CERTIFICATION AND THE FACTS OF LIFE

John M. Parker, CPG
District Manager, Kirby Petroleum Co.; Vice-President, AAPG

Organizations and governments generally do not move toward desirable goals by the most logical, the most effective, or the least expensive route. The facts of politics and people intervene, and compromise decisions are made which proceed toward a goal in devious fashion. It has been apparent for many years that professional responsibility and professional recognition in Geology are facts of life. It was not until the 1950’s that serious conversation was initiated to formalize certification programs and to prepare for registration procedures. It was not politically possible to achieve a worthwhile certification procedure until 1963. In conflicting and inefficient fashion, SIPES, AIPG, and AAPG all conceived specific certification procedures during that year. In addition, several local societies tightened up their membership qualifications in 1963. The Illinois Geological Society brought into effect certification procedures for its own members.

The response to the AAPG certification plan proves that the benefits of certification are of interest to a large number of petroleum geologists. Inquiries by geophysicists also indicate that men in this branch of Geology are interested in a certification program. Engineering geologists have already achieved a variety of organizations and certification and registration procedures. The all-specialty response to the AAPG certification plan shows that many geologists are now beginning to accept their professional responsibilities.

In reviewing all this rapid development stemming from long-pent-up needs and desires, the many societies have expressed the desire to continue to move toward a logical goal. They do not want to see solidified in bureaucratic concrete four or five separate geological certifying agencies with resultant jealous and bickering officials with overlapping jurisdictions, multiple application forms, multiple initiation fees, multiple annual dues, multiple coordination committees, conflicting requirements, multiple standards of evaluation, all leading to the generally inefficient jumble that would downgrade the meaning and purpose of certification.

In 1957, several members of the AAPG, working with the AGI, attempted to interest the AGI in setting up certification procedures for any geologist of a member society who qualified. After several years of study on the matter, AGI elected to forego any possible professional action.

Ben H. Parker, in his AAPG presidential address given in Denver April 26, 1961, stated that the five elements or attributes essential to a profession are:
1. Systematic body of theory
2. Professional authority
3. Community sanction
4. Ethical codes
5. Professional culture

He closed his talk as follows:

"Such attributes are not self-nurtured, however. They require the concerted efforts of every member of our profession to assure their continued development. This can best be brought about by a strong, aggressive professional organization which can represent all geologists in professional affairs. Our Association (AAPG) is a scientific and technical structure which was not organized to function as a professional group. It is my considered opinion, however, that we must broaden the scope of our rightful activities to include professional affairs UNLESS the majority of all geologists can and do agree promptly in the promotion of a purely professional organization to discharge these obligations. Only by a combination of individual effort and the functioning of such a professional organization can we hope to maintain the professional leadership with which we are charged."

In 1962, both candidates for President of AAPG stated emphatically that they were in favor of a certification program and that, if elected, each would attempt to institute one. Cam Sproule was elected, and he immediately initiated vigorous discussions on the subject with the Executive Committee and reopened the matter with AGI. AGI replied again that they would not undertake such a program, and the AAPG Executive Committee outlined a procedure whereby AAPG members could be certified by their own organization. During
1963, in keeping with his beliefs as stated in his AAPG presidential address, Ben Parker joined with Edward E. Rue and Frank B. Conselman in discussions with regard to organizing an institute of professional geologists which would have as one of its objects the certification of geologists. This certification would be for all qualified geologists in all branches of the profession. A steering committee meeting was held in September, 1963, and AIPG was formally organized in November, 1963.

In August of 1964, the AAPG membership approved an amendment to the AAPG constitution which provided for the certification of AAPG members by AIPG. Throughout the discussions leading up to the passing of this constitutional amendment, many members expressed the conviction that certification and the related problems of registration should eventually be handled by AIPG or AGI. Since AIPG was less than a year old, it was not believed practical to turn this matter over to a brand new organization with a membership of less than one hundred people. The AIPG Executive Committee recognized that they should move ahead without waiting to see if AIPG jelled, with the thought in mind that later certification procedures in AAPG and AIPG might be combined and that possibly still later all certification procedures could be centralized.

Discussions were held in early 1965 between Executive Officers of AAPG, AIPG, and SIPES as to when and how to achieve unity of certification. A formal Committee on Coordination of Certification was appointed and met at the AAPG New Orleans meeting and made recommendations for standardizing certification.

Acting on these recommendations in July, 1965, the AIPG Executive Committee formally requested that AIPG determine the basic geological and ethical qualifications of all who applied for AAPG certification. This attempt to unify the profession for the good of all geologists came under such criticism from a few AAPG members that the Executive Committee rescinded its request.

As can be determined from the foregoing, great amounts of time have been spent by many people in consideration of the problems of professional action in Geology. Through all the deliberations there has been one thread of agreement binding the deliberators together -- the imperative need for concerted professional action by geologists, preferably through one unifying body.

Roster and Newsletter Corrections

Please make the following corrections in your 1966 Rosters:

Charles S. Robinson
John W. Koenig, CPG 141
Continental Oil Company
P. O. Box 795
Menlo Park, New Jersey

Thomas L. Kesler, CPG 331
Minerals & Chemicals Philipp Corp.
Oklahoma City, Okla.

The January issue of The Professional Geologist inadvertently misspelled Clifford H. Gray’s name. Mr. Gray is Secretary-Treasurer of the California Section.

Our sincere apologies to these members.

The Geologist, The Public, and The Institute
James Boyd, CPG
President, Copper Range Company
Vice-President, AIPG

When in 1963, Ben H. Parker suggested that I apply for membership in the AIPG, my first reaction was similar to that of many of my contemporaries: "What good is it to me to join another geological organization?" Knowing Dr. Parker through a lifelong professional and personal friendship, I knew that he never asked anything lightly and that he was far too busy to be engaged in anything frivolous. I, therefore, applied and was honored to be able to pass the intensive screening process and to become a Certified Professional Geologist.

With Ben Parker you do nothing by halves, and being associated with Martin Van Couvering you learn the real meaning of dedication. To then be associated with the rest of the members of the Executive Committee was to find the seriousness of the problem facing the entire geological profession and the unselfish attention to overcoming the details of human inertia involved in anything so new.

Most dedicated geologists are, in every sense of the word, professionals. Unfortunately, because they rarely come in direct contact with the general public, geologists have not created an image of professionalism. Yet no scientist or engineer requires more basic training, experience, or integrity of thought than a geologist. He must work from a limited set of data collected in one place, assisted only by geophysics to project his mind into a third dimension. From these few data as bases for inductive reasoning, he will come to conclusions on which vast sums of money may be expended.

As the search for mineral deposits of all kinds and the basis for engineering structures require deeper and deeper penetration into the crust of the earth, the necessity of more profound training, experience, and integrity becomes greater. Each time money is lost by being invested in projects which have received inadequate geological considerations, the profession and the public are hurt. The creation of a corps of carefully selected professional geologists who are certified to undertake such work is of the utmost importance to the public at large.

It is required, moreover, that the public know the importance of the profession. It is vital for the public to learn that there is a place to go to find men to undertake responsibilities who have the unqualified approval of their peers as to their competence and integrity. It is of the utmost importance, then, that there be one place to go where professionalism is the primary concern. The scientific geological societies have determined that this should be done in one place, and the AIPG has been established for that purpose.

Active membership in the AIPG is, therefore, the public duty of all qualified professional geologists whether or not they can personally benefit from such membership.

"Be what you are, give what you can, and the rest of the time, mind your own business." ...Michael Drury
PLANNING FOR A PROFESSION’S FUTURE

Thomas D. Flynn, CPA
Principal Partner, Arthur Young & Co.
President, American Institute of Certified Public Accountants

The magic words in management circles today are planning, control, and decision-making. It is noteworthy that the word planning always comes first.

Since World War II great strides have been made in developing techniques for planning, control, and decision-making in military organizations and in industrial corporations. Not nearly so much progress has been made in non-profit membership associations.

To be sure, surveys have been made of various aspects of professional activity. For example, the famous Flexner Report on the medical profession many years ago resulted in a radical change in the educational system and the standards of qualification for physicians and surgeons. Not so many years ago the American Bar Association conducted an extensive survey of the legal profession. The American Dental Association has done a good deal of work in delineating specific objectives and making recommendations for their attainment.

But I am not sure that any profession has developed a comprehensive program of action, dealing with all areas of concern to its members, with due regard to probable changes in the environment.

The American Institute of Certified Public Accountants is in the middle of an effort to do just that. We are encouraged by the progress that has been made so far. Of course we all know that planning to be successful must be a continuous and never ending process. However, the present program of the American Institute represents a massive effort on the part of the profession over and above the normal planning required to deal with current activities and programs.

Professions Occupy Special Role

Let’s go back for a minute and consider why such an effort is worth undertaking in the first place. The professions occupy a special role in our society. So far they have been given the privilege of self-discipline, have been allowed to set their own standards, have achieved a large measure of public respect and confidence, and have played an important role in the development of public policy in the areas in which their members are considered expert.

It is perhaps this somewhat privileged position of the professions which has led to efforts to professionalize many newer groups in addition to the ancient and honorable professions of law, medicine, and the ministry. Today, claims to professional status have been very well established by engineers and architects. The claim of the certified public accountants has achieved a wide degree of acceptance. Chartered life underwriters and chartered financial analysts are on the way. The public relations fraternity is beginning to develop professional standards. Management consultants have been at it for many years. Even business management itself is frequently referred to as a profession. And there are others.

Some of the members of the older, learned professions have looked down their noses at the upstarts. But many sociologists and other students of our society have concluded that this trend is a good thing. The attempt to achieve professional status involves raising standards of technical competence, responsibility, and ethical behavior.

Tests of Professional Status

It is generally agreed that the tests of professional status include a common body of specialized knowledge which all members of the profession must master before they branch out into more specialized phases: a recognized formal educational process; a standard of professional qualifications for admission to the profession; a code of ethical conduct; a recognition of the public interest in the work they do; and an organization for self-discipline and advancement of the special obligations of the group.

So lively has become the interest in professions and their role in our society, that the Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in the fall of 1963 devoted an entire issue to an analysis and discussion of the professions and their problems. One of the articles dealt with the characteristics of so-called “emerging” professions, of which, incidentally, the author classified the accountants as one.

Service versus Gain

One thing is clear: no group can hope to obtain recognition as a profession if it is mainly profit oriented. It must put the public interest ahead of the immediate self-interest of the members of the profession. This does not mean that the professionals are not interested in making money. Obviously, they are. It only means that making money is not the dominant objective. In other words, when a conflict arises between immediate gain and service to the public, it is service to the public which must take precedence. The group must seek to develop in each member an attitude of mind, and a professional approach which will place the greatest emphasis on excellence of service in meeting the needs and requirements of his client and the public.

It is quite clear that attainment of professional status is no easy job and it is not to be accomplished overnight. It can occur through the natural processes of social evolution. But in my opinion, it can be expedited by planning and decision-making.

The group’s objectives must be clear, and this requires planning. If the objectives are to be attained there have to be controls agreed upon by the group seeking professional status.

Well, then, if it can be assumed that professionalization is desirable, and that it can be expedited by the planning process, just how does one go about it? How can anyone plan, for example, for a profession composed of eighty thousand certified public accountants, of widely diverse backgrounds, engaged in a wide variety of activities, in firms of widely differing sizes, and many of whom are employed in corporations, educational institutions, government agencies, or other pursuits?
Basic Assumptions

The first thing to do, obviously, is to establish basic assumptions and objectives which will be generally acceptable to a substantial majority of the group. In 1956 the late Marquis G. Eaton, then President of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, appointed a committee on long-range objectives to grapple with this task. In 1962 the committee published the results of its first five years of work. It offered answers to the questions: What is accounting? What are CPAs and what is their place in the accounting function? What is the nature and what are the characteristics of the most common types of practice conducted by CPAs? How can CPAs prepare for expanding opportunities? How can the profession best organize itself to assist them in this preparation? This report was published as a monograph under the title, "The Accounting Profession--Where Is It Headed?"

At this point, however, it was decided that only a beginning had been made. The committee had been engaged in five years of introspection. It had done a splendid job, but it had been talking largely to itself and to other certified public accountants. It had given little attention to the outside environment and its probable impact on the profession's plans.

Accordingly, a new committee was appointed with two objectives—one, to examine the outside environment as it might affect the CPA profession, and two, to identify the problems the profession faces in adapting itself to the probable condition of that environment in the years ahead.

The committee recognized immediately that it would be helpful to utilize the services of experts in other fields who already knew enough about various phases of the environment to give the committee comprehensive answers to its questions.

"Profile of the Profession: 1975"

The first step was to delineate the questions.

After some months of effort and consultation with many CPAs around the country, the committee produced a series of questions classified by subject matter under the title, "Profile of the Profession: 1975."

Under eight major subject headings about 150 questions were stated. For example, under social environment, it was asked, "What will be the level of technical education of people, generally, in the trades, in the professions?" "What about the general level of education in this country?" On the subject of political environment, it was asked, "How will government regulation of the individual and of business affect the accountant's role?" Concerning economic environment, questions were asked about population increases, trends in gross national product, the impact of automation, and so on. Similar series of questions were stated under the general headings of Areas of Professional Service, Problems of Education, Research, Attitudes and Problems, Professional Ethics, Personnel, Procurement and Retention, Public Interest and Social Obligation, and the Structure of the Profession.

Consultation with Experts

The committee then began a series of consultations with outside experts to whom these questions were presented. Each consultation took an entire day or a large part of it. A stenotypist attended each session and took down a verbatim transcript of the discussion. The consultants were offered a fee for their services, since they were expected to prepare and to submit a written digest of their views. After each consultation, a member of the committee, with the aid of the stenographic transcript, wrote up a brief position paper summarizing the results of the interview as they appeared to affect the interests of CPAs. These position papers were widely circulated among the leadership of the profession, and comment was invited. Altogether there were about thirty consultations over a period of more than three years.

Among the consultants was an outstanding professor in the behavioral sciences, a nationally-known economist, the dean of one of the outstanding graduate schools of business, two mathematicians specializing in operations research, the head of an outstanding foundation, a professor of political science, the president of a large corporation, the president of a small corporation, the head of an investment banking firm, a vice president of a commercial bank, an investment analyst, a public relations consultant, a professor of sociology, several accountants from foreign countries, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, several accounting professors, and a few distinguished certified public accountants specializing in various areas of practice. Executive secretaries of state societies of certified public accountants and principal members of the staff of the Institute were also consulted by the committee.

The Results Are Published

At the conclusion of the consultations, the Executive Director of the Institute, John L. Carey, was invited to put all the findings in a book, presenting the results in an orderly and consecutive manner. He assembled the stenographic transcripts of the consultations, the position papers written by the members of the committee, the comments and correspondence of members of the Institute who had offered suggestions throughout the course of the exercise, and dozens of magazine articles and books which had come to the attention of the members of the committee during their activities and which had some bearing on the subjects under discussion.

On January 15, 1965, the book was published under the title, The CPA Plans for the Future. It discusses the changing social environment, economic trends, the impact of automation, the relations of government and business, and the movement to internationalism. In the light of this background, it discusses the probable course of accounting practice in all principal areas, the problems that exist in professional areas of education and training, personnel, ethics, research, public interest, and legal liability. It also discusses the structure of the profession under such headings as the Concept of the Firm, Specialization, State CPA Laws, Relations with Other Accounting Groups, Publications, and Professional Societies.

But this book, ambitious as it is, is only a second step. All it purports to do is to identify the profession's problems in the context of its present situation and to suggest, in some instances, what courses of action might be desirable in an effort
to solve these problems. But it does not present an action program. It is only background for the next step.

The Third Step

Step number 3 has just been initiated. I have appointed a seven-man planning committee that is charged with the responsibility of spending three years in the development of an action program for the Institute, for state societies, and possibly for accounting firms, to attain the goals which the committee will propose as those to which the profession should aspire.

In the first two years, the committee will conduct seminars, conferences, and meetings of various kinds for discussion of the CPA Plans for the Future. The objective is to attract the widest possible participation on the part of the membership in commenting on where the profession wants to be in the next ten or twenty years, and how it may best get there.

After two years of receiving and compiling suggestions from all interested parties, the committee will spend its third year in constructing the action program involving, possibly, reorganization of the Institute, restatements of objectives, elimination of some present activities, the addition of other activities, consolidation of some, and so on. This program will go to the Executive Committee of the Institute and then to its governing body, the Council, which consists of more than 200 members from all parts of the country.

Undoubtedly, it will require another year or two for the Council to act on all the recommendations it will receive. Our hope is that by 1970 we will have a comprehensive plan and program of implementation which will have been accepted by the vast majority of members of the profession. Then, of course, it will have to be constantly revised in the light of changing conditions to keep up with the times and projections of shifts in the environment.

Imperfect as this process may prove to be, and incomplete as any resulting plan and program may prove to be, I have no doubt, personally, that the effort will have been well worthwhile. More CPAs will have had to think about their role in society, their legitimate aspirations and their personal objectives as members of the accounting profession than ever before. I am hopeful that there will be a broad consensus on where the CPAs in the United States want to go, how they think they can contribute the most to the society of which they are a part, and what steps will have to be taken in order to realize their dreams.

The Cost

What will this effort have cost? In terms of staff time of the American Institute, fees to consultants, travel, and publications, the cost over the entire nine-year period will have been roughly $100,000. In terms of the time at their regular rates given by the volunteer members of the long-range objectives committee, the planning committee, and all the other members of our professional societies who have participated and who will participate over the next three years, the cost will be huge. But happily, some of the most brilliant men in our profession have been willing to donate their time, thought, and experience to this effort without any charge to the Institute.

It seems to me that the costs, however calculated, are modest compared to the potential benefits to be derived from planning. As a profession, we cannot afford to do without planning. And I heartily recommend it to any similar organization that is seriously considering the possibility of obtaining recognition as a profession.

(Editors' note: Adapted from an address before The Million Dollar Round Table, published in Association Management, August, 1965, p. 10-13. Reprinted with permission.)

SPOTLIGHTING GEOLOGY

Edith M. McKee, CGP
Consulting Geologist

Chicago has a well-deserved reputation as a geologically depressed area, and I don't mean structurally. As a geologist living in the Chicago area, I have repeatedly found the business and government communities blank about geology, even though unconsciously using it in some aspect of what's more to the point--needing to use it.

Obviously, drastic action is needed to bring geology and geologists into public focus. As an attempt to rectify this situation, in September, 1964, I approached a local radio station, WEEF-Highland Park, about the possibility of doing a weekly broadcast. Since they needed some educational-public service programming, they gave me one-half hour on Saturday mornings; and I assumed full responsibility for preparing and presenting the program gratis on an experimental basis.

The WEEF executives were as unfamiliar with geology and its applications as all the other broadcasters and publishers and business men generally, but they were willing to take the risk. Anyway, they could always cancel out if the program really had no listener appeal. To their great surprise and gratification, when GEOLOGY AND YOU went off the air June 1, 1965, after 34 weeks, they estimated that it had drawn approximately 30,000 weekly listeners. This audience ranged from first graders to top executives in Chicago industrial circles. It was required listening for many elementary and high-school classes, and even for some college classes. So many listeners called the station asking for more geology that the station manager asked how soon I could start broadcasting again.

GEOLOGY AND YOU has dealt with applied geology rather than being a course in geological principles. My experience with military and engineering geology and underground storage as well as mineral exploration and geological mapping around the world, plus a curiosity as to community and industrial present and future needs, proved a good launching platform for presenting applied geology to the community. In format, the first half of the program was an analysis of current news items with geological ramifications; the last half was discussion with a guest executive from business, industry, or other profession, concerning the effect of geology on that particular profession, business, industry, or government project. The topics ranged from water, weather, travel, and industrial site
development, to oil, mining, banking, law, and pharmaceuticals. On April 10th, for example, the Pakistan-Red China treaty was discussed as a news item, pointing out the key role oil would play in predicting diversionary tactics in Kashmir and western India while China went after India's eastern oil province and aimed for a backdoor approach to Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, and Vietnam. Since April the Rann of Cutch and the Kashmir-Jammu and Sikkim flames have flared. The Chicago business community has cooperated generously in providing guests, even though they had never considered geology a factor in their operations previous to my contacting them. By the end of the year I occasionally got calls volunteering guest speakers, and that was progress.

We are now negotiating with sponsors, with the bright prospect of putting a weekly geological radio program on a commercial basis. The rate won't compete with that demanded by Herman's Hermits or Rock 'n Roll disc jockeys, but it would bring geology into commercial broadcasting spheres. One plan is for one or several public-spirited companies (oil, mining, or utilities) to pay for the live weekly program, and from the tape of that show to duplicate it and make it widely available to other large and small radio stations and schools, either at a very small fee or gratis as part of their public relations programs. The cost of such an undertaking is very small indeed, and the thousands of local radio stations in this country and even overseas are eager for interesting programs to use.

Here AIPG members can put their shoulders to the wheel. It would greatly help to organize this project if geologists contacted their own local radio stations and learned the possible interest in developing a new educational-public service program with proved audience appeal. Any inquiries or reports can be sent directly to me or to Mr. Deane Osborne, Director, WEEF Radio, Highland Park, Illinois.

If any geologists have projects or items of broad public interest, please let me know and we'll give them air time. In this respect, I want to make it clear that any technical subject which can be explained in simple English terms can interest GEOLOGY AND YOU listeners. AIPG is directly concerned with expanding and improving the public aspects of our profession, and radio offers geologists the opportunity to contact a broad public audience. Television will eventually accept us also; but for now, WEEF Radio opened the broadcasting door last year, and asks for more GEOLOGY AND YOU for this year.

MEMORIAL

William R. Barlow, CPG, was killed in an automobile accident February 12, 1966. He was Division Stratigrapher and former Division Paleontologist for Standard Oil Company of California, Western Operations, in Bakersfield, California. During more than a decade and a half of service to his company, Bill had accumulated a host of friends, to whom his death brings great sorrow.

"On the door of a dead man, one can knock forever."

...Zorba the Greek

WHAT COST PROFESSIONALISM?

William A. Newton, CPG
President, Rocky Mountain Natural Gas Co.

What are members of other professions willing to pay in annual dues to further their respective professions? And how do these compare with our profession as represented by the AIPG?

This report on annual professional dues includes Institutes and Associations representing the Architects, Physicians, Dentists, Veterinarians, Attorneys, Public Relations, and Accountants. Each has its national and state dues, and four of the seven have dues for local societies and/or associations.

These are numerically strong, effective professional organizations. To practice in any one of these professions without membership in the respective professional institute or association is almost unthinkable. To do so would be to practice without professional recognition. Professional recognition includes recognition inside the profession as well as outside the profession.

The state and local dues, as given in the analysis below, are for the State of Colorado.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Membership</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>AIPG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 National Annual Dues</td>
<td>$30-60</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Colorado State Dues</td>
<td>10-75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Local Societies (Denver)</td>
<td>10-55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other words, if you were a member in an average professional institute living in Denver, your annual professional membership dues would be $113. The annual cost for geologists is $30 for AIPG dues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other words, if you were a member in an average professional institute living in Denver, your annual professional membership dues would be $113. The annual cost for geologists is $30 for AIPG dues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This analysis of the professions identified above shows that in Colorado professional men are willing to pay annual professional dues averaging 4.5 to 5.6 times the cost of professional dues for geologists in the AIPG. The comparison is probably valid for most states.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do each of these professions have a single Institute to represent them? The answer lies primarily in &quot;strength in numbers&quot; and in a single, strong, knowledgeable voice for each respective profession.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thus, when one of these professional institutes goes before a state legislature or Congress, it speaks authoritatively for thousands of members. It can be heard where oftentimes the individual cannot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do members of the other professions strongly back their respective professional institutes by membership therein? Primarily, this is done to further the aims of the profession internally, and also externally in its relationship with the public. Also, the professional institute is a strong vehicle for protecting its members from intrusion by charlatans and unscrupulous practitioners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thus, with practically all eligible professional men being members of their respective professional institute, the organization is strong and effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The AIPG needs the strong backing of all qualified members of the geological profession: the geological profession sorely needs a strong AIPG, the organization born for the specific purpose of representing all specialties in the profession.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Executive Committee Meeting
FEBRUARY 5-6, 1966

This summary of the second meeting of the current board of AIPG officers is intended for the general information of the membership and is not a substitute for the complete minutes available in the Golden office. Procedural and most routine details are omitted. All nine members of the Executive Committee and the Executive Secretary attended. Sessions were continuous from 8:40 A.M., February 5th, to 11:26 A.M., February 6th, except for meals and a night’s recess.

The Auditor’s Report for 1965 was approved, as was the budget for 1966, which shows expenditures estimated at $29,460.06. A part of this was to be supplied by voluntary contributions, of which some had already been received in 1966. The remainder was pledged by Executive Committee Members. Plans were made to present clearly to the membership the costs of operation and the sources of income of AIPG.

A report of the Academic Qualifications Board recommended bases for accreditation of schools offering degrees in geology, for raising the minimum academic requirements for membership in AIPG (including the Master’s degree or its equivalent in an accredited school), and for re-evaluating the period to be counted as professional experience. Unanimous approval was given to the principle of requiring the Master’s degree or its equivalent as a part of future requirements. Accreditation studies pursued by AGI and pertinent letters by CPGs Frank E. Byrnes and Thomas C. Hiestand were discussed. The report was approved and the Qualifications Board was asked to continue its work on the basis of our recommendations and the new data.

A report by the Committee on Accreditation of Scientific Societies recommended that CIMM and IGS be approved, and this was done. A full list of the approved qualifying societies is to be published soon in The Professional Geologist.

A report by the Committee on Committees named the AIPG committees that presently exist and recommended further standing and ad hoc committees. The report was approved with the request to recommend revisions to the by-laws needed to permit activation of the suggested standing committees. Work done by the Geologic Hazards Committee in Los Angeles (Chairman, Jahns) was commended. The Committee on Committees is to consider the problem of the length of term to be served by AIPG’s delegates to the House of Society Representatives, AGI. The Committee was also asked to consider means of dealing with employment opportunities for CPGs; for producing a brochure for distribution to industry; said brochure to portray the ways in which geology can be useful to industry; and for recommending to government agencies the kinds of geology they need for the development of urban water resources.

The invitation of the Texas Section to hold the 1967 Annual Meeting in Houston was accepted. The general policy of having the annual meeting begin on the second Friday of October in each year after 1966 was adopted.

The California Section will be asked to sponsor an AIPG booth at the GSA Convention in San Francisco next November.

The Editor presented estimates of the cost of producing a volume of the talks given at the Second Annual Meeting. It was decided to get further estimates on a soft-cover version of the volume and to query the members as to their desire for such a volume at a stated price. The volume is to be produced if its costs will be covered by indicated sales. A preview of sales for a possible Third Annual Meeting volume will be obtained prior to that meeting.

The 1967 Roster is to have a coded listing of the specialty practices of the members. Allen Tester accepted the task of codifying these specialties among professional geologists and will report at the July meeting.

After studying their Constitutions and By-Laws, the Executive Committee approved the states of Alaska, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming for Section status.

A suggestion that the national office collect the annual dues of the Section Members for the Sections was referred to the Advisory Board.

As states become qualified for section status, they are to be so notified and given copies of the Model Section By-Laws. The Committee voted to continue the policy of qualifying the Institute as a foreign corporation in each state as that state section is approved. Sections will be asked to underwrite the cost of foreign corporation qualification.

Several members of the Committee have written to Dr. Donald F. Hornig, Special Assistant to President Johnson, recommending that the USGS be designated the Federal agency for earthquake investigation and research and for other Federally financed earth science research.

Meetings of the Executive Committee and the Advisory Board are to be held in St. Louis at the AAPG National Meeting, April 25-28. The Advisory Board will meet on Sunday, April 24, and the Executive Committee will meet Monday, April 25.

Respectfully submitted,
s/Jay Glenn Marks, CPG
Secretary-Treasurer

NEW SECTION OFFICERS

Alaska and Wyoming, new State Sections, have reported the election of the following officers:

**ALASKA**

President .................. William C. Fackler, CPG
2512 Lord Baranof Dr., Anchorage

Vice-President .............. Thomas Wilson, Jr., CPG
1519 Hidden Lane, Anchorage

Secretary-Treasurer ......... Thomas R. Marshall, Jr., CPG
1569 Birchwood, Anchorage

**WYOMING**

President .................. Owen P. Miles, Jr., CPG
235 Midwest Building, Casper

Vice-President ................ Carl W. Klaenhammer, CPG
1335 South Wolcott, Casper

Secretary .................. William A. Sears, Jr., CPG
Box 1369, Casper
NEW ASSISTANT EDITORS

We are pleased to announce the following AIPG State or Section Editors, who have been appointed since the January issue;

COLORADO
Gerald G. Loucks, CPG
C/o Colorado Oil Co.
1000 Denver Club Bldg.
Denver, Colorado

OHIO
Robert L. Bates, CPG
Department of Geology
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

ILLINOIS
Merle Williams, CPG
P. O. Box 701
Mt. Vernon, Illinois

OKLAHOMA
Bing Q. Yee, CPG
Humble Oil & Refining Co.
1411 Classen Blvd.
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

OREGON
Herbert G. Schlicker, CPG
156 S. E. 39th Avenue
Portland 14, Oregon

PENNSYLVANIA
Marvin L. Peterson, CPG
727 Galway Drive
Bethel Park, Pennsylvania 15102

VIRGINIA
Emmett A. Finley, CPG
10110 Forest Avenue
Fairfax, Virginia 22030

The response to our request for Assistant Editors has been gratifying, and we hope to be able to complete the list before the May issue of the Newsletter.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor:

Quite unintentionally, I seem to have antagonized certain members of AIPG by a communication published in the November issue of The Professional Geologist about the proposed Nuclear Reactor site at Corral Canyon. Although it was published under the heading “Professional Opinion,” that was not my intention. During this controversy I talked to and listened to some forty to fifty geologists give their opinions on this subject. My statement that the site was on the Malibu Fault was intended as a consensus, as I should have stated. It was not intended as a statement of my personal opinion, just as an item of news. Hence, it came as quite a surprise to find myself vigorously criticized for saying what I did.

I am quite well aware that there are opposing views, and I regret that I have offended any of my fellow members of AIPG, especially since it was not my intention to take sides in what I knew to be a controversial issue.

s/Carlton M. Carson, CPG
California Section Editor--AIPG

November 24, 1965

Dear Editor:

The subject of geological education and training has been discussed with a number of A.I.P.G. members across the country during the past year. The consensus is that this subject is one to be mentioned in the NEWSLETTER and, therefore, I am presenting my own views with the hopes that others will follow with their views, pro and con.

Virtually unanimously, the geologists in their discussions have expressed concern over problems related to mineral economics, particularly problems arising from the rising costs of acquisition and discovery of reserves. In some cases, an oversupply of minerals, particularly petroleum, casts economic shadows over oncoming years. Another problem is the decline in geology student enrollments which triggered curtailment of faculty staffs. Generally, the curtailment of geological services in industry is alarming.

The A.I.P.G. Code of Ethics is founded on voluntary self-evaluation. Certification points to professional reliability in geologic practice, and to professional acceptance in areas of education, government, and industry. Qualification of a member is conditioned on his active participation in scientific and technological societies. These basic features, in my opinion, should be kept in mind when accreditation is being considered.

I concur with those who believe that accreditation in geological education and training is failing to keep pace with advances and extensions being adopted in the professions of law and medicine. The A.I.P.G. Executive Committee’s policies reflect reluctance to assume authority in matters and procedures of accreditation legislatively, judicially, or executive. To me, it appears that educators jealously guard privileges existing in a monopoly of programming geological education and training. However, this does not mean that there is imminent conflict on account of the A.I.P.G. requirement of four years’ geologic practice after Ph.D. degrees are granted, before qualifications of professional geologists are met.

Objectively, I shall present in outline some methods and procedures for accreditation which stay within bounds of the A.I.P.G. Code of Ethics. Colleges, institutes, and universities can undergo self-evaluation, and can be certified to stimulate improvement of services rendered in geological education and training; they can establish a process of accreditation, on a voluntary, rather than authoritative, basis.

Initially and without delay, in my opinion, the A.I.P.G. Executive Committee should appoint a Chairman, Board of Education and Training, who would submit nominations from which the Committee would appoint members comprising the Board as follows:

(1) A.I.P.G. C.P.G., Liberal Arts and Sciences School faculty
(1) A.I.P.G. C.P.G., Technological School faculty
(2) A.I.P.G. C.P.G., Graduate School faculty
(1) A.I.P.G. C.P.G., Federal or State Geological Survey staff
(1) A.I.P.G. C.P.G., Industry, corporation geological staff
(1) A.I.P.G. C.P.G., Industry, consulting, independent geologists

Initially, the Board would prepare a report, prescribing a form of application for accreditation; presenting procedures
for self-evaluations and certifications for colleges, institutes, and universities; recommending suitable fees for handling applications; and outlining procedure for the Executive Committee to approve applications and issue certificates. Measures and means should be standard and, therefore, joint action with scientific societies and accreditation consultants would be advisable.

The Board's report logically would establish divisions or ranges in scope of geological education and training for self-evaluation by schools. The following outline suggests three divisions or ranges, designated alphabetically:

A. Curriculum, pre-geologic requirements, 4 years, granting BS and AB degrees
B. Curriculum, geologic requirements, 4 years combined, granting MS and Ph.D. degrees
C. Post-academic requirements, 4 years, for membership eligibility in A.I.P.G.:
   (a) geologic practice in specialized work, and acceptance in areas of education, government, and industry
   (b) membership in national societies (A.A.P.G., G.S.A., A.I.M.E., S.E.G., S.E.P.M., affiliates)
   (c) continuation programs, on or off campuses, intensive studies directed by Certified Professional Geologists drawn from areas of education, government, and industry.

The geological profession would be in a healthy state, in my opinion, should geologists' schools of thought differ widely in evaluating education and training. But it would be in an unhealthy state should prostration result in an economic vacuum being filled by non-geological professionals in government and industry. In other words, engineers, physicists, and chemists are in charge of work which geologists could aggressively take over in mineral economics, exploration, and exploitation.

When geological education and training are fully implemented and established in the direction charted by the foregoing outline, a firm foundation and renaissance will be provided wherein high-school students and undergraduates will be convinced once more that they can be rewarded socially, scientifically, and economically when they undertake careers in geology. Those of us who have been engaged in geologic practice over the past forty or fifty years can reassure these students that we have received ample personal rewards; salaries and fees have been comparable with those in other professions, and opportunities to acquire properties and securities have been ample.

The A.I.P.G. faces a great challenge in making evident that future geologists who are willing to obtain adequate education and training will receive rewards commensurate with professional capabilities. The A.I.P.G. Code of Ethics, Certification, and voluntary basis of accreditation for schools can be means of meeting that challenge. Constructive criticism is invited.

Thomas C. Hiestand, CPG

SECTION NEWS: LOUISIANA

An organizational meeting was held in Lafayette, Louisiana, on January 24th for the purpose of forming a district chapter of the Louisiana Section. Officers chosen for the new district are:

President Dr. John C. McCampbell, CPG
Head, Geology Department
Univ. of Southwestern Louisiana

Vice President John Ruggles, CPG
Exploration Geologist
Humble Oil & Refining Company

Secretary-Treasurer W. S. McAlister, CPG
Area Geologist
Texas Eastern Transmission Corp.

On January 25th a meeting of the Louisiana Section was held in Lafayette for the purpose of implementing the AIPG movement in Louisiana and to discuss plans for the first annual meeting, which will be held September 24, 1966.

W. S. McAlister, CPG
Assistant Editor, Louisiana Section

TEXAS SECTION OFFICE MOVED

The offices of the Texas Section and the Secretary-Treasurer have been moved to a new location. Please address all correspondence to: James A. Wheeler, CPG, Secretary-Treasurer, 928 Americana Building, Houston, Texas 77002.

PROFESSIONAL PARAGRAPHS

JOHN P. DOWDS, CPG, has been elected President of the Engineering Club of Oklahoma City.

REGINALD P. BRIGGS, CPG, has been elected President of the newly formed Geological Society of Puerto Rico.

The Virginia Association of Professional Geologists has elected officers for 1966. EMMETT A. FINLEY, CPG, is Vice-President and ARTHUR C. MUNYAN, CPG, is Chairman of the Board.

JAMES A. PETERSON, CPG, has joined the staff of the University of Montana, Missoula, as associate professor of geology.

RICHARD C. OBURN, CPG, and MAX R. MOTT, consulting geologists, have formed a partnership with offices at 730 Midland Savings Building, Denver, Colorado.

ORLO E. CHILDS, CPG, President of the Colorado School of Mines, has been named to a national commission charged with reviewing U.S. regulation of public lands, the Public Land Law Review Commission.

ROBERT B. BERG, CPG, has been elected President of the Rocky Mountain Association of Geologists. CHARLES R. WILCOX, CPG, is the new 1st Vice-President.

STAN W. TOTTEN, CPG, vice-president in charge of exploration for Standard Oil Company of California, Western Operations, Inc., has been appointed Chairman of the new Exploration Committee of Western Oil and Gas Association.

HOWARD J. PINCUS, CPG, has resigned his position as chairman of the geology department at Ohio State University to return to full-time teaching and research. ROBERT L. BATES, CPG, is now the vice-chairman of the department.
ROBEY H. CLARK, CPG, has been appointed exploration manager of the Houston Division of Mobil Oil Company. Clark succeeds ARNE R. NIELSON, CPG, who has been elected vice-president, director, and manager of exploration for Socony Mobil Oil of Canada, Ltd.

STUART S. MERWIN, CPG, has been appointed to the newly created post of general manager - mining, Union Pacific Railroad, Natural Resources Division. The move reflects the railroad's widening interest in mineral development in its operating and tributary areas.

DONELSON A. ROBERTSON, CPG, of Pittsburgh, resigned from Shell Oil Company on January 15th to establish a geology department for Appalachian Stone Division of Martin-Marietta Corporation. His new business address is Box 120, Mercersburg, Pennsylvania.

JAMES A. MARTIN, CPG, Missouri Geological Survey, was recently elected Vice-President of the Association of Missouri Geologists.

JOHN A. "JACK" TAYLOR, CPG, independent geologist, is the President of the Oklahoma City Petroleum Club for 1966.

The AIPG members present at the Virginia Association of Professional Geologists voted to establish a Virginia Section of AIPG. The number of AIPG members in Virginia approaches 25.

WOLFGANG E. ELSTON, CPG, Associate Professor of Geology, University of New Mexico, gave a talk before the Albuquerque Geological Society on January 18th on the geologic interpretation of large moon craters. Dr. Elston is doing NASA sponsored research on terrestrial volcanic analogs with large moon craters.

RICHARD W. FETZNER, CPG, has been appointed to the American Petroleum Institute's Educational Advisory Committee to the Committee on Public Affairs.

WILLIAM H. KAY, CPG, has recently resigned as Manager of Exploration, Midland Exploration Company, to accept a position as Assistant to the President, Texaco Oil Company, 400 Petroleum Club Building, Denver, Colorado.

ARNE FRYXELL, CPG, has joined Union Texas Petroleum Division of Allied Chemical as geologist in the Denver office.

WAYNE FELTS, CPG, Assistant to Division Manager, Texaco, Inc., Anchorage, has been transferred to Houston, Texas, on special assignment. Wayne and his wife Betty left within 6 days of notification of transfer. Probably record time, but then it has been 10 to 20 degrees below zero in Anchorage.

ART HAWLEY, CPG, Sacramento consultant, has just left for a trip to Tahiti to see if it's true what they say about the Polynesian girls before the tourists spoil everything.

ROBERT H. PASCHALL, CPG, has been elected President, and LOWELL E. GARRISON, CPG, has been elected Vice-President of the Sacramento Petroleum Association for 1966.

WILLIAM N. TINDELL, CPG, has been elected Chairman of the Outer Continental Shelf Study Committee of the Independent Petroleum Association of America.

JAY GLENN MARKS, CPG, Secretary-Treasurer of AIPG, has been transferred to Los Angeles effective March 7, 1966. His new business address is: Humble Oil and Refining Company, 1800 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, California 90067.

ROBERT H. PASCHALL, CPG, has been instrumental in having the State Association of County Assessors form a Mining Advisory Committee in California. In his position as Senior Petroleum and Mining Appraisal Engineer for the State Board of Equalization, Bob will be privileged to serve as Executive Secretary to that Committee. One goal of the Committee will be to write a manual for county use in the appraisal of industrial mineral properties similar to a manual on "The Appraisal of Oil and Gas Producing Properties," which Bob put together.

GEORGE H. DAVIS, CPG, geologist with the Water Resources Division of the U.S. Geological Survey, is on loan for 2 years with the Hydrology Branch of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, Austria.

CPGs elected to offices in the Oklahoma City Petroleum Club are JOHN A. TAYLOR, President, and ROBERT M. BECKER, Board of Directors.