DR. NORMAN TOPPING

Dr. Norman Topping, President
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

Dear Dr. Topping:

The Executive Committee of the American Institute of Professional Geologists at its meeting on October 8, 1969 approved the recommendation of the AIPG Cooperative Evaluation Committee, which visited the University of Southern California on May 26, 1969. This Committee, and its parent Professional and Scientific Standards Committee, reported that the Department of Geological Sciences at the University of Southern California is accomplishing its objectives and presently is qualified to offer programs of education which lead to the following degrees: Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Master of Arts, Master of Science, Doctor of Philosophy.

The cooperation and courtesies extended to the AIPG Cooperative Evaluation Committee by members of the faculty and administration at the University of Southern California are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

R. Dana Russell

November 4, 1969

NEWS FROM THE SECTIONS

Ohio

The Ohio Section held its annual meeting at Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, on October 2. Speaker was Richard J. Anderson, on the subject 'Recent Developments in Oceanography and Their Impact on Geology and Geologists.' New officers were announced, as follows: President, Glenn W. Frank, Kent; Vice-President, Wayne D. Martin, Oxford; Secretary-Treasurer, Ted DeBrosse, Columbus; members of Executive Committee, Richard P. Goldthwait, Columbus, Alfred C. Walker, Westerville, and Roy H. Reinhart, Oxford.

MISSISSIPPI

The annual meeting of the Mississippi Section was held in the Capitol City Petroleum Club, Jackson, on September 10. Nineteen members and nineteen guests were present. Special guest was President R. Dana Russell. News items of the meeting were carried in several papers.

The Third Annual Report of the Mississippi Section is being assembled, under direction of Armando Ricci in Natchez, and Leroy Fulghum, Fred Mellin, and Bill Munroe in Jackson.

LOUISIANA

The fourth annual meeting of the Louisiana Section was held on September 20 at the Holiday Inn, Lafayette. There was a business session in the morning, and a series of four papers in the afternoon. Professional registration was discussed at the afternoon session by the executive secretary of the State Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors. Three papers then followed on various aspects of environmental problems.

NEW YORK

The New York State Section, at its annual dinner meeting held on October 2 at Schrafft's Restaurant in New York City, elected the following officers for the coming year: president, Frank J. Markewicz; vice-president, Hans W. Schreiber; secretary-treasurer, William E. Cutcliffe.

Guest speaker at the meeting was Samuel R. Moses, director of New York State's Bureau of Urban Affairs. He addressed the members and guests as a representative of the American Institute of Planners; Mr. Moses is president of the New York chapter of AIP. In addition to describing the make-up of AIP, he mentioned that many planners are not aware of the significance of geology in planning. He suggested more interplay, beginning with the College curricula for both geologists and planners.
REPORT OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON EVALUATION OF GEOLOGY DEPARTMENTS

In response to a request received last summer from the California Board of Registration for Geologists, the Executive Committee through President R. Dana Russell created an Ad-hoc Committee on Evaluation of Geology Departments. The committee was appointed and given its charge in a memo on July 18, 1969, from the President. Committee members are Samuel P. Ellison, Jr., Konrad B. Krauskopf, Truman H. Kuhn, John C. Maxwell, and Howard J. Pincus, Chairman.

California Assembly Bill #600, 1968, explicitly reserves to the Board of Registration the authority to set its own criteria for educational requirements. However, anticipating a deluge of applications this summer and fall, the Board decided that it urgently needed help in evaluating departments. Thus, although the committee had to act far more rapidly than was desirable, it appeared to be wiser from AIPG's point of view for the committee to do a hurry-up job than to leave this to an overworked Board burdened with evaluating many factors in each applicant's vita.

The committee was instructed to formulate two lists of geology departments that, in the opinion of the committee, have been providing professional-level training in geology, a) from 1960 to 1969 and b) from 1960 to 1969. Note that the period of the first list includes the period of the second.

Instructions on the mechanics of voting and of compilation of the two approved lists were provided by the Executive Committee. Each member of the committee was instructed to cast a vote of "yes," "no," "maybe," or "don't know" for each period for each of the departments in the AGI Directory of Geoscience Departments. Departments receiving five "yes" votes were given automatic listing for that period. Those with at least three "yes" votes and no "no" votes were given approved listing at the discretion of the chairman. Problematical cases are to be reviewed in later rounds of consultation.

In transmitting these lists to the Board on October 17, 1969, it was made clear that the evaluations are the work only of the ad-hoc committee and do not in any sense represent a formal evaluation by the membership of AIPG. Further, the lists are confidential and are the property of the California Board. The Board is free to use the lists in any way it sees fit--including not using them at all.

Each member of the committee voted on over 700 departments listed in the AGI directory. Of these, 200 were put on the approved lists, 143 appearing on the inclusive 1960-1969 list, and 57 on the 1960-1965 list.

It is of interest that the committee members, coming from different areas in the U.S. and with different backgrounds, turned in votes showing a remarkable internal consistency. Over one-quarter of the institutions appear on the 1960-1969 approved list, which could be interpreted to indicate first a substantial increase in professional-level geological training in recent years and second that the members of the committee have been aware of this. There was a remarkable consistency among the votes of individual committee members on departments in small schools that might be expected to be familiar only to the committee members residing nearest them. Voting on well-established departments resulted in no surprises.

This exercise in no sense constitutes accreditation or a substitute for the cooperative evaluation as conducted by the Committee on Professional and Scientific Standards. However, the experience gained could be used, for example, to indicate which institutions and which classes of institutions might be benefited most by the more thorough process of cooperative evaluation.

Howard J. Pincus, Chairman

AGI QUESTIONNAIRE DUE

On February 2, 1970, the AGI, operating under contract with the National Science Foundation, will mail to all geologists, geophysicists, and other earth scientists in the United States the biennial "National Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel." The Register is maintained by the NSF by directive of the Congress, and the AGI is responsible for the Earth Science portion.

Information derived from the Register provides industry, educational institutions, and governmental agencies with a picture of the status of our professional and scientific activities. It is also used to identify individuals with specialized training and ability to serve our country in times of emergencies. manpower studies of the AGI, and resultant reports, are in large measure based on analyses of the statistical data derived from the Register. These analyses provide our profession with information on supply and demand of earth scientists; educational, age, and service characteristics; salary ranges and medians; and mobility of geologists. Reports are regularly published in Geotimes.

You can strike a blow for professionalism by completing and returning your questionnaire promptly!
THE PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

LET'S TALK

In my first column, in the January '69 issue of The Professional Geologist, I pled for monthly State Section or local meetings to discuss controversial issues of professionalism. I plugged the same subject -- the need for free and frank discussion -- in almost every other issue. It was the main theme of my Presidential Address. And here it is again in my swan song. I'm hopped on the subject.

In my last column I promised a list of discussion items -- possible topics for those monthly meetings -- primarily as a means of reviewing the "State of the Institute" and determining its future course. I said "Let's re-examine our mission, our specific objectives, and our methods for achieving them. Let's discuss these problems with each other, and then let our Advisory Board delegates, Headquarters, our Editor, and our President, know our conclusions." O.K., here's an outline for a series of discussions on "The State of the Institute." It doesn't purport to be all-inclusive, but it should stimulate you to think of other questions that need exploring. And a review of past issues of The Professional Geologist will suggest several more.

1. What are our objectives in AIPG?
   a. With respect to membership:
      1) Do we really expect to represent (i.e., to speak for) all professional geologists?
      2) If so, what percentage of the eligible geologists do we need to enroll, to claim to speak for the profession?
      3) What percentage can we realistically expect to enroll? 5%? 10%? 25%? 50%?
      4) How do we go about reaching that goal?
   b. In what ways do we expect to represent the profession; i.e., are some of our current activities really professional? Are we overlapping too much on other organizations? Or are there things we should be doing that we're not?
   c. Should more of our effort go into political activity? Should we set up a drive for universal chartering or registration? (And if registration became general, would there be any need for AIPG?)

2. Having decided on objectives, how do we reach them?
   a. Can we set priorities on our objectives, so we don't waste effort by spreading ourselves too thin?
   b. Is our current organization, depending heavily on State Section initiative, the best one for our purposes?
   c. If so, how do we get the State Sections to assume and carry out their responsibilities more effectively? Suggestions received include:
      1) Organize local "chapters" in those states with larger memberships.
      2) Provide section and chapter officers with monthly discussion items (here are some!).

3) Stimulate local groups to take an active part in local politics.
4) Have more visits from national officers and from the Executive Director.
5) Improve information exchange on controversial issues by opening the pages of The Professional Geologist to all communications from the State Sections.

There are several ways to organize these discussions; one of the best is debate style, with an eloquent proponent speaking for each point of view, followed by questions and comments from the floor. When the argument gets too warm, try the old Quaker trick of "silent meditation" -- call a holt to all discussion for five or ten minutes while each person thinks about what the others have said, instead of thinking up new arguments for his own point of view. You might also try the trick recommended by the communication specialists -- before stating the next point in your own argument, you must re-state your opponent's point in different words than he used, but preserving his meaning -- and he is the judge of whether you've succeeded. This type of luncheon meeting can be fun, as well as instructive and enlightening.

So - o - o -, may you have good talk. And may I see the results of it at our Advisory Board meetings next year, where, as you know, I'll be acting as chairman.

I can't end this last column without a farewell word on how gratified and complimented I feel at having been chosen your president for this year. You have given me much pleasure and taught me a lot; I hope that I have helped the Institute some in return. And I want to assure the incoming officers and Advisory Board representatives that I'll do all that I can to make their takeover on January 1 as easy as possible. They won't need much help because you have chosen very well.

Au Revoir, and thanks,
R. Dana Russell

CONSULTANTS: REGISTER!

In response to an announcement in the July-August issue, followed by a circular sent out with the September list of applicants, 140 consulting geologists have indicated that they will support a consultants' register. Although this is short of the 250 minimum desired, Clark Millison has been authorized by the Executive Committee to proceed with the register, incorporating some of the suggestions received on the returned forms.

To make the register a self-supporting reality, 110 more consultants are needed. To get in and be listed, send your name and a statement of interest to A.F. Brunton at the headquarters office. Do it right away!
Thank you, Lloyd, for inviting me to this meeting; I am pleased to be here and to be able to bring all of you greetings from your fellow organization of AIPG -- the American Institute of Professional Geologists. We had our annual meeting two weeks ago in St. Louis, attended by both your current president, Lloyd Cluff, and your incoming president, Dick Lemke. At that meeting, Dick pointed out that the word "professional" in our name creates considerable misunderstanding among members of other geological organizations -- a common reaction is "What's with those guys, do they think they're the only professionals?" Of course we don't, but we do find the many connotations of the term "professional" confusing, and wish, with Dick, that we could find a suitable substitute. Unfortunately, there just aren't any good synonyms. Yet understanding of what we are trying to do, for all geologists, is so important that I hope you'll bear with me for a few minutes while I try to explain what we mean by "professional," and why we complement AEG, AAPG, GSA, SEG, and the many other geological organizations, rather than compete with them.

Not everyone considers the term "professional" one of approbation. Many of our academic colleagues consider it one of opprobrium, believing that it connotes commercialism. Certainly that's one of the recognized meanings of the term, the one specifically applied to the oldest profession -- to quote Webster: "participating for gain or a livelihood in an activity often engaged in by amateurs," and the amateurs have pretty well taken over the oldest profession. But Webster also defines profession as "A calling requiring specialized knowledge and often long and intensive academic preparation, used by way either of instructing, guiding, or advising others, or of serving them in some branch of learning or science." This is the meaning we profess, and I think that all of us are professional in the sense of this definition -- our academic colleagues, government employees, company employees, and consultants -- we all either instruct, guide, advise, or serve others, using our knowledge of the "learned profession" of geology. How, then, does AIPG differ from AEG and other geological organizations? It differs in its orientation and functions; AIPG is exclusively concerned with those aspects of the geological profession that are largely ignored by most other groups.

The most obvious characteristic of a learned profession is its body of scientific theory and knowledge. Geology is one of the oldest of the physical sciences, going back to Greek and Roman times, so by now we have a very large body of organized geological knowledge that has been increasing exponentially in recent years. Essentially all of our geological societies are concerned with maintaining and expanding, and most of them with applying, one or more scientific or technical aspects of this body of knowledge -- AEG, for example, is concerned with the development and application of geological knowledge as applied to engineering problems; AAPG with its development and application as applied to petroleum exploration and production, etc. AIPG, on the other hand, is not responsible for any of these scientific or technical aspects of geology; our responsibility is solely for those matters that concern geology as a profession. We are dedicated to the professional advancement of all geologists, regardless of specialty or occupation, and we wish to work with all the other geological groups in achieving this end. We have, as you know, been designated by the American Geological Institute as the member organization to which all matters of professionalism shall be referred.

What do we mean by "professionalism" and "professional matters"?

1. We mean establishing and maintaining high professional standards. This, in turn, means evaluation of the education and other training, the professional competence and practice, and the professional ethics, of every applicant for certification as a professional geologist.

2. We mean protecting the public from charlatans and other nonprofessionals.

3. We mean establishing the legal status of professional geologists and protecting them from repressive legislation.

4. We mean educating the public and governmental bodies on the contributions geology can make in all fields of application, and especially these days in the use, enjoyment, and control of our physical environment.

5. And finally, we mean providing a single, strong organization that is willing to stand up in public and speak, firmly and objectively, on public matters where geologists can make special contributions; that can speak for all branches and all specialties of geology, and do this even if it means becoming involved in political activities.

You, of course, as AEG members, are also concerned with these problems, as are members of other geological groups, but you are primarily concerned as individual members of the geologic profession. AEG, as an organization, is only incidentally concerned with these professional matters -- if it became too concerned, its tax-exempt status as a scientific and educational organization would be jeopardized. Besides, it represents only one segment of the profession. AIPG is exclusively concerned with these matters, and for the entire profession. And these professional problems are tough ones; there's plenty here to keep us busy without competing with other geological organizations on technical problems.

Finally, you may ask how much progress we've made in our nearly six years of history. We've increased in size from a handful of founders to about 2000 active members in 27 State Sections and 23 foreign countries. We have a headquarters staff of one Executive Director and one secretary; these two are the only people in AIPG receiving either salary or expense funds. Essentially all our work is done by volunteers, yet in five short years these dedicated professional geologists have accomplished
a great deal for all of geology and all geologists. A sampling is listed on the sheet entitled "A Few Salient Accomplishments of AIPG" — if you're interested, copies are available on the table by the door. If you are eligible for membership and are not now a member, we welcome your application — come join us in helping to raise the professional standing of all geologists.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SCREENING REVIEW

It is not an overstatement to say that the Screening Boards of the several Sections of AIPG have as much responsibility for the future welfare and effectiveness of the Institute as do the members of the Advisory Board and the Executive Committee, for in the long run the welfare of the Institute will depend on the character and quality of its membership.

The following review of the role and function of the Screening Boards has been prepared by the Ad Hoc Committee on Screening Review, most of the members of which have served on screening boards and/or the Executive Committee of the Institute, and is intended to serve as a "Handbook" for screening boards. In preparing it, the committee has reviewed the Bylaws of the Institute, the practices and precedents established by Executive Committees and Screening Boards through the first five years of the Institute's existence, and the opinions of many members active on both the local and national level, as well as the opinions of the committee members themselves. There can be no substitute for the diligence and sincerity of purpose which has become traditional among the Screening Boards of the Institute; it is hoped that these guidelines will make their duties and decisions less arduous and promote a greater uniformity of understanding and performance.

I. AUTHORITY OF THE SCREENING BOARD. The final authority for the acceptance or rejection of any applicant lies with the Executive Committee of the Institute. To assist them in their decisions the Executive Committee delegates the responsibility for investigation and recommendation to Screening Boards elected by the several Sections. While presumed to be representative of the viewpoint of the Section, the Screening Board reports solely to the Executive Committee and is responsible to the Institute as a whole, not to the local Section.

(Note. Since, upon election, the Screening Board passes from control of the Section to control of the Executive Committee, its performance must be supervised by the latter body. The local Section will normally have little knowledge of the activities of the Screening Board, its diligence, or its decisions, and has no means of control. An inefficient Screening Board may even be re-elected unless the Executive Committee makes dissatisfaction known to the local Section. This Committee had earlier submitted the recommendation that the Bylaws be changed to provide that the Sections shall nominate members to be appointed to the Screening Boards by the Executive Committee rather than elect the Boards directly. This recommendation, which was not accepted at the time of original submission, would serve two functions. (1) The Screening Boards would be more directly under the control of the Executive Committee, which could, in the case of severe deficiency, make new appointments as needed without depending on new Section elections; and (2) the role of the Screening Board as subordinate to and supportive of the Executive Committee would be emphasized. The recommendation is re-submitted at this time.)

While the vote of the Screening Board, required by the Bylaws, is heavily relied upon by the Executive Committee, the "voting" function of the Screening Board is secondary to its "investigating" function. Not only is investigation necessary if the vote of the Screening Board is to be useful, but the Screening Board should submit a detailed report of its investigation, or be prepared to submit such a report upon request, whenever it returns an application to the Executive Committee. (Note. This Committee finds no obstacle in the Bylaws or Constitution to a requirement that a detailed report of investigations accompany any returned application. In our opinion, this could be implemented by a directive of the Executive Committee.) Except when new questions arise following circulation of the applicant's name to the members of the Institute, it should be unnecessary for the Executive Committee to refer an application back to the Screening Board for further investigation.

II. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SCREENING BOARD. In addition to its responsibility to the Institute, the Screening Board also undertakes a heavy obligation to the public. The recommendation that an applicant be granted recognition as a Certified Professional Geologist in effect constitutes a recommendation of the applicant as one who is fully competent and trustworthy in the practice of geology. Our ability to serve the public and our acceptance by the public is in large part dependent upon the maintenance of the reputation of the CPG.

Finally, but no less important, the Screening Board bears responsibility to the applicant himself. If the Institute continues its growth and influence in the geologic profession, and if CPG status continues to gain acceptance as evidence of a level of professional competence, then membership in the Institute will be an important professional credential with significant economic and social consequences. To erroneously deny admission to the Institute is most unfair to the applicant. On the other hand, an overly generous attitude towards screening works an inequity on the present members of the Institute and on qualified applicants by diluting the value of their membership.

It is the responsibility of the Screening Board to make a thorough investigation of each application referred for its consideration, to conscientiously and objectively review the application and the results of the investigation, and to recommend acceptance or rejection considering the best interests of the Institute, and public, and the applicant himself.

III. PROCEDURES. The Screening Boards of the several Sections have the responsibility of organizing themselves in such a way as to perform their functions efficiently. Because of differences in size of geologic population, geographical distribution,
and types of geologic endeavor, the specific procedural details of the various Sections may not be uniform. However, definite procedures should be established and should include the following points.

A. Communication. A single member of the Screening Board, usually its secretary or chairman, should receive all applications from headquarters and should provide for their prompt circulation among other members of the Board. This should be followed up to insure that the application receives prompt attention and full investigation, and that the application, recommendation, and report of investigation are returned to headquarters as promptly as is commensurate with thorough handling.

B. Investigators. Investigation of the applicant should be carried out by members, preferably two or more, who have the best opportunity to know both the applicant and his professional and personal contacts but who are not so close to him in personal friendship or business contact as to make objectivity difficult.

C. Review of the Application. Although each application will have been reviewed by the headquarters staff to assure that the nominal requirements are met, each application should be reviewed including the following questions. (1) Are there any deficiencies in the formal training of the applicant which may not have been evident to the headquarters staff? (2) Is all the experience indicated fully professional in character? (See below.) (3) Are the Sponsors individuals who have had an adequate opportunity to evaluate the competency and conduct of the applicant? (4) Is there any question of the objectivity of the Sponsors due to personal friendship or business contact? (The fact that a sponsor is personally close to the applicant is by no means derogatory in itself; however, a notation that this is the case may be most useful in the event the applicant’s candidacy is contested.)

D. Confirmation of Experience and Performance. Screening Board members should recognize that the applicant will invariably select as Sponsors those individuals from whom he is most certain of getting a good recommendation. They may not always be those who have had the best opportunity to evaluate the candidate’s suitability nor should the “eminence” of a Sponsor preclude further investigation. Supplementary inquiries should always be made, preferably by personal or telephone interview, with colleagues and employers.

E. Investigation of Applicant’s Character. Very often an applicant will be known to members of the Screening Board only in a professional sense. Further inquiry into the applicant’s personal conduct may often be justified, but must be handled with much tact and without placing too much reliance on the opinion of any one individual.

F. Review of Investigation. Provision should be made for the Screening Board as a whole to review the results of the investigation of each applicant. If any deficiency or undesirable aspect has been noted, further investigation should be made to the fullest extent possible, even if complete resolution of the issue is not forthcoming. (The Screening Board should recognize that referrals back to the Board for further investigation are burdensome to the Executive Committee and a hardship on both the Institute and the applicant. Insofar as possible, the investigation and report of the Screening Board should be sufficiently complete to form a basis for further decision even if subsequent objections arise.)

G. Recommendation to Accept or Reject. Except where impossible due to prolonged absence or illness, the whole Screening Board should be balloted on the question of acceptance or rejection. Board members who may have served as Sponsors or be otherwise committed to the applicant should abstain.

H. Return of Application to Executive Committee. As soon as the investigation and recommendation are complete, the files should be returned to the Executive Committee. If there is a lack of unanimity among the members of the Screening Board regarding the acceptance of the applicant, or if there is any other reason to anticipate that the application will require extensive consideration by the Executive Committee, it is particularly useful to include a full report of the investigation and deliberations of the Screening Board. There is no need to make the Executive Committee ask for information which it will obviously require to make an informed decision.

IV. SPECIAL DIFFICULTIES IN EVALUATION. A study of the screening procedures of the Institute has indicated that most of the difficulties occur in the evaluation of experience and character requirements and in the handling of objections or derogatory comments regarding applicants.

A. Quality of Experience. A wide diversity of opinion is apparent with regard to the quality of experience required by our Bylaws. Is the computer on a seismic crew practicing geology within the intent of our Bylaws? Is supervision of a soils-boring rig the practice of geology? Is experience restricted wholly to well-sitting a fully professional practice? Is a geologist engaged primarily in sales of geologic equipment truly practicing as a geologist? Does an individual cease his "geological" experience when he is promoted to an executive position, or when he is promoted laterally or diagonally to another department?

The number and variety of such problems is so great as to defy individual answers for each question. Rather, the experience of the applicant should be evaluated against the following criteria.

1. Does the employment claimed by the applicant require a substantial amount of geologic knowledge? - Many soils-boring personnel and engineering technicians learn enough "geology" within a few weeks to perform the duties of "geologists" employed by some firms and agencies. The same is true of "well watching" in the petroleum industry. While such employment may contribute to the early stages of the development and experience of a geologist, they cannot be considered to represent full professional practice if they represent the sole geologic aspect of a position over a prolonged period of time.

2. Does the experience indicated require scientific judgment based on geologic principles? - A salesman for geologic instruments may use a great deal of geological knowledge in his contacts with potential customers. If he serves as a consultant or advisor in designing or recommending specific instru-
mentation systems, he may, in fact, be exercising geologic judgment; however, if his use and knowledge of geology is wholly to facilitate communication with his customers, the quality of his experience is suspect.

3. Does the applicant's experience show appropriate professional development with expanding responsibility? - Perhaps more than any other test, this is indicative of the applicant's true professional caliber. Particularly in the early years of geological employment, the absence of increasing professional responsibility constitutes grounds for questioning of competence and proficiency.

4. If the applicant is not currently engaged directly in geology, is his present position attributable to an earlier successful practice? - In many areas of endeavor, successful application of geology will result in promotion to positions which are not directly geologically related. Often these jobs involve at least indirect supervision of geologic activities. On the other hand, employer's requirements, personal preference, or professional inability may result in lateral transfers to positions whose geologic involvement is only incidental (as for example, into the land department of a petroleum company). While evaluation of such changes will always be difficult, a useful test is the "upward and onward / sideways and out" rule. If an applicant has been promoted above direct geologic involvement as a result of his successful function as a geologist, subsequent experience should be acceptable. If, on the other hand, the change in position is not traceable to geological performance, subsequent experience may not be credited.

5. Is the applicant's experience overspecialized? - An applicant may have developed a very high level of professional proficiency within an area of study so narrow as to exclude the field of geology as a whole. While such instances are rare, they have occurred, usually in connection with an applicant with a bare minimum of experience, most of which has been gained in graduate and post-doctoral studies. If subsequent investigation should show that the applicant has in fact spent his whole professional career in "laboratory investigations of conodonts" or the "mathematical synthesis of Love waves" without concern for their geologic significance and contact with other aspects of geology, then there is legitimate question as to whether the geologic experience meets the intent of our Bylaws.

6. Is the applicant's occupation truly geology? - This question often arises with scientists whose early training was not exclusively geological and whose initial experience was outside the geological field but whose investigations in the fields of chemistry, physics, biology, etc., have led them into a real and lasting involvement in geology. Where there is evidence that such applicant's interest and involvement in geology is more than a tangential result of some other field of study, it seems an unrealistic and unnecessarily narrow outlook to rule that his experience is not geological solely because he did not earlier call himself a geologist.

It seems clear to us that the purpose of the experience requirements in the Bylaws is twofold: first, it is an extension of the training requirement, providing a period during which the future applicant acquires greater breadth and depth of geologic knowledge; second, it provides a period of "testing through practice" upon which the applicant's competence and proficiency can be judged. Therefore, experience which does not indicate enrichment of the applicant's geologic knowledge or demonstrate an increasing level of competency and proficiency should not be credited towards meeting the experience requirement.

B. Personal Integrity. The evaluation of personal integrity presents the Screening Board with perhaps its most difficult problem. It is particularly important here that the Board recall its threefold obligation, to the Institute, the public, and the applicant. The Bylaws give great latitude to the Screening Boards in assessing personal integrity, and thereby impose the responsibility for careful and sincere judgment. The Bylaws do require a sustained record of adherence to the highest professional and ethical standards. The clear implication is that, in this case at least, any reasonable doubt shall accrue to the benefit of the Institute and the public, and that evidence of questionable business or ethical conduct shall be disqualifying. The Screening Board should further note that the requirement for a "sustained" record leaves little room for the consideration of mitigating circumstances or evidence of recent reform. In short, the Bylaws demand that the applicant be a person of unquestioned integrity in his community and his profession.

But what is "good business practice"? Standards are so variable from industry to industry and throughout the country that a good business man in one area may be considered a "sucker" in another and a "sharpie" in a third. In many professions, and in some aspects of our own, it is considered unforivable to have a beneficial interest in a business or property upon which one is writing a public report. While it may be unwise to cloud the objectivity and independence of a professional engagement by personal involvement in the enterprise itself, is such a disengagement required by the Injunction of our Bylaws to require the "highest" level of business practice? To do so would be to automatically reject a large portion of the geologic profession.

In addition to inquirying our own Code of Ethics, Screening Boards must evaluate how well the applicant adheres to the "codes of ethics" of his particular locality and area of business interest. This is not to say that Screening Boards must accept a "thief honored by thieves," but rather that they should give some consideration to varying standards in some aspects of business practice. It is not inconsistent for a petroleum geologist who commonly accepts overrides to vote for the rejection of a mining geologist who does the same thing, if it is clear that such practices are not acceptable in the area in which the applicant works.

Perhaps at some future date the Institute will formulate a comprehensive "Canon of Ethics." In the meantime, "highest" professional and ethical standards should be construed to require absolute honesty and integrity, the subjugation of salesmanship to objectivity, adherence to the spirit as well as the letter of our Code of Ethics and of every obligation.

Because of the great difficulty in establishing "rights and wrongs," the Screening Board is called upon to make conscien-
tilous use of the authority and latitude granted them by the Bylaws in considering and making recommendations based on business practices. They may, and should, recommend a rejection of applicants who have a general reputation of "sharp" or undependable business practices, even though there is no firm supporting evidence. To admit an applicant who has an unfavorable reputation is to stain the Institute, its present members, and other applicants with the same doubts and criticisms borne by the applicant under consideration.

C. Personal Ethical Standards. How broadly should a Screening Board evaluate the ethics of the individual? Should it extend its investigation to the applicant's personal life? Should it accept or reject an applicant on the basis of chronic drunkenness or a history of unpleasant marital notoriety? Once again, the Screening Board must rely on its own judgment and use the latitude and authority granted it by the Bylaws.

It is possible that defects of personality are so severe as to render an applicant unfit for membership in the Institute. The Screening Board is not qualified to judge the applicant's morality in nonprofessional affairs; however, they may validly consider whether or not the applicant's defects of personality or morality are so severe as to reflect unfavorably upon the profession, the Institute, and its members, if he is admitted. Such defects must be both grave and notorious to serve as the sole basis for rejection of an applicant; however, the Screening Board should recognize its responsibility and authority in such questions and must not yield to the temptation to ignore or evade its responsibilities.

D. Objections and Derogatory Comments. Either during an investigation or following circulation of an applicant's name, the Screening Board may be confronted with objections to the applicant and derogatory comments regarding his qualifications. While instances of spiteful and willful misrepresentation have occurred and will undoubtedly occur again, they are exceedingly rare. Occasionally, an objection arises from a misunderstanding. On the other hand, Screening Boards should recognize that most people find it distasteful to make critical remarks about other individuals, particularly when such remarks may disqualify them from such organizations as AIPG. Experience has shown that the great majority of objectors, whether their objections prove to be valid or not, are acting in good faith and with more than average sincerity. Every objection or critical comment is worthy of careful evaluation. The fact that the objection comes only from one person among many interviewed does not diminish the need for investigation, for it may be that such individual is the only one with the courage and candor to say what others know or suspect, or perhaps the objector has had an unusual opportunity to observe some weakness or deficiency on the part of the applicant.

The Screening Board must discriminate between questions of professional competency and personal integrity. One substantiated instance of dishonesty should be disqualifying. On the other hand, it takes more than one mistake, or seeming mistake, to support professional incompetency. In the first case, further investigation will normally be concentrated on determining the validity of the specific charge of dishonesty; in the latter case, investigation will necessarily require a broader inquiry to determine whether there is sufficient evidence of professional shortcomings to support a charge of incompetence.

The Screening Board does not have "grand jury" powers. It is unlikely that it will be able to develop incontrovertible evidence supporting or denying any objection made regarding an applicant. It must investigate to the fullest extent possible and accept the responsibility for making a judgment on the information available. While it must be fair to the applicant and endeavor to protect him from damage by spiteful, ill-informed, or otherwise invalid objections, it must also be fair to the profession, the public, and the Institute and its members.

E. Some Common Screening-Board Mistakes:

1. Lack of Thoroughness. - The failure of a Screening Board to make a thorough investigation is simply passing the buck. At best the Board will have to contend with the application a second time when it is referred back for further investigation. At worst, it is setting the scene for the time-consuming, difficult, and distasteful procedure of disciplinary hearings and action if an undesirable applicant attains membership; and, in the meantime, is responsible for the damage to the reputation of the Institute and its members resulting from the identification of such an applicant with the Institute.

2. "Sectionalism." - Members of the Screening Board are not Section officers but rather are representatives of the Institute on a national level. They should not be guided by the desire of a Section to increase or restrict its membership. To directly or indirectly establish higher or lower standards for membership qualification is to usurp the power of the Advisory Board, the Executive Committee, or the membership as a whole. To be unusually restrictive is to weaken both the financial support and the influence of the Institute. To be exceptionally liberal is to dilute the meaning of membership.

3. Lack of Objectivity. - Individual members, or the Screening Board as a whole, may, on occasion, be subject to personal and business pressures for the admission or rejection of an applicant. While they are elected in part because they are representative of the Section and are properly responsive in some degree to the legitimate will of the Section's members, they must maintain their objectivity and represent the majority, not a vocal minority. Screening Board members who feel their connection with an applicant is so close as to prohibit full objectivity should abstain without apology.

4. Self-Sufficiency. - Screening Boards may be tempted to make up their minds about an applicant on the basis of their own observations and opinions, without investigation or consultation, and/or may fail to recognize their subordinate and supportive role, failing to communicate and cooperate with the Executive Committee on disputed applications.

5. Over-Zealousness. - Excessively thorough investigation may be tantamount to general publication of an applicant's status, and may, if the applicant is later rejected, result in unnecessary embarrassment to both him and the Institute.

6. Procrastination. - Both the applicant and the Institute are entitled to prompt consideration of any application. It is insulting to the applicant to allow his application to gather dust.
for a period of months. Two or three weeks should be sufficient for the screening procedure unless extensive investigation turns out to be necessary.

In view of the many pitfalls into which a Screening Board may fall it is a tribute to the Institute, its members, and those who have served and now serve on Screening Boards that our screening process works so well. Failures of Screening Boards have been very rare and usually slight in degree.

V. SOME GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS. Many Screening Board members are concerned with their legal as well as their moral responsibility to applicants. This question has been investigated several times by the Institute, at the national, state, and local levels. As long as the Screening Board does not act capriciously or maliciously, or discriminate against an applicant on grounds other than those described in the Bylaws, it is the unanimous opinion of all attorneys consulted that the individual Screening Board member incurs no personal liability. Conceivably, a suit could be brought against the Institute of which the Screening Board is an agent, but such a suit is given little chance of success.

What the Screening Board member must have is a thorough understanding of the membership requirements and policies of the Institute and a willingness to investigate each applicant thoroughly and then to weigh the interests of the profession, the public, and the applicant in arriving at a recommendation.

The Screening Board member must take his role seriously and should not accept it unless he is prepared to devote a substantial amount of time and worry to the job. He will probably receive more brickbats than flowers.

September 29, 1969 Neilson Rudd, Chairman

AIPG AFFILIATED WITH NRC

On October 8, President Russell was informed by Gordon J. F. MacDonald that the request of AIPG for affiliation with the Division of Earth Sciences of the National Research Council had been approved. Richard M. Foote has been appointed AIPG representative for the period ending June 30, 1972.

CALENDAR OF MEETINGS

The next annual meeting of AIPG will be held on October 14-17, 1970, at Oklahoma City. Headquarters will be the Skirvin Hotels. Jerry B. Newby is general chairman.


ORRI BOOKLET AVAILABLE

"The Rights of the Overriding Royalty Owner" is the title of a 10-page booklet issued as Bulletin 8 of the Society of Independent Professional Earth Scientists. Author is George B. Collins. Copies may be obtained by writing to SIPES, P.O. Box 61134, Houston, Texas 77061.

PROFESSIONAL PARAGRAPHS

SHERMAN A. WENGIERD, AIPG, has been elected a director of Thompson International Corp. of Phoenix, Arizona. The corporation is exploring for oil in Utah and other western states.

ROBERT E. HERSHEY, AIPG, became state geologist of Tennessee on July 1, with headquarters at Nashville. He succeeds WILLIAM D. HANDFORD, AIPG, who is now chief geologist with the Tennessee Valley Authority, replacing BERLEN C. MONEYMAKER, AIPG, who is retiring.

GLENN W. FRANK, AIPG, was one of three faculty members at Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, to receive the 1969-70 alumni award for distinguished teaching. He is the seventh to be so recognized in a faculty of 750. The award includes a certificate and a check for $1,000.

DEAN R. FELLOWS, AIPG, formerly senior geologist with H. J. Gruy and Associates, Dallas, has joined Eugene E. Nearburg, Dallas independent oil operator.

RICHARD W. LEMKE, AIPG, Denver, is president-elect of the Association of Engineering Geologists.

ROBERT G. STANSFIELD, AIPG, with the Corps of Engineers at Mission, Kansas, has recently returned from Panama where he was working on canal-route studies.

LAURENCE BRUNDALL, AIPG, was recently appointed to the Environmental Quality Advisory Board of the City of Santa Barbara, California.

JOSEPH H. SAWYER, AIPG, petroleum consultant of Los Altos, Calif., recently returned home after completing a six-month assignment for the Ministry of Petroleum Affairs, Kingdom of Libya. The visit was arranged through International Executive Service Corps.

The geologic map of Wyoming is currently being revised. Anyone having surface mapping data compiled since 1955 should get in touch with DANIEL N. MILLER, JR., AIPG, state geologist, Box 3008 University Station, Laramie 82070.

ROBERT F. HERRON, AIPG, has been named assistant vice-president of Marine Resource Consultants, Inc., Santa Monica, Calif. To take his place as chief marine geologist, the firm has employed RICHARD L. HESTER, AIPG, until recently chief geologist with Pauley Petroleum.

J. W. (JAY) SKRABANEK, AIPG, is now employed as a geologist for UOP - Johnson Division, located at 1560 Longmeadow St., Longmeadow, Mass. 01106.

J. W. LUCKETT, JR., AIPG, has been elected a vice-president of the Rocky Mountain Oil and Gas Association.
PROFESSIONAL PARAGRAPHS

C. M. MALLETTE, AIPG, has been appointed chief geologist for the western United States of the Minerals, Pigments and Metals Division of Chas. Pfizer & Co. He will direct acquisition and utilization of raw materials, with headquarters at Victorville, Calif.

NORMAN K. (OLE) OLSON, AIPG, has been named state geologist of South Carolina. His address is Box 927, Columbia, S.C. 29202. He was formerly with the Southern Railway System.

WILSON M. LAIRD, AIPG, director of the Oil and Gas Division, Department of the Interior, addressed the annual meeting of the Gulf Coast Association of Geological Societies on October 30.

ROBERT C. LANG, AIPG, chairman of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board, headed a conference on the underground disposal of salt water, held November 7 at Oklahoma Panhandle State College, Goodwell.

RUDOLPH K. HOGBERG, AIPG, formerly with the Minnesota Geological Survey, heads the newly formed Industrial Minerals and Environmental Geology Division of the Lindgren Exploration Company.

IAN CAMPBELL, AIPG, state geologist and director of the California Division of Mines and Geology since 1959, retired on October 30.

CAREY CRONEIS, AIPG, chancellor of Rice University, received the Kemp Medal of Columbia University on November 7. The medal is awarded "for distinguished public service by a geologist."

RONALD G. MERCER, AIPG, of the Ferguson Oil Co., was elected president of the Mid-Continent Section of AAPG at the biennial meeting of the Section, Amarillo, Texas, on October 1.

EDWARD R. KELLER, AIPG, is the newly elected first vice-president of the Intermountain Association of Geologists, and HOWARD F. ALBEE, AIPG, is second vice-president. JOHN M. HUMMEL, AIPG, has been elected representative to the AAPG house of delegates.

Election of WILLIAM C. HAYES, AIPG, as president of the Association of American State Geologists, previously announced here, becomes effective at the close of the next annual meeting, April 27-30. PETER T. FLAWN, AIPG, is currently president of the Association.