meeting in Williamsburg, Virginia October 16, 1986, Dr. Henry Muller reported that at a South Carolina Section meeting on September 17, 1986, fifteen members of that Section voted unanimously to approve a resolution recommending to the College that it withdraw its membership from the Federation Of Prosthodontic Organizations. The resolution also called for notifying the officers of the College of the resolution and asked that it be reported at the meeting during any discussion of business related to the FPO. On behalf of the South Carolina Chapter, Dr. Muller made a motion: *"That the eligible voting members of the American College of Prosthodontists shall be polled by mail in a manner which reflects time being of the essence and which assures the confidentiality of the ballots on the question: The American College of Prosthodontists shall withdraw its membership from the Federation of Prosthodontic Organizations"*. The motion seconded and after considerable discussion, an amendment to the motion: *"That the College be bound by results of that vote"*, was made and seconded. The amendment carried.

During lengthy discussion of the original motion it was stated that the Executive Council, at its last meeting, had voted 8 to 1 to maintain membership in the FPO. It was also stated that the College should not abandon the FPO unless a contingency plan was in place. A motion: *"That the motion be tabled until the next annual session to allow Dr. DeSteno and the committee that he will appoint looking at the contingencies, will be able to have a contingencies plan to choose from at the time we poll our membership about being in or out of the FPO"*, was made and seconded. The motion passed, thereby tabling the original motion until the next annual Business Meeting.

At the Annual Business Meeting in San Diego in 1987, Dr. Robert Strohaber

of the South Carolina Section made a motion: *"That our motion from last year that was tabled be returned to the floor"*. The motion was seconded and passed. The original motion to take the vote was also passed.

Since the original motion by South Carolina in October 1986, tremendous activity and achievement have been generated among the FPO, ADA and the ACP. President Kuebker has continued the negotiation process with the FPO with the purpose of providing the College membership a viable alternative to withdrawal from the FPO.

Two resolutions were prepared and submitted for approval by the FPO Executive Committee at the February 19th meeting in Chicago. The accepted resolutions are included in President Kuebker's letter to the members, page 1, this issue.

The resolutions would require a By-Laws change by the FPO House of Delegates in September, 1988.

During the second day of the Chicago Executive Council Meeting, President Kuebker addressed the issue of withdrawal of the ACP from the FPO. He asked everyone including the Executive Council and some 19 other College Committee persons present in turn to state their position on this issue and invited all to ask any questions.

From around the table there was a unified agreement that the College should stay in the FPO at this time. Some members were in favor of remaining with the FPO because of the changes that have occurred including a mechanism to resolve many past problems. It was recognized that it has been difficult for the FPO to represent the specialty and the discipline in issues where there is conflict, i.e. fee listing with insurance companies, peer review, Yellow Page advertising and State licensure for specialties. All of those issues have two sides, the generalist with an interest in prosthodontics and the prosthodontic specialist. Allowing the ACP to address these specialty areas has been a marked advancement and has minimized the conflict. One member stated that over the past year and a half, major strides have been taken, but these may be only the first steps in a continuing negotiation. Another member stated that we can attain our objectives either within or outside the FPO, but we can achieve them more rapidly and expeditiously if we stay within the FPO. There was a general consensus that specialty issues should be addressed by specialists so that other organizations such as the

ADA looking into prosthodontics recognize the College when they are addressing specialty issues.

Past President DeSteno expressed his opinion that the College must keep the momentum going and this would require everyone's support. He stated that the support is critical and is in the form of College members paying FPO dues. This number determines the appointment of College delegates to the FPO House of Delegates. He stated that the College must continue to work very hard with every member's support so that we can assume a vital role in the FPO.

After further discussion, a motion: "The Executive Council recommends continued membership in the FPO at this time", was made and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The above information has been taken from the file of Official College Minutes. The Secretary requests that you carefully read the information in this Special Newsletter and then make your decision on the enclosed ballot. All ballots must be returned to the Secretary in care of the Central Office by May 16, 1988.

SHOULD THE COLLEGE REMAIN IN THE F.P.O.?

One of the College's longest standing goals is to be the spokesman for the Specialty of Prosthodontics. To me this includes being the sponsoring organization for The American Board of Prosthodontics and being recognized as such by the American Dental Association. This is necessary if the voice of 1500+ College members is to be considered by dentistry's parent organization in that group's decision and policy making process, when it relates to our Specialty.

For years we have jostled with the FPO relative to our respective roles in this area of mutual concern. Recently several organizations have seen fit to withdraw from the FPO and our College is about to decide on this issue.

Officials of the ACP, ADA and FPO have met to discuss the various modes by which The American Board of Prosthodontics could be jointly sponsored by the ACP and FPO. It was said that joint sponsorship could not be officially recognized by the ADA. However, such joint sponsorship of the American Board of Public Health Dentistry by two public health organizations did exist.

Now, the FPO hierarchy has agreed to put before the FPO House of Delegates two resolutions which would

designate the ACP as the representative of the Specialty of Prosthodontics and the sponsoring organization of The American Board of Prosthodontics within the structure of the FPO. Further, an FPO/ACP council would be established to monitor actions which would have an effect on our Specialty.

To me Resolution 2 is vague and may be in conflict with that part of Resolution 1 which states that the ACP will represent the Specialty.

Still, the FPO has made a conciliatory gesture towards our College. Should we ever wish to petition the ADA for sole sponsorship of The American Board of Prosthodontics without first attempting this avenue of resolution of this dilemma, such a lack of ACP cooperation would be an impediment to other initiatives.

I therefore feel that the College must cooperate in this effort and for the time being remain within the FPO — this is a change from a previously long held opinion of mine that we should withdraw.

However, I make the above statement with the following caveat — the passage of the two Resolutions is not the end of the issue. All of us, and particularly the Officers and Executive Councilors of the College, must insure that not only the letter but the **SPIRIT** of the agreement must be scrupulously observed and implemented. All matters relating to the Specialty of Prosthodontics must be referred to the College by the FPO and when the Specialty is to be represented outside the framework of the ACP or FPO, a spokesman chosen by the College must speak for the Specialty.

Should this not happen, in my view, it will only be a question of time before the issues hopefully being resolved today will once again rise for consideration with one difference — the attempt at ACP/FPO cooperation will be behind us.

Robert W. Elliott, Jr.
Past President 1976-1977

A PAST PRESIDENT SPEAKS

The American College of Prosthodontists. An idea whose time had come. Our founders were pioneers and visionaries who knew the **specialty of prosthodontics** had to be unified, clarified, and heard if it was to survive.

The groundwork was laid; the organizational details worked out. A fledgling organization launched to recognize, attack, and solve problems related to **the specialty**. The doors were open. No

exclusive club here. Membership was achieved by educational credentials. Private practitioners, academicians, and military dentists all saw the challenges; all were willing to contribute and to make opportunity and fairness the hallmarks of the organization.

No back room deals here. The meetings of the Executive Council were where business was done, and were and are open to all. The minutes were published almost verbatim. As a policy any member can receive a copy by asking. A Newsletter which was and is a "news" letter has kept the membership interested, aware, and fully informed. Its usefulness is a tribute to J.D. Larkin, Bob Elliott, and Ken Stewart.

Where was the College going and what were its directions? Again, no doubt here. Aims and Goals were developed in detail in New Orleans in the early 70's, and were thoroughly reviewed and rewritten in San Antonio in the 80's. This June will see another workshop directed toward redefinition of the Aims and Goals. All members can contribute through their Sections; all members will see the results published; and each College committee will set forth to meet their individual goals and will account for their accomplishments three times a year.

Lastly, the maturing process was aided by outstanding leadership openly chosen by the members, a steadily growing membership, and a sound financial base. This organization like many "blue chips" in America has good corporate memory, a proud esprit de corps, a recognizable logo, a spirit of entrepreneurship, excellent financial management, a solid management structure in its central office, and modern day technologies in its business activities. The American College of Prosthodontists is here to stay and the profession knows what it stands for.

Where does the College stand on the issues? Again, we're on record here. Some which are of concern now are:

I. Adequate and proportional representation in the Federation of Prosthodontic Organizations.

Our Delegate strength has not been proportional to the size of the College nor to the financial support we have been asked to give and have provided the FPO. The Delegate strength is based on dues paying members (dues paid to the FPO) and we now have a suitable formula to correct this situation. At present approximately 55% of our membership has paid dues to the

FPO and this equates to 7 Delegates (as opposed to the 3 which we've had in the past). We should all pay our FPO dues and increase this delegate strength to the maximum.

II. Specialty issues resolved by the specialty organization.

In the past, many specialty issues coming from the American Dental Association, the U.S. government, insurance carriers, state societies and the like stopped at the FPO. The College has no concrete assurances that these issues now will be referred to us, but more and more this is happening. The president of the FPO, Alex Koper, is bending over backwards to see that the College officially addresses specialty issues. He is to be complimented on this approach and the FPO officers in the future should follow his good example.

III. The specialty organization should represent the specialty in the Interspecialty Group.

The FPO represented the specialty of prosthodontics in this group for a long period of time. The other specialties wondered why prosthodontics was not clear on what were specialty issues and what were discipline issues. A great responsibility of any specialty is to insure the discipline is advancing and is productive for the benefit of the public. But those in the discipline should not and cannot speak to specialty issues. In 1986, John Rhoads, the President of the FPO at that time, asked that the College come into the Interspecialty Group as an equal and joint part of the prosthodontic representation. Again, wisdom and fairness were shown by a leader in the FPO; something which could be expected in a man of John's caliber. This should continue.

IV. Sponsorship of the Board

New resolutions worked out between the College and the FPO will establish the FPO/ACP Council for the Affairs of the American Board of Prosthodontics. We, the College, will achieve degrees of sponsorship within the framework of the FPO. This is a compromise which is acceptable to the ADA. We should work hard to see that these resolutions pass at the FPO House of Delegates. This solution will no doubt evolve further to the benefit of the specialty in years to come.

Now what? The issue to get the College out of the FPO comes to a vote. This same issue was debated in the business meeting years ago in Monterey, California. Strong stands were made on both sides. It arose again

with the South Carolina resolution in Williamsburg in 1986. That section is to be congratulated on a well thought out resolution which takes the emotion out of the vote. Remember, you are going to be able to make a well educated decision and vote in the quiet of your office or home. In 1987 in San Diego at the Business Meeting the South Carolina resolution came off the table and again members with great conviction to improve the specialty spoke on both sides of the issue. Since that time our officers and Executive Council have continued to work out the issues with the FPO. Discretion, good judgement, calmness, and a dedication to do what is right for the membership and their goals have prevailed.

The scenario which takes the College out of the FPO at this time isn't a good one. It would mean everything would stop. It would cause each organization to completely reassess their direction and their goals. It would confuse the profession and the ADA and other outside entities dealing with the specialty. It would cause good men with good intentions to become alienated and counterproductive. These outcomes are not what we want.

I have always maintained membership by paying dues to the FPO. I do that to insure full College representation in the FPO based on dues paying members. I have always had faith in the good judgement of good men. Issues should always be discussed now and in the future. There will be continued evolution and new compromises. We, the College, will hold our own and insure the specialty grows and has its say.

How will I vote? I will vote to STAY IN — and know the future holds as many challenges and as much hard work as the past. I am recommending that you join me in this effort. Vote to stay in and ask others to do likewise. I know you will make the right choice and I thank you.

Noel D. Wilkie, D.D.S.

GEORGIA SECTION

Dear Dr. Stewart:

The annual business meeting and election of officers of the Georgia Section, American College of Prosthodontists was held on March 19, 1988. As is customary, this meeting was held on the Saturday of the Hinman Dental Meeting in Atlanta.

At the meeting the question of the college's withdrawing from the Federation of Prosthodontic Organizations

(the South Carolina Resolution) was addressed. It was the consensus of the attendees, moved and unanimously approved that the Georgia Section go on record as supporting the ACP Executive Council's recommendation to remain in the FPO.

With the approval of the pertinent resolutions by the FPO Executive Committee on February 19, 1988 and pending approval by the FPO House of Delegates, The American College of Prosthodontists can be expected to receive recognition as the representative of the Specialty of Prosthodontics. Serendipitously this will be possible within the structure of the FPO and The American College of Prosthodontists will be able to continue as a pure specialty organization with its membership being prosthodontic peers.

Our position is in no way contrary to the aims of our colleagues from South Carolina. We are grateful that through their efforts the matter has been pressed to affirmative action on our behalf. An untimely and precipitous action by our membership to vote to withdraw from FPO membership at this time would be contrary to our objectives and best interests.

Sincerely,

E. Neal Kopp, D.D.S.

President, Georgia Section

American College of Prosthodontists

A GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY

Opportunity is defined by Webster's dictionary as "a favorable combination of circumstances". Of course, to take advantage of an opportunity requires that one recognizes when a combination of circumstances is favorable. This is, in fact, the essence of this special edition of the ACP Newsletter. The executive council of the College would like to make certain that all the members of the College realize that an opportunity exists for the College to achieve a prominence within the FPO that will benefit the College and FPO and the specialty and discipline of prosthodontics.

When reading the various articles and editorials in this newsletter, keep in mind what the College has been trying to achieve and what we can achieve. President Kuebker has clearly and succinctly discussed this issue in his message. The issues may seem complicated and confusing to some and esoteric to others. Reading this newsletter thoroughly should clear any confusion.

The upcoming vote will significantly

influence the College and FPO. Voting to retain our membership within the FPO will give us the opportunity to play out the scenario which began last September in Chicago at the FPO House of Delegates meeting. As you know by now, the significant result of that meeting was changing the calculation of delegates for member organizations. The College was clearly the winner with the passing of that resolution. The executive council has worked these past months so that we may benefit from the increase in our FPO delegates. It gives us a very strong base within the FPO from which to work.

If the College does vote to stay within the FPO and the FPO House of Delegates meeting this September proves to be a disappointment, we can reassess our position with the FPO. The vote we are about to take is not for perpetuity. A new vote can be taken at any time.

A vote to withdraw from the FPO could compromise our position with the ADA. We will have to pursue our goals and objectives directly with the ADA. Although possible, the cost to the College could be astronomical. We would need a very strong commitment from all the members of the College. This commitment will not only be financial but also moral. I have no doubts the College would rise to the occasion and ultimately be successful whatever the cost.

My question is, Why not take the more logical approach and play out the scenario as it exists? It will not cost the College anything and certainly could benefit the College in many ways. As stated above, either way the result of the vote is not carved in stone.

The success of the College's plan to deal with the FPO during the next few months and at the FPO House of Delegates meeting is predicated on the number of delegates we will have. The delegate count is based on dues paying members. One delegate for each organization and one additional delegate for each 100 members who have paid dues. If you haven't yet paid dues, it is not too late. We need your support. The more delegates we have, the more influential we can be. You can forward your dues (\$75⁰⁰) to the address below:

Federation of Prosthodontic Organizations
211 East Chicago Avenue
Suite 948
Chicago, ILL. 60611
Attn: Mr. Peter C. Goulding

You make the decision. Think about the circumstances as they exist. If you feel we are in a favorable position, then

help the College take advantage of this opportunity. Cast your vote to retain membership within the FPO. If you haven't yet paid your FPO dues please do so as soon as possible. Remember, the strength of the College within the FPO is based on its delegated count.

Cosmo V. De Steno DMD PHD

Dear Dr. Stewart:

After reading the latest ACP Newsletter, I feel compelled to comment on the South Carolina Resolution and the FPO.

For twelve years I have 'filed' three dues statements each year in their proper place. I have done this because I considered them to be another expense for which I received no benefit. I continue to believe that the personal benefits are not worth the cost, but my attitude has changed as to the reason for paying dues.

I am convinced that if the ACP hopes to achieve its stated goals and objectives, we must do it through the FPO. As an independent organization, the ACP will find it much more difficult to be the spokesperson for prosthodontics. We will become an out-law organization in the eyes of organized dentistry.

I believe that a much easier road to achieving our goals in prosthodontics will be to gain influence within the FPO itself. This can only be done by paying FPO dues and increasing representation within that body. As the ACP gains strength within the FPO, we will be in a position to influence and sometimes dictate their policy. In that regard, The American College of Prosthodontists will absorb the FPO and use their existing framework to meet our objectives.

The FPO seems to be finally becoming more responsive to our needs. If this is true, maybe it is time we gave them our full support.

Regardless of each individual's opinion as to the South Carolina Resolution, I believe it is a very critical crossroad in the future of the ACP and prosthodontics. I would urge all members to critically look at the facts and thoroughly understand the situation before their vote is cast.

Sincerely,

David J. Crozier, D.D.S.

Dear Dr. Stewart,

I would like to state my position on the issue of withdrawing from the Federation of Prosthodontic Organizations. When the matter was presented by the South Carolina delegation at the

annual meeting I had an open mind on the question until I had more information. I believe that the February 1988 Newsletter and previous publications have been very thorough and have discussed the various points very adequately.

Therefore, I intend to vote against the resolution to withdraw. I believe that the officers of the College have been very diligent in communicating with the leaders of the Federation and have stated our position very forcefully. I believe that the College can be much more of an influence in prosthodontics and in dentistry by working within the framework of the Federation. The appropriate increase in delegate strength certainly is a positive step and a means to be heard more effectively. It will be especially important that all members of the College maintain our strength by paying our dues to the FPO so that the number of delegates properly represents the College.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my views.

Sincerely,

Gerald W. Eastwood, D.M.D.
3805 Queen Mary Drive
Olney, Maryland 20832

PLEASE PAY YOUR FPO DUES

As of March 18 only **53 percent** of ACP members had paid their FPO dues, giving the College **7** votes in the 1988 FPO House of Delegates. If all Fellows and Associates were to pay their dues, the College would have **14** delegates. We need as many votes as possible to ensure passage of resolutions of importance to the specialty.

Please pay your dues **before July 1**, as that is the cut-off date for determining delegate allocation. Send your dues to the:

Federation of Prosthodontic
Organizations
211 E. Chicago Avenue, Suite 948
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Make certain you indicate that you are an ACP member.

Dear Editor:

This letter is in response to your request for opinions on whether the College should vote for withdrawal from the FPO or should remain an active member.

This question seems premature in that a quick review of our bylaws discloses that our only conduit to organized dentistry in the United States

is through the FPO. If we sever our formal relationship with the FPO, we in effect disenfranchise ourselves, without necessarily having any impact on the FPO position relating to any matter, and deprive ourselves of any voice in the ADA or its structure.

Prior to reviewing our relationship with the FPO, the College needs to establish a direct formal relationship with the ADA.

Sincerely,
John B. Houston.

The Resolution of Conflict of Interest

Since its foundation in the late 1960's, the Federation of Prosthodontic Organizations has represented, and continues to represent at the ADA level, the Specialty of Prosthodontics and the Discipline of Prosthodontics. The specialty consists of Board Certified and Board Eligible Prosthodontists, and the discipline consists of General Dentists with varying degrees of interest and training in prosthodontics. The American College of Prosthodontists, as the only organization limited to Specialists, is a major advocate of the Specialists' views within the FPO.

The Problem:

How does the FPO represent the Specialty and the Discipline on issues of conflicting interest? How does the FPO initiate action and champion an issue that would benefit the Specialists to the possible detriment of the Generalists, or initiate action and champion an issue that would benefit the Generalists to the possible detriment of the Specialists?

Some of the Issues With Conflict of Interest: State Specialty Licensure

Prosthodontists endorse state specialty licensure because it assists the public to identify specialists. States with specialty licensure have eliminated or minimized the problem of General Dentists misleading the public by announcing themselves as specialists in the Yellow Pages, personal stationery, and other publications.

The ACP also endorses the concept of specialty licensure by credentials. All graduates of an ADA accredited specialty program and Board Certified Specialists should be eligible for a state specialty license by credentials. Furthermore, a state specialty license should be limited to the aforementioned individuals. The time for Grandfather specialists in prosthodontics ended 25 years ago.

Many General Dentists, in FPO member organizations, are in opposition to state specialty licensure, and especially

opposed to state specialty licensure limited to Specialists.

Yellow Pages Listings — Four years ago, the ACP initiated a program to allow ACP members to list themselves under the ACP Logo in the Yellow Pages specialty guide for prosthodontics. This project was initiated to help the public identify specialists in the listings. The ACP is opposed to General Dentists listing under "Prosthodontics" specialty guides in the Yellow Pages. The Generalists listings are false and misleading because the public does not know the difference between "Prosthodontists" and "Prosthodontics". The public assumes that all of the names in the specialty guides are specialists even though the Yellow Pages often prints a disclaimer on each page.

Certainly the General Dentists in FPO member organizations who list themselves in the specialty guide are opposed to the ACP position.

Third Party Fee Benefits — The ACP supports the concept of third party separate fee listings for Specialists to compensate for full-time post-graduate specialty programs, elevated indemnity insurance premiums for some specialties, and referrals of difficult treatment situations. The ACP, along with other dental specialty organizations, was able to obtain support of this position by a resolution of the Delta Plans Association in 1985. However, the General Dentists majority at the 1987 ADA House of Delegates was able to change the definition of UCR (usual, customary, reasonable) eliminating additional training as justification for differential in fees between Generalists and Specialists.

The American Board of Prosthodontics — The FPO sponsors the Board, however, the majority of members of the FPO member organizations are not eligible to take the Board examination. Can the FPO continue to devote the time, energy, expense, and dedication to the American Board of Prosthodontics when the Board is viewed as a benefit by a minority of members within the member organizations?

Issues on the Horizon:

1. The FTC is in the process of mobilizing an effort to curtail the specialties in dentistry.
2. An effort by Specialists might be made to have separate insurance codes for specialists or specialty procedures.
3. The definition of standard of care as it relates to services provided by

Generalists and Specialists in the peer review arena might need refinement.

These are but a few of the many issues where a conflict of interest may exist between the Specialist and Generalist within the FPO. Where does the FPO stand on these issues? Can the FPO advocate the Specialists' position without alienating the Generalists. Will the ACP's position be heard by the ADA, the state dental boards, the FTC? Who will champion the issues on behalf of Prosthodontists? These are serious questions which require innovative solutions.

To Withdraw or Not to Withdraw:

In my opinion, ACP withdrawal from the FPO is not a viable solution. The ADA will continue to look to the FPO as the sponsor of the American Board of Prosthodontics, thus, the representative of Prosthodontics. The ACP would be left with no input to the ADA on specialty matters. Gaining sponsorship of the Board for the ACP, after withdrawing from the FPO, would be a bloody, disruptive, destructive, expensive and protracted process with no assurance of winning.

Proposed Solution:

The leadership of the FPO and the ACP have created a viable solution. The ACP now has the opportunity to represent the specialty within the FPO by (1) increasing the ACP representation in the FPO House of Delegates, (2) being the sponsoring organization of the American Board of Prosthodontics within the structure of the FPO and in cooperation with other member organizations, (3) composing the reply to specialty matters that have been directed to the FPO.

These are highly significant and appropriate changes within the structure of the FPO that should be given a chance to work.

The FPO is currently utilizing the ACP for specialty matters. All inquiries to the FPO on the peer review of Prosthodontists are forwarded to the ACP. Recently, the FPO received a request from the Wisconsin Dental Association for guidelines in peer review of dental implant procedures and the FPO forwarded the request to the ACP Central Office. The ACP Peer Review Committee responded to WDA with our Peer Review Manual that currently contains dental implant guidelines.

In October, 1987, the State of Washington Department of Licensing asked the FPO for information regarding state specialty licensing by credentials. The FPO forwarded the letter to the ACP for direct reply.

In January, 1988, Colonel Reddy, Consultant to the Surgeon General for Fixed Prosthodontics, requested guidelines for monitoring quality care in the specialty of Fixed Prosthodontics from the FPO. This request was forwarded to the ACP and AACBP for direct response.

The ACP now has direct representation, along with the FPO, on the semi-annual Interspecialty Meetings. This is a group of representatives from each of the dental specialties. The group prepares concerted efforts by the specialties on specialty matters prior to the ADA House of Delegates.

As ACP members, please give the changes in FPO structure and policy your most attentive consideration and allow the evolution of the ACP in Specialty representation to continue by voting against the resolution to withdraw from the FPO.

David W. Eggleston, D.D.S.
ACP Executive Councilor

PUBLIC & PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON IMPLANT PROSTHODONTICS

It is important that all members of our Committee support the position of opposing the resolution to withdraw from the FPO if we are to be successful in defeating this motion. As active members of committees it is our responsibility to contact as many of our colleagues as possible and outline the advantages we have received in our relationship with the FPO.

In the immediate future, we must vote on one of the most crucial issues facing the ACP — Should we stay in the Federation of Prosthodontic Organizations? Members of the College have the responsibility of being knowledgeable voters. The next issue of the **ACP NEWSLETTER** will be devoted entirely to the explanation of the Resolution. If you have any additional questions, call your Officers or those who have contributed to the issue of the **ACP NEWSLETTER**. Study all of the material and **be informed** when you cast your ballot.

Changes have evolved in our relationship with the FPO, the most significant were the approval of the following resolutions by the FPO Executive Committee on February 19, 1988. See President Kuebker's letter to the members of the College.

Both changes to the FPO By-Laws must be approved by the House of

Delegates in September, 1988. Should the ACP membership veto withdrawing from the FPO, and the FPO House of Delegates fail to receive the necessary votes to permit the by-laws changes, it will be reported at the October ACP Business Meeting and open discussion on withdrawing from the FPO will be considered.

WHY SHOULD WE VOTE TO STAY IN THE FPO? — TO OBTAIN SPONSORSHIP OF THE BOARD!

The FPO has been the sponsoring organization of the American Board of Prosthodontics since 1971. Sponsorship of the Board has been the major point of conflict in our relationship with the FPO and is the issue usually raised in debate concerning withdrawing from the FPO. **There are three principal benefits to being the sponsoring organization of the Board:**

1. The American Dental Association communicates directly with the ACP on any important issues concerning the specialty and discipline.
2. The ACP has the ability to nominate and elect Board members. The Council has three representatives from the College, three from the FPO and one each from the Academy of Crown and Bridge Prosthodontics, the Academy of Denture Prosthetics and the American Academy of Maxillofacial Prosthetics. The change made to the Council for the Affairs of the American Board of Prosthodontics in Resolution 1 is that it will become an FPO/ACP Council rather than an FPO Council.
3. Representation of the specialty of prosthodontics with other specialty organizations. For the past two years the ACP has been represented in the Interspecialty Group, an ADA approved organization of dental specialties. This group meets twice a year to discuss issues of mutual concern. Resolution 1 would provide the College representation in the Interspecialty Group equal to that of the FPO.

As stated by Bill Kuebker, "Through actions of the September, 1987 FPO House of Delegates and the February, 1988 FPO Executive Committee, we are on the threshold of achieving the number one goal of the College — to be the accepted, recognized authority in the specialty of prosthodontics. We have now reached the point where leaving the FPO would not be an appropriate decision. Admittedly, as many of you have known, I have not always felt we should remain in the FPO and really felt that the ACP could not reach its goal of becoming the true represent-

ative of our specialty until we became the sponsor of the American Board. Achievement of this goal is different than originally perceived."

Instead of voting to sever our relationship with the FPO, the College should take advantage of the hundreds of enthusiastic and willing workers it could provide to provide direction and leadership to the FPO. Although it is difficult to understand the necessity of the college becoming involved in "politics" of other organizations, it is vital that we provide leadership to combat opposing forces (organizations of generalists, Federal Trade Commission, etc.) who would stifle or possibly eliminate the specialty of prosthodontics.

While there is some truth in the theory that the FPO would collapse if the ACP should withdraw its membership and that it would be natural for the ACP to then assume that leadership, the problem is time — the time that is necessary for the FPO to collapse and the time required for the ACP to achieve sponsorship.

To become the sole sponsor of the Board, we would have to:

1. Convince the Council on Dental education and the House of Delegates of the ADA that they made a mistake in appointing the FPO as the sponsoring organization or that the FPO no longer meets the requirements of a sponsoring organization.
2. Provide substantial evidence that the ACP meets all the criteria for sponsorship.

Because of this two-fold problem, any evaluation would be focused on both the FPO and the ACP. The specialty of prosthodontics would be fair game for those who oppose the specialty and the college would be entirely without representation with organized dentistry.

Before casting your vote please consider all the possibilities as I have. What will be gained by withdrawing that cannot be fulfilled by remaining in? Even though the promises of the FPO have not lived up to their expectations, do not overlook the progress that has been made.

Strong leadership and total support of the members of the College for the specialty of prosthodontics is vital. Evolution with the FPO may be the wiser course of action. We are now in the position to provide the strong leadership for within to restructure the FPO.

**PLEASE VOTE IN OPPOSITION TO
WITHDRAWING FROM THE FPO.** Your continued support of the College's welfare is appreciated.

Sincerely,
Thomas J. Balshi, D.D.S., F.A.C.P.