**SUMMARY OF ADVISORY BOARD AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

**Advisory Board**

On October 4th, 27 delegates representing 17 State Sections met for their debate. The most hotly discussed item was the possibility of creating a second class of membership. In the presentation, Bill Newton pointed out the need to take cognizance of our younger geologists who have all the requirements of membership except that of experience. This vigorous and well-trained group of young men could add to the vitality of the Institute. In turn, the Institute could directly encourage the kind of professional development necessary to gain the public respect we desire. Some delegates were instructed by their Sections to vote against the issue.

A motion was made to recommend to the Executive Committee that an Associate grade of membership be provided. After it became apparent that the motion did not have enough support, an amended motion was passed to recommend that the issue be referred to the Professional and Scientific Standards Committee for study. It was interesting to note that the representatives from California, Colorado, Missouri, Pennsylvania and Texas, who represent well over half the membership, favored the creation of a second class of membership. For this reason, the Advisory Board was justified in keeping the issue alive even if "in Committee."

Other discussions resulted in the following recommendations to the Executive Committee:

1. The listing of specialty categories and telephone numbers in the 1967 roster, 10 to 7 vote;
2. Provide for decals and lapel buttons for distribution to the membership, by a unanimous vote;
3. Consider changing the By-Laws on the election of officers, by a 24 to 3 vote;
4. That membership solicitations be coordinated at the Headquarters Office;
5. To set a policy to encourage local meetings of Certified Professional Geologists, by an unanimous vote;
6. Accept the proposal of the Oklahoma Section on promoting geology through the use of educational signs.

At the close of the meeting, a Resolution which was passed unanimously by the Oklahoma Section was read by Jack Taylor. It called for presentation and adoption by the State of Oklahoma of an act providing for legal licensing of geologists through chartering.

**Executive Committee**

The fourth meeting of the 1967 Executive Committee was held on October 5th and 6th.

Action on Advisory Board recommendations occupied the major portion of the meeting. The item of a second grade of membership was referred to Committee as recommended. In addition, the Executive Director was asked to furnish bids and designs for lapel buttons and decals for use by the membership and also to prepare a questionnaire for approval of the Executive Committee to determine specialty categories of the membership and telephone numbers as recommended by the Advisory Board Delegates.

A motion was passed that a detailed retirement plan for Institute employees be presented in "The Professional Geologist" so that the membership of the Institute may be informed of our efforts in that regard and that funds be set aside pending acceptance of the program.

The rest of the meeting was devoted primarily to the routine year-end business of the Institute.

**Annual Meeting, October 7, 1967**

The highlight of the Annual Business Meeting was President Tester's "State of the Institute" address. After the routine reports of the Secretary-Treasurer and Editor, the more controversial issues were discussed.

A motion was passed that the codification of the membership be reconsidered by the Executive Committee for possible other action than is now anticipated.

A long discussion was pursued concerning the second class of membership. President Tester explained that the Professional and Scientific Standards Committee was charged to present a plan in this regard by July 1, 1968, with the thought in mind that a detailed plan may overcome the objections raised by some Sections.

A motion to initiate the machinery to undertake the creation of the grade of Honorary Membership was passed just before the close of the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward E. Rue, CPG 12
Secretary-Treasurer
EDITORIAL

In October, the Fourth Annual Meeting of AIGP was held in Houston, Texas, and was attended by 114 delegates, most of whom were from Texas, but with a large percentage from locations throughout the remainder of the United States. In the months preceding the date of the Annual Meeting, all but a few State Sections of AIGP held their annual meetings, of which the meeting of the California Section may be considered typical. Forty-three AIGP members participated in that event at Santa Barbara.

Each AIGP annual meeting, national or local, has its business session. In Houston, those who attended were not counted, but approximately 50 members were present. In Santa Barbara it was necessary to conscript an errant member from the bar to bring the group up to the requisite voting strength of 26.

AIGP nationally claims more than 1600 members, of whom 7% registered at the Houston meeting, and evidently less than 3% participated in the business session. In California there are 255 CPGs and, of these, 17% attended the Santa Barbara meeting, and 10% transacted the Section's business.

During the Santa Barbara meeting, the issue of statutory geological registration, and the policies of the Section regarding it, were matters of particular interest. After summarizing past history and offering a future course of action for discussion, one member made the following bleak commentary on AIGP’s role among California geologists:

"Here it is, less than two months after a bill which might have obliterated the geological profession was nearly adopted by the California State Legislature, and geologists in California are certain to face again the specter of geological legislation. Still only ten percent of the AIGP membership in California, or one percent of the entire California geologic community had enough interest to show up at a meeting where the future of geology on a statewide basis might largely be determined."

Similarly, at the national meeting in Houston, where the objectives of six important Institute committees were presented, and other vital business matters were discussed, only a tiny fraction of the membership appeared. Viewed in terms of the total number of geologists throughout the United States, the Houston contingent becomes vanishingly small; yet such Institute work as academic accreditation, geologic hazards, and public relations may eventually affect the entire profession.

The membership should be aware that the success of AIGP programs is largely dependent upon the energies, enthusiasm and participation of the members themselves. Apathy among the membership must surely lead to the frustration of our ambitions.

STATE OF THE INSTITUTE

Before delivering his Presidential Address at the Fourth Annual Meeting, President Tester gave this report on the general condition of AIGP.

The State of the Institute is good, certainly not perfect but far from failure.

As of today 1653 Certificates have been issued of which 1628 Members are living and active. There has been a loss of 18 by death (1.1 per cent) and seven by resignation (0.4 per cent) in the history of the Institute. The average age of the Members is 47 years, a relatively youthful and healthy age for men of broad experience and professional maturity.

The Institute has operated in 1967 within the budget adopted January 21, and has retired $4,000 of its indebtedness. We have earned over $400 as interest on funds collected early in the year and allocated to expenses late in the year.

There are now eleven Members delinquent in dues for the full year of 1967 and eight others delinquent in Section dues. These Members have not yet realized the importance of State Section functions in the organizational structure of the Institute. Some of these Members were borderline admission cases at the time of their application and their delinquency now emphasizes the importance of careful screening and evaluation of financial responsibility.

As of September 30 we have received 1/2 new applications in 1967, slightly over 19 per month. Our budget for 1967 contemplated an average of 25 per month. We have added 169 new Members since January, with 111 applications now being processed. The declining rate of increase in new Members fits the pattern started in 1966. Our future requires a stabilization or increase in the rate of inflow of new applications.

"I always thought an executive was doing well if he was right 50 percent of the time."

...Alfred P. Sloan
THE PRESIDENT'S COLUMN
(From the Presidential Address, Fourth Annual Meeting, Houston, Texas)

THE FUTURE OF THE INSTITUTE

The Institute has made remarkable progress in the four years since it was founded in November 1963. Each year important events have occurred; some have helped and some have deterred the growth in our membership, but in review, I believe the leadership during the first three years has saved the Institute from serious damage that could have delayed for several years our present status.

Most of the present Members have joined the Institute because they believe in its concepts, principles, and objectives. There is still a flow of new applications; I estimate a total of about 2000 members may be the limit of those who will join the Institute on faith alone, but we will lose many of these in the future if we do not produce services of value to the profession.

Even though our membership is still growing and new applications are being received on an average of about twenty each month, we are at a critical stage in our development and of planning for the future. The year 1967, and possibly 1968, will be considered the turning point historically in the establishment of the Institute as a strong and virile professional organization. Much depends on the success or failure of professional programs that have been started and the effectiveness of the work of our Members. It is becoming increasingly more difficult to convince geologists that the Institute needs their prestige and moral support. Even those geologists that understand the need for a professional society now ask, "what has the Institute accomplished," or "what is the Institute doing for the profession?"

I believe the Institute has already performed a useful service, if only by having been founded and surviving the four years with growth while being watched by the cautious skeptics. This morning you heard the six major Standing Committees report on their plan of work and their objectives which will enlarge the stature of the profession and demonstrate the impact of geology on the lives of many of our contemporary citizens. It is this type of service the Institute must provide to convince five thousand more of our fellow geologists that the Institute is doing a job that will benefit them as individuals and return values far in excess of their annual dues.

The Institute has a big job ahead, and our future success lies in the hands of the present Members. The Officers and Committees cannot do the job alone but must have help by the membership at large. We must all work and work with unity of purpose and support the programs that will show the non-member geologists and the lay public the value of an organized professional geological society. To be specific, there are several parts of a work program we must accomplish:

1. We must increase our membership, we must have a wider distribution of members, and we must have a better balance of all types of geological disciplines and employment. Our membership must be more representative of the entire profession.

The American Geological Institute estimates there are about 32,000 people in the United States that consider themselves to be Earth Scientists. Let us estimate that 20,000 of these can qualify for AIG. We now have only about 8 per cent of these, and we need a minimum of 35 to 40 per cent to command the full respect and recognition by the public and to provide the funds to service our professional projects. A membership of seven to eight thousand Certified Professional Geologists, well-distributed and balanced in the many fields of geological endeavor, working together, can attain all of the objectives of the Institute. It will be the quality of these Members representing the mature and experienced geologists of proven ethical standards that will bring our profession to the desired position of respect, and not the number of names on our rolls.

2. We should re-examine our position on our internal certification of geologists. In the past we have minimized the importance of this feature and called it merely a name for a Member of the Institute. I have followed this opinion, but as I view the future I now believe that certification of geologists by geologists on the basis of achievement and demonstration of ability should be a prime purpose of the Institute. We will strengthen our image before the public, we will differentiate the quality of practitioners, we will emphasize our control on ethical conduct, we will provide a better understanding of the profession by the courts and legal counsel, we will establish a stronger position with legislative bodies, we will be recognized as a truly professional society. We will actually become the Institute of Certified Geologists. We must continue to maintain the rigid standards of training, experience and ethical conduct in the certification procedure.

3. The Institute must provide a professional service to achieve public recognition of the geological influence on the relations of man and his environment. We must educate the public to recognize geology as a science and those who practice it scientifically as professional geologists, but those who use its vocabulary without understanding or without geologic facts as charlatans. We must maintain surveillance of the business and moral conduct of those who practice geology.

4. We must motivate geologists to work for the profession and stimulate them to raise their standards of performance. By so doing we will enhance the respect for the profession by the public, and increase the stability of geological employment.

5. The Institute must serve geologists by keeping them informed of new activities that concern the relationships of men and world events. The professional side of a geologist deals with subjects in the humanities, the sociological, historical, rhetorical, political and economic problems that arise from his knowledge and use of the science of geology. We need a medium of communication to advise and counsel our Members in ways not yet developed. We need a substan-
tial publication, a digest of professional relations, that will examine in depth the causes and effects of the many actions in which the functions of a geologist are concerned.

6. The State Sections must perform more of the obligations of the Institute in all the phases of its professional work. Each Section should parallel the Institute Standing Committees to support their work. The State Section is the local contact which can focus the energy of the CPG's on the problems where they exist. Those Sections that permit a junior or professional type of membership or believe such association would help a young geologist should utilize every opportunity to demonstrate to him the principles and objectives of the Institute. It is at the State Section level that the young and maturing geologist can be indoctrinated in the meaning of an elite organization that counts experience as the most valuable asset a geologist has in performance of his scientific work.

My thesis is that the future of the American Institute of Professional Geologists depends on the ability of the Members to perform the duties required by the aims and purposes of the Institute as set out in the Constitution. You will be tempted to deviate from these principles due to pressures or difficult problems or by aberrant ideas. You will need to make some minor adjustments, but do not forget that the Institute is unique among other professional organizations, and you can be proud that each Member stands on an equal base.

My term in office is nearing its end. I have considered the privilege to be your President as the greatest honor of my life.

Allen C. Tester

1968 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

At the Advisory Board meeting held October 5, 1967, in Houston, Texas, the following members of the Advisory Board were elected to serve on the Executive Committee for 1968:
Frederick F. Mellen .... Past President, Mississippi Section
Richard E. Faggiono .... Past President, New York Section
Vito Goutas ......... Past President, Louisiana Section
Robert R. Berg .......... Member, Texas Section

The composition of the Executive Committee for 1968 will, therefore, include these representatives as well as the elected officers of the Institute, as follows:
John T. Galey ...................... President
Thomas D. Murphy ............... Vice President
Richard M. Foosse .......... Secretary-Treasurer
Arthur O. Spaulding ............. Editor
Allen C. Tester ................. Past President

"If you are lonesome -- read a book. If you are sick -- eat some fruit -- plant the seed. It will be appreciated much more -- and longer -- than a tombstone. Think before you speak--is it kind?--is it true?--is it necessary? To stop the feared depression, don't WANT what you haven't the money to buy--but SAVE some of what you've earned."

... A. P.

INSTITUTE INFORMATION

A Panel Discussion by six of the Major Standing Committees of the Institute was arranged as a part of the general program of the Annual Meeting in Houston. The Chairman of each of the six committees selected was asked to present a short statement of the objectives and plans of his Committee assignment. This was not a progress report, as most of the Committees had been at work less than six months, and a few Committee members had been appointed only recently to fill vacancies. But rather, the purpose of the Panel was to inform Institute Members that professional work is being done and how the Committees are approaching their problems.

The impact of this part of the program was startling, as had been expected. It was unfortunate that time was limited and discussion was curtailed. Many Members hope that future Annual Meetings will devote more time to similar but more detailed discussions. There are almost 1600 CPG's who did not hear the Panel Reports, and for that reason they are summarized briefly in the following paragraphs. Here are some answers you can give prospective new members when they ask what the Institute is doing for the profession.

Allen C. Tester

PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE
Dr. Truman H. Kuhn, Chairman

Dr. Kuhn presented the following report of the activities of the above committee:

"In one respect the Committee on Professional and Scientific Standards is a new committee -- created since the last annual meeting as a result of AIPG committee reorganization.

"On the other hand, this new Committee continues, in part at least, the activities of the old two-year six-man Academic Qualifications Board.

"Appointed in May 1967, the Committee was charged with

1. Standards of Collateral Scientific Societies,
2. Membership Qualifications,
3. Accreditation of Geology Departments.

"The first two assignments are new to this Committee. Accreditation is a holdover from the original Board. To facilitate operations the 12-man Committee was formed into two sub-groups: William A. Newton headed the Qualification for Membership and the Qualifications of Collateral Scientific Societies Subcommittee; Frank E. Byrne headed the Subcommittee on Accreditation of Geology Departments; Charles S. Robinson was vice-chairman.

"A. Standards of Collateral Scientific Societies

"One of the requirements of membership in AIPG is membership in a geologic society approved by the Executive Committee. Through rigid interpretation excellent geologists are being denied AIPG membership and our Committee was asked to examine the problem.

"Committee members are in accord with the general principle of the requirement for membership in a geologic society, but in order to give more flexibility in administra-
tion, the Committee recommended on July 6, 1967 that the Collateral Society should fulfill the following needs:

(1) Science of Geology, or one of the geologic specialties, should be important to the purpose, goal, or reason for its existence.

(2) The Society should provide a regular means of expression of scientific and geologic thought by organized meetings or publications. For basic information necessary to make recommendation to the Executive Committee two essential requirements are:

(1) Copy of the Constitution and/or By-Laws of the Collateral society, and

(2) Letter of evaluation of the organization, preferably from an AIGP member.

This concept was reaffirmed on Thursday, October 5, 1967. Later it was learned that the Executive Committee had accepted this recommendation in its entirety. These changes would insure evidence of professional interest but are not too restrictive.

B. Membership Qualifications

"There has been no activity in this category but it is understood that the Committee will be asked to consider other classes of membership.

C. Accreditation of Geology Departments

"This phase is a continuation of the studies of the old Board which on October 20, 1966 reaffirmed a statement formulated on October 7, 1965:

(1) Accreditation of degree-granting geology departments is necessary.

(2) Accreditation should be initiated by state committees.

(3) Recommend a preliminary approach:

a. Inspection of only those departments requesting AIGP accreditation.

b. Inspection of only those departments in institutions accredited by a regional accrediting agency.

c. Develop an AIGP institutional questionnaire.

d. Inspection and preliminary evaluation of departments by AIGP state groups.

(4) Eventual need for funds.

This statement was further discussed and re-reaffirmed on Thursday, October 5, 1967.

"During all discussions it was emphasized that the prime reason geology departments should be inspected is to upgrade the profession of geology and increase quality of AIGP members. These are stated functions of AIGP. The purpose is not to establish a rigid set of standards.

"As a more accurate description of purpose and functions, the Committee is now using Cooperative Evaluation of Departments of Geology rather than the phrase Accreditation of Geology. In its last meeting the Committee considered criteria for evaluation, visiting committees, general procedures, and financing.

"The Committee agreed to proceed with actual evaluation, realizing that many unsolved, unresolved, unanticipated problems exist. It is hoped that at least three degree-granting departments will request inspection by the Committee and that the necessary evaluations will be made before the 1968 Annual Meeting. The inspection committee will consist of three AIGP members, one from industry, one from government, and one from an academic institution. The first chairman of these three Inspection Committees will be Henry Neel, Charles Robinson, and Edward Rue. Most of the expenses will be borne by the Committee members.

"By working with cooperative departments and institutions in actual examinations, the Committee will have an opportunity to start to develop the necessary experience in departmental inspection and more realistically develop usable philosophies, procedures, and forms. After inspection, a report will be submitted by this Evaluation Committee to the Professional and Scientific Standards Committee who in turn will report to the Executive Committee of AIGP. If the department is accepted, the Executive Committee then will notify the department and AIGP members."

STATUTORY REGULATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
Jackson M. Barton, Chairman

Henry H. Neel, on behalf of the Committee Chairman, gave a brief discussion of the objectives of this committee. Those objectives are:

1. To keep informed of all existing and proposed laws and rules that affect or will affect geologists. To support those that are favorable to geologists and to the public, and to oppose those that are not.

2. To assist the members in the various states in attaining legal recognition if they so desire. To inform them of what is being done in other states.

3. To create a uniform law that can be adapted to the needs of any state, to the end that the greatest degree of uniformity possible will exist among the various states.

4. To study the problems of reciprocity and to guard against the adoption of any laws that will restrict the free movement of geologists from one state to another.

PUBLIC RELATIONS AND PUBLICITY COMMITTEE
Edith M. McKee, Chairman

During the past 10 years there has been an increasing awareness among geologists that, as a profession, we need to accept current business practices and actively communicate with the public through public relations programs. That this 1967 Annual Meeting has taken public relations as its theme spotlights the emphasis being placed on the need to inform nongeologists of our role in the economy.

The AIGP Public Relations and Publicity Committee is charged with conceiving, organizing and putting into operation a national program for the geological profession. The broad aims of the program are:

1. To inform business, industrial, academic and governmental decision makers of the total picture of how geology affects their own activities.
2. To inform geologists of growing business trends or areas where geology should be applied.

3. To expand student and teachers' interest in geology as a profession by providing professional help to elementary geology programs at both the teacher and student levels. Currently geology is part of the 3rd-5th grade curriculum in most schools in this country; at this age level the children are excited about geology, and take their enthusiasm home to mother and father who can learn to apply geology to their business and community activities. The AGI-BSCP program is restricted from these grade levels, as well as providing materials too technically advanced for use by the lower grades.

Immediate and long-range action is planned to accomplish these aims. Drawing upon the experience of the physicists, who most successfully launched a public relations program some years ago to put their profession in a position of strength, various projects can be adapted to our own needs. To get results from these programs, the active cooperation of every individual geologist as well as every AIPG State Section is urgently needed.

To communicate with nongeologists, we have to speak and write in ways that will interest them. We have to find ways of making available our ideas and activities to the broadest possible spectrum of the public. This can be done quickest by:

1. Compiling a mailing list for geological news releases covering newspapers, magazines, radio and television. The physicists regularly send materials to over 600 editors and news people; it is no wonder that they are often in the limelight.

2. Developing a central-speakers' bureau of geologists available to speak to schools, civic groups, clubs, special interest groups such as bankers or business executives.

3. Organizing local symposia to discuss specific geological problems with newsmen, business or professional groups, or special interest groups on subjects needing more than a one-shot lecture.

4. Cooperating with elementary school teachers and classes by developing materials and services such as TV programs, taped talks, field trips, class discussions, providing samples, etc.

To be of lasting value to the profession, long-range programs must be established to perpetuate the geological public relations work. Included in these programs is the establishment of a permanent office with a small staff, and funds to maintain it and the work. It is imperative that funds be found for this work; in 1963 the American Institute of Physicists budgeted over $100,000 for public relations work, half of it from grants, and as a profession recovered far more than that sum in contracts - prestige - and individual salaries. This AIPG committee will seek to organize and fund a 3-year pilot project: to establish a permanent public relations staffed office. Seed-money grants have been provided for other professional groups to start comparable programs, and it is reported that several foundations might regard a geological program with favor.

The work of this committee is intended to enhance the public image of geology and geologists. We will be working closely with other AIPG committees and with other geological societies. To accomplish our aims, we need the backing and active participation of all geologists whether CPG's or not. This central committee will act as a focal point, coordinating body, and receiving center for ideas and action. Much of the local work will have to be done by the State Sections, and even by individuals. Right now each one of you can help by:

1. Sending us materials for news releases.
2. Making yourselves available to speak before groups. Tell us what subjects you prefer to discuss so we can start a file of "titles."
3. Work on developing symposia for special groups in your area: bankers, science writers on the papers, teachers, civic leaders, builders, etc.
4. Personally approach your local newspapers and broadcasting stations to sell geology news stories.
5. Look for and report to us local interests or problems which are geologically oriented and merit our action to focus attention.

PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS COMMITTEE
E. L. Krititzsky, Chairman

General Objective
The Committee will investigate employment conditions that might have adverse effects on either the professional stature of geologists or the ability of geologists to earn a living through the practice of their profession. In order to carry out its assignment most effectively, the Committee has been divided into three separate groups and will study the following:

Academic Panel
(1) The abuses that the academic tenure system has on persons who have not attained tenure.

Petroleum and Mining Panel
(1) Refusal of major oil companies to hire geologists who have reached the age of 35 or 40.
(2) The practice of some major oil companies who fire older geologists while hiring young graduates.
(3) The widespread practice of retiring oil geologists at about age 55.
(4) Attrition among geologists or rate at which geologists leave to enter other fields.
(5) The condition of "consultants" in petroleum geology.

Government and Engineering Panel
(1) Disparities in pay between geologists and engineers in the Federal Service.
(2) 'Ghost' writing and anonymity of professional people.
(3) Application of lie detector tests in some positions.

GEOLOGIC HAZARDS COMMITTEE
Martin Van Couvering, Chairman

The subject of geologic hazards caught the attention of AIPG in 1965, with the result that a Commission on Geologic
Hazards was created. Later the title was changed to "Standing Committee on Geologic Hazards," in order to conform with the By-laws of the Institute. The latter terminology is used currently.

The activities of this body began with a series of breakfast meetings during the national conventions of the older geological societies, including GSA, AAPG and AIME. The most recent breakfast was held at the Houston meeting of our own AIPG, and was perhaps the most successful one. The procedure has been for the Chairman to call upon each participant for comments. There has always been plenty of enthusiasm and active participation in these meetings.

At a recent meeting, the Chairman appointed a Steering Committee, under the chairmanship of David Evans. After due deliberation, this committee recommended that the country be divided into ten districts for the purpose of facilitating the work. These districts are as follows, but their boundaries may change as need and experience dictate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Maine</th>
<th>Connecticut</th>
<th>Delaware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Wisconsin</th>
<th>Illinois</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Tennessee</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th>Mississippi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. North Dakota</th>
<th>Nebraska</th>
<th>Kansas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Oklahoma</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Louisiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. Idaho</th>
<th>Wyoming</th>
<th>Colorado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. Washington</th>
<th>Oregon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIII. California</th>
<th>Nevada</th>
<th>Arizona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X. Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each district is entitled to one member and one alternate on the central committee. With the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, this will make a twelve-man committee, in conformity with the By-laws of the Institute. It is contemplated that each district will hold at least an annual meeting, at which every interested person will be welcome, regardless of membership in AIPG. In this way, the problems of the district, with reference to geologic hazards, can be thoroughly analyzed. So much enthusiasm has been displayed in the breakfast meetings that we believe those attending the annual district meetings will react in the same way. As yet, not all of the district chairmen, nor their vice-chairmen, have been selected. Their names will be published in an early issue of The Professional Geologist. In the meantime, all correspondence should be addressed to: Martin Van Couvering at 1870 Knollwood Drive, Pasadena, California 91103 (phone 213-681-9636) with carbon copies to Vice-Chairman Henry Neel at 802 Roosevelt Building, 727 West 7th Street, Los Angeles, California 90017 (phone 213-622-6968).

The plan of organization calls for the establishment of a repository, in each district, for news items, reports and other matters that are relevant to geologic hazards. It is a pleasure to announce that the California Division of Mines, which is already active in this field, has suggested setting up a separate section to be called the "AIPG Geologic Hazards Library." Perhaps other state surveys can be persuaded to do likewise.

COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES -- P. E. LaMoreaux, Chairman

As originally visualized, the Committee will investigate and evaluate governmental policies at all levels related to the work of geologists. It will study governmental regulations which affect geological research and exploration. At the present time the members of the Committee are availing themselves of information collected as part of other activities of professional societies oriented along the same purpose and scope. It is hoped that within six months a more specific agenda of work for the Committee can be developed.

ENGINEERING GEOLOGY IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA


"Engineering Geology in Southern California" is a unique publication, and first of its kind. The Editors, Richard Lung and Richard Proctor, have assembled an outstanding contribution by 39 experienced authors that deals with the diverse and interrelated geologic problems of a geographic region. The publication combines the principles of theory and practice of engineering geology with the features of a geologic guidebook, and reference on Southern California. By interrelating the problems of the practitioner to the environmental geology, the authors have presented an approach that has not received adequate attention heretofore.


George A. Kiersch, Cornell University
ALASKA
Newly elected officers of the Alaska State Section are:
President ......................... John M. Sweet
Vice President .................... Allen B. Scouler
Secretary-Treasurer .............. Marvin D. Magnus

CALIFORNIA
At the Third Annual Meeting of the California Section, the following officers, having been elected earlier, were installed to administer the Section during 1968:
President ......................... Edward A. Daney
First Vice President ............. Edward A. Gibb, Jr.
Second Vice President .......... William H. Crutchfield
Secretary-Treasurer ............. William C. Gussow

Matters of particular importance facing the California Section during the forthcoming year will be a renewed attempt at statutory registration of geologists and the Fifth Annual Meeting of AIFG, to be held in San Francisco October 11 and 12, 1968.

COLORADO
Newly elected officers of the Colorado State Section are:
President ......................... Fred S. Jensen
Vice President .................... Louis J. Scopel
Secretary-Treasurer .............. Charles C. O'Boyle

ILLINOIS
Nelson Rudd reports that the following officers were elected to head the Illinois Section of AIFG during 1968:
President ......................... John C. Frys
Vice President .................... William R. Clark
Secretary-Treasurer .............. Merle E. Williams

Edith McKee writes that Mayor Daley has just expressed his favor with the proposed plan to locate Chicago's third BIG airport on an island to be developed roughly 6 miles offshore in Lake Michigan. This is a feasible project so long as thorough studies are made of the surface and subsurface lake-bottom geology and the various water movements and related erosion-deposition patterns which will be disturbed and also established. Fortunately, the Harza Engineering Co. of Chicago has geologists on its staff, and is planning very extensive testing programs before starting the construction. As described now, the airport itself would be located on what is now lake bottom, with the waters held back by a massive dike system; this bowl-shaped development will assist landing and take-off of the anticipated super-planes, and the glide pattern over the lake will be safer than over skyscrapers.

The new geologic map of Illinois (scale 1:500,000) published by the Illinois State Geological Survey, Urbana, Illinois, is an entirely new compilation differentiating several units not shown on previous state maps. On the same sheet are three cross sections and northern and southern stratigraphic columns that show lithologic character and nomenclature. Six small inset maps show geologic structure, glacial geology, thickness of the glacial drift, and the areal geology of the Sub-Pennsylvanian, Sub-Middle and Upper Devonian, and Sub-St. Peter surface.

IOWA
Newly elected officers of the Iowa State Section are:
President ......................... Herbert E. Hendriks, Sr.
Vice President .................... Allan B. Osborne
Secretary-Treasurer ............. Fred H. Dorheim

LOUISIANA
Newly elected officers in the Louisiana Section are:
President ......................... Arthur H. Trowbridge
Vice President .................... J. R. Pierson, Jr.
Secretary-Treasurer ............. Joseph W. Fusso, Jr.

MISSISSIPPI
Newly elected officers in the Mississippi Section are:
President ......................... Gordon W. Gulmon
Vice President .................... Charles R. Kolb
Secretary-Treasurer .............. Harold E. Karges
Committee-man ................... Troy J. Laswell

MISSOURI
Newly elected officers of the Missouri State Section are:
President ......................... Kenneth G. Bolling
Vice President .................... Wallace B. Howe
Secretary-Treasurer .............. G. Donald Emigh

MONTANA
Newly elected officers of the Montana State Section are:
President ......................... Clifford A. Balster
Vice President .................... John R. Wane
Secretary-Treasurer .............. Robert L. Marsh

NEW MEXICO
The News Letter of the New Mexico Section reports the election of:
President ......................... Frank Kottlowski
Vice President .................... Clay Smith
Secretary ......................... Wendell Cole
Treasurer ......................... William LeMay

The following is reproduced, verbatim, from page 4 of the New Mexico Section News Letter:
"Considerable discussion of the New Mexico Section news letter ensued; it has been suggested that it be sold to nonmembers and institutions. The first three issues cost a total of $130. The executive committee felt that we should continue it although it is expensive. We will continue free distribution to local geology societies, libraries, geology departments and prospective members. Two members, who prefer to remain anonymous, contributed $25 each toward the cost."

On page 6, however, under the Treasurer's report for the fiscal year 1967, the following receipts are shown:
Dues for 1966 - 8 members, at $2.50 .......... $20.00
Dues for 1967 - 33 members, at $5.00 .......... 165.00
*Contribution of $25.00 each, in March, from Sherman A. Wengard and Edward E. Kinney, help defray costs of news letters ........................................ 50.00
$235.00

*(Anonymity is fine even if it does last for only two pages. . . . Ed)
**NEW YORK**

Newly elected officers of the New York State Section are:

President ................. Frederic L. Kadey, Jr.
Vice President ............... Chester O. Ensign, Jr.
Secretary-Treasurer .......... Hans W. Schreiber

**OHIO**

Newly elected officers of the Ohio State Section are:

President ....................... Fred H. Klaer, Jr.
Vice President .................. Robert L. Bates
Secretary-Treasurer .......... Alfred C. Walker

**OKLAHOMA**

The third annual business meeting of the Oklahoma Section of AIPG was held at the 89er Inn, Oklahoma City, Saturday, September 16th. President Jerry B. Newby presided. Officers for the forthcoming year were announced:

President ................. Howard S. Kunsman
1st Vice President .......... George C. Hardin, Jr.
2nd Vice President ........ John J. Rupnick
Secretary-Treasurer .......... Frederick H. Holden

The Oklahoma Section has 97 members, an increase of 20% in the past year.

The Tulsa group of the Oklahoma Section arranged a meeting Friday, October 27, at the Sinclair Refining Company Research Lab to entertain prospective new "members" by means of personal contact. Each AIPG member invited a guest to whom the advantages of AIPG were explained. Dr. Allen C. Tester gave a short talk emphasizing the projects now being developed by the Institute to enhance the profession. Howard Kunsman, new President of the Oklahoma Section, and Darwin Quigley CGP, were in charge.

**TEXAS**

Newly elected officers of the Texas State Section are:

President .................. John S. Rives
Vice President ................. Morgan J. Davis, Jr.
Secretary-Treasurer .......... Benjamin F. Hoffacker, Jr.

**UTAH**

Newly elected officers of the Utah State Section are:

President ....................... Graham S. Campbell
Vice President ................... David W. Elias
Secretary-Treasurer .......... Harvey E. McCann

**VIRGINIA**

Newly elected officers of the Virginia State Section are:

President ....................... Arthur C. Munyan
Vice President ................... Emmett A. Finley
Secretary-Treasurer .......... David M. Young

**WEST VIRGINIA**

Newly elected officers of the West Virginia Section are:

President ....................... Benton M. Wilmuth
Vice President .................. Robert B. Erwin
Secretary-Treasurer .......... Phillip W. Johnson

**WYOMING**

Newly elected officers of the Wyoming State Section are:

President ....................... Donald B. Basko
Vice President .................. Vincent L. White
Secretary ......................... John L. Wrobleski
Treasurer ....................... Charles S. Tenney

---

**REGISTRATION OF GEOLOGISTS**

Members of AIPG may have gained the impression that all efforts to register geologists originate in California and reflect the peculiarities of the profession in that state. Such is not the case, and AIPG is indebted to Fred L. Fox, CGP, for his lucid account of the most recent development in Pennsylvania. Fred's joint letter to the Association of Engineering Geologists and to AIPG is reproduced in its entirety as a means of illustrating one of the fundamental purposes of AIPG and what could happen to geologists, if there were no such organization to represent their interests. AIPG will play an active part in coping with the situation which Fred describes in Pennsylvania, and, should AIPG be successful in asserting its influence with respect to this situation, its achievements should stand as a permanent testimonial of its raison d'être and its service to the profession.

Board of Directors, A.E.G. and Executive Committee, A.I.P.G. 

Gentlemen:

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is planning an examination for Geological Engineering under the existing Professional Engineers Registration Law (Pa. Act 367, 1946). This examination will provide yet another path toward the P. E. Title. This action could have a profound effect upon the profession of Engineering Geology. Just how great this effect will be remains to be seen.

It may very well be that the engineering profession, as it now stands, does not truly require this new path toward registration. After all, the Pennsylvania law provides only for the title of "Professional Engineer," without specialty. Any geologist desiring registration as a Professional Engineer can take the existing civil or soils examination to achieve his goal. The specialty part of the examination is not what keeps many geologists from passing the test. The Engineer-in-Training section provides the stopper; most geologists cannot pass the structural section of the E.I.T. A Geological Engineering examination will not affect the E.I.T.--only the specialty.

O.K., then. If this is only another P. E. examination, why should we be concerned?

It is possible that we, as Engineering Geologists, may find some portion of the work which we now do preempted by the engineering profession. It is even possible that the term "Geological Engineer" may tend to be considered synonymous for Engineering Geologist. The engineer may or may not press the legal advantage of his license. If he should, the geologist will suffer.

To sum up the foregoing, the planned Geological Engineering examination will not aid the geologist in obtaining a license as a Professional Engineer, nor will it aid or benefit the profession of geology. It could, on the other hand, result in imposing limits on the geologist in the practice of his own profession.

October 16, 1967
Why should a geologist be registered, anyway?

Registration under existing Professional Engineers Registration Laws satisfied the need to supervise and regulate those performing acts, such as designing structures and public works, that will affect life, health, property, or public welfare.

A geologist performs no such acts. Even an engineering geologist does not directly perform such acts. Geology treats of the origin, history, constitution and structure of the earth, including the operation of the physical forces affecting it. A geologist applies his knowledge of the properties of the earth and its constituent rocks, liquida, gases and minerals toward the solution of basic problems related to man’s physical environment.

An engineering geologist does not design that which he studies. It is there, naturally. The work of the engineering geologist is geared to the needs of the engineer. The engineering geologist assures that the geologic factors affecting the planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance of engineering structures and ground water resources are recognized, interpreted, and presented for use in engineering practice (A.E.G. definition). Once the information is presented for use, the engineer, and not the geologist, does the engineering (performing the acts of design and construction) affecting life, health, property and public welfare.

On the other hand, one facet of the geologist’s makeup which may be overlooked may have an effect upon life, health, property and public welfare. Because of his rather broad educational background, his empirical approach to problems and his understanding of the effects of time, climate, wind and water upon the earth as a whole, the geologist is uniquely qualified to consider the effect of a (safe, well-designed) structure or public work upon the site, area or region in or on which it is (well-) constructed by a qualified engineer. By virtue of his training and experience with the “Big Picture,” he may well be able to predict the changes on a heretofore stable environment which will be wrought by, for instance, a large-scale water supply project.

It may therefore be argued that the geologist does have a responsibility regarding life, health, property and public welfare, and should be regulated by registration. By the same reasoning, the gas-jockey at the corner station should also be registered, since the brake job that he does on your automobile can also affect life, health, property and public welfare, especially if he were to leave out a bolt. Even the majority of engineers who design our automobiles are not registered, and their work has a profound effect upon life, health, property and public welfare.

While the information contributed by a geologist toward the total information leading to the design of a structure or public work is, at the very least, useful (and, more realistically, invaluable), it does not fall into the same category as the actual design of a bridge span or a high-rise building. The geologist’s information is helpful, and may even determine the feasibility of a project, but it is not critical from a life, health, property and public welfare standpoint. A geologist does not design a tunnel. He may determine the character, quality and strength of the materials penetrated, and may even make detailed measurements to provide specific and quantitative information about them, but the engineer will do the actual design. If he is in doubt, the engineer will overdesign to develop the necessary margin of safety.

The engineering geologist fills a real need. He is a specialist in a specialized world. His contributions to humanity are no less real or valuable than those of the engineer. A license will not increase the caliber, scope or quantity of his contributions. A license is not, or should not be, a statement of qualifications. In most states, a geologist may only obtain a license under existing engineers’ acts. Why should he be required to pass an examination in structural design? He doesn’t need it, and will never use it. In all probability he never had a course in structures or strength of materials, and may lack the background necessary to pass such an examination. His inability to pass a Professional Engineer’s examination does not make him an inferior geologist.

If it is credentials we are after, we must begin with regulation and control by our professional peers. If we must register for survival, we must register not as engineers (which we are not) but as geologists. We should see to it that our standards are such that our registration has a real meaning. The obtaining of a P.E. license by a geologist has no real meaning within the geological profession. We represent an honorable profession that serves humanity well. Why be forced to qualify under existing engineering registration laws in order to practice a profession which is not engineering? Let us rather improve and enhance our profession from within.

At the same time, we must resist any efforts, deliberate or not, on the part of the engineering profession to preempt the duties and/or assume the responsibilities of the Engineering Geologist. We have lost “soils engineering” forever, and are in the process of losing the rock mechanics ball. “Geological Engineering” strikes pretty close to home. These things have occurred because of a lack of unity within our own profession. The A.I.P.G. can be an ideal instrument for reversing this trend, but it includes a large number of geologists who do not work closely with engineers on a day-to-day basis, and are affected little, if at all, by the immediate problem at hand. The A.E.G., on the other hand, is made up entirely of geologists who are vitally affected. Therefore, it can be seen that the A.I.P.G. cannot be expected to line up solidly behind any action to register (or whatever) engineering geologists, while the A.E.G. may show a basic difference in approach to the problem by the two organizations.

Now is the time for all good geologists to come to the aid of their profession. Engineering geologists are in a position of having to fish or cut bait. The future of this subdivision of our profession is at stake. If we allow it to be assimilated by the engineering profession, the entire geological profession will be affected. Any effort to register under existing Professional Engineers’ Registration Laws is a step in the wrong di-
rection. We must do it ourselves. Let's get organized, make a decision, and get on with it.

Very truly yours,

FRED L. FOX

HEADQUARTERS

If you have in your possession, or know of a potential applicant who has in his possession, the old form application which states that $20.00 must accompany the application, $15.00 for dues and $5.00 as a nonrefundable fee, please destroy these application forms and order new forms from the headquarters office. Many of the applications we are receiving are on the old form and our first correspondence with the applicant must be a request for an additional $5.00 inasmuch as the dues of the Institute are now $20.00. We do not think the applicant forms the most favorable impression of the Institute in such cases.

A REQUEST

As many of you have found, the first question asked by some potential applicants when they are approached regarding becoming members of the Institute is "What can AIPG do for me?" Though most of us are satisfied to know that we are building a stronger, more vital profession, perhaps we should make an attempt to answer this question. We have learned of some instances in which membership in the Institute has been of personal advantage to Members and there must be others. Has your membership in the Institute broadened your professional contacts, helped you obtain clients or job assignments, helped you qualify as an expert witness before a court of law or a regulatory agency, benefitted your relations with other professions, enhanced your professional standing in the community? If so, please send the headquarters office a short paragraph outlining the circumstances.

OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

The annual dues statements that have been returned to this office with the coded employment, degree and specialty information have contained many worthwhile suggestions for changes and additions. Rather than write each of you a letter, may we state here that the majority of your suggestions will be implemented when the data is transferred to your file card.

It has been suggested that "Self-employed" be separate from "Retired." Number 8 under "Kind of Employer" will now be the "Retired" category. Those of us who formulated the code assumed that even the retired geologist kept his "hand in" by doing some consulting work and was never really retired.

If a Member has two Baccalaureates or Masters in different majors, this will be noted on the file cards. Additional specialty categories will also be added such as "Stratigrapher" and others as has been suggested.

GEOLOGISTS REAL GENTLEMEN, SHE SAYS

RE THE MEMBERS of the American Institute of Professional Geologists who held their annual meeting here.

May I say that they certainly were a pleasant departure from some of the other groups Houston has been host to. I had begun to wonder if many traits had gone out of style, but these men were all nicely dressed and neatly shorn, beautifully well mannered, brilliant and efficient, responsible and masculine gentlemen.

And they devoted their sessions to such things as the geologists' responsibility in public affairs, and how geologists can better their image with industry and public. Glory be! I'm glad I'm a woman again, because now I know there are a few real men around.

MRS. MARY A. SMITH

3614 Montrose Number 1005
Reprinted from the Houston Post

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

AIRMAIL

October 27, 1967

Dear Sir:

When plans for the AIPG were first promulgated and an effort made to establish an organization, I refrained from making application to join because I wished to see whether the organization would be parallel and of equivalent status to the registered professional engineers' associations of the various states. As time went on, it appeared that this seemed to be the aim of AIPG, and therefore I submitted my application and am pleased to have been qualified for membership.

I am therefore greatly disturbed at the continuing pressure being applied on our organization to broaden the membership base. I address myself particularly to the Article on page 7 of the September, 1967 issue. I do not wish to make a lengthy rebuttal of the arguments presented for such a broadening but merely wish to register my protest against the idea in its entirety. Despite the earnest protestations of the protagonists of this policy, the eventual result can only mean the weakening of the need for the organization by people like myself who practise geology individually and professionally. I have no wish to deny the benefits of our organization to those who are qualified, but let them make application and be elected under the standards now in effect without adding to the types of membership.

An organization of 10,000 is not necessarily twice as strong nor twice as good as one of 5,000.

Sincerely yours,

Lendall P. Warriner

Mining Consultant

78 Langdon Avenue
Ardsley-on-Hudson, N. Y.
LETTER TO THE EDITOR

October 10, 1967

Dear Sir:

After reading Mr. Bruer's recapitulation of the future status of geologists we believe that his suggestion to convert the A.I.P.G. into a guild (Trade Union) within the framework of the National Labor Relations Act should be given serious consideration by the Officers and Advisory Board. The advantages seem to outweigh any real or fancied disadvantages. The elimination of reciprocity problems between states might well lead to the elimination of the same problems internationally.

The rather widespread prejudices against Unions are largely due to unsavory activities of some leaders, who confuse the welfare of their members with their own aggrandizement. This is something which could scarcely happen in the case of AIPG.

With best wishes for the future of the AIPG.

K. F. Dallmus, CPG No. 1119
Caracas, Venezuela C. C. Jefferson, Jr., CPG No. 1300
Apartado: 10.128 H. W. Thoms, CPG No. 1162
Sabana Grande

PROFESSIONAL PARAGRAPHS

DR. ALLEN C. TESTER, President of AIPG, was invited to attend the inauguration of Eugene Swearingen as the Seventeenth President of the University of Tulsa, November 10, 1967. Dr. Tester was unable to be present, so JERRY B. NEWBY, CPG and Past President of the Oklahoma Section was designated as AIPG's official representative.

DR. BEN H. PARKER, CPG, has been elected President of Frontier Refining, Denver. He has been Vice-President of Frontier since 1942, and a Director since 1951.

M. M. FIDLAR, CPG, President of Mountain Fuel Supply, Salt Lake City, has been elected president of the Pacific Coast Gas Association.

Many distinguished members of AIPG contributed to the success of the AEG Annual Meeting in Dallas:

DON U. DEERE, CPG, spoke on "Shale Mylonites";

RICHARD H. JAHNS, CPG, co-authored the paper, "Shiny Parting Surfaces in Clay-Rich Rock";

GEORGE D. ROBERTS, CPG, presented "Residual Soils Overlying Clay Shales";

EDWIN E. LUTZEN, CPG, and JAMES H. WILLIAMS, CPG, described "Missouri's Approach to Engineering in Urban Areas"; and

JOHN A. TRANTINA, CPG, talked on "Geohydrology of Clay Shales."

PETER T. FLAWN, CPG, delivered the luncheon address October 26 on "The Environmental Geologist and the Body Politic."

FRED T. HOLDEN, CPG, exploration geologist in Humble Oil & Refining Company's Oklahoma City office, has been promoted to Senior Professional Geologist. It has been announced by the company. The appointment is for outstanding technical accomplishment in accordance with Humble's recently established system of professional titles in its exploration and production departments to recognize increasing levels of individual professional achievement.

THOMAS E. KELLEY, CPG, Houston oil and business executive, has left for Juneau, Alaska, to take up his new job as Alaska commissioner of natural resources. His appointment, effective-November 1, was announced in October by Alaska's Governor Walter J. Hickel.

Big ads in Farmington and Albuquerque papers show CPG CHARLES F. "CHIEF" BROWN holding a core, by a rig, and with his usual smile. As the expert on the Pictured Cliffs formation, "Chief" was singled out by the geologically minded El Paso Natural Gas Company to show why the company intends keeping the West well supplied with gas.

DAVID E. DUNN, CPG, who is Acting Chairman of the Department of Geology, University of North Carolina during the fall semester 1967, was elected Vice President of the Carolina Geological Society for 1968 and is scheduled to conduct the annual field trip for the spring meeting of the South-eastern Section of the Geological Society of America.

STEVEN H. HARRIS, CPG, has been named President of the North Dakota Geological Society for the coming year.