ANOTHER CLASS OF MEMBERSHIP

(This statement was prepared by Vice-President Wheeler for the newsletter of the Texas Section. -- Editor)

The question of another class of membership for AIPG is a delicate but serious problem of the Institute and the Section. Most members of the Texas Section were not in favor of creating another class of membership in 1968. We felt that our Junior Membership category was adequate for the young graduate who lacked the experience requirement to become certified as a professional geologist. The plan and program for Junior Membership in the Section were excellent, but were not properly carried out. A maximum of four Junior Members joined the Section. Today there is only one.

Those who attended the Advisory Board meeting and the Annual Business Meeting of AIPG in St. Louis heard the urgent plea and the pro and con discussion on the need for another class of membership. After hearing this discussion, I have changed my opinion on this subject.

We are growing steadily in our membership of CPG's, but in doing so we are leaving tomorrow's leaders in the profession completely out of the picture. We are not giving these young men a future prospective of professionalism which will perpetuate AIPG. In other words, we are, relatively speaking, becoming an "Old Men's Organization."

The young graduates of today feel they are being left out of professional activities. This feeling is a definite deterrent to their developing an interest in AIPG and aspire to become certified. There is a great need to interest these younger geologists in professionalism and AIPG in order that they will help guide the organization through the turmoil of our changing times. By creating another class of membership, these men will be exposed to the aims and purposes of AIPG and be better qualified to become Certified Professional Geologists when they have accumulated their experience.

A resolution was adopted at the Advisory Board meeting, and approved by the Executive Committee, to resubmit this issue as a referendum to the membership in 1970. A suggestion was that the two classes of membership be called Member and Certified Professional Geologist. Upon graduation, a geologist could apply for membership as a "Member" of AIPG. He would not be allowed to use the title of CPG nor could he vote, but he would have all the other privileges of membership. Upon accumulation of the required number of years in experience, he would be eligible for certification.

In view of the possibility that I may be accused of being "brainwashed," I would like to enter the plea that I do, for the reasons mentioned, believe that we need to consider another class of membership. I am proud to be certified by AIPG, but also believe that we should be offering the younger group some encouragement in the field of professionalism.

J. A. Wheeler

NEWS FROM THE SECTIONS

NEW MEXICO

The New Mexico Section met on January 10 in the geology building, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque with President Sherman Wengard presiding. Thirteen members were present. According to the Section's newsletter, topics discussed included increasing the membership, publication schedule of the newsletter, and the present status of requirements for registration of geologists in the state. Vice-president of the Section is W. J. LeMay, secretary is W. W. Baltosser, and treasurer is R. H. Cress. W. A. Mournard edits the newsletter, "The New Mexico Certified Geologist."

ALASKA

The Alaska Section met on January 9 and elected these officers for 1970: president, Keith W. Calderwood, consultant; vice-president, William C. Penttila, with Atlantic Richfield, and Secretary-treasurer, Thomas R. Marshall, Jr., with the state division of oil and gas. All are residents of Anchorage.
Sirs:

The fundamental necessity for continual growth of AIPG has resulted in a general change of opinion by the current membership. We need the young enthusiastic geologist in our great organization, and he certainly needs us. The impasse revolves around how do we get him, and what shall we call him after he joins us?

Rules and regulations of the new young geologist have been well-covered by many letters, but opinions differ concerning what he should be called. Those of us that have joined are called Certified Professional Geologists. Is there any reason why the young member could not simply be called a Professional Geologist? For certainly if he fulfills all the other requirements except experience, he is a professional geologist no matter what field of geology he is employed in. Therefore, I submit for consideration the two groups of members: Certified Professional Geologists and Professional Geologists.

Thank you for The Professional Geologist, for I really look forward to receiving it.  

Wm. G. Park, AIPG  
February 13, 1970  
Dallas

Sirs:

Reference is made to your editorial in the February 1970 issue of TPG. I am pleased and not at all surprised to see the shift in sentiment from one class of membership to two classes, during the past two years.

The selection of names for the two categories of membership is always a problem. However, I do not see anything wrong with the suggestion of the Virginia Section, in proposing Member and CPG for the two classifications. I see nothing wrong with a person who is a member of the AIPG saying "I am a member of AIPG," and I see nothing wrong also with a CPG person saying "I am a member and a Certified Professional Geologist of the AIPG." In fact, it seems to me that this states the distinction nicely; it gets the word certification in there for the certified person, and it retains AIPG, which we all want.

I will be interested in how the comments run from the rest of us AIPG members.  
Allen F. Agnew, AIPG  
February 17, 1970  
Pullman, Washington

Sirs:

Like Frank H. Jacobeen, Jr. (February 1970 TPG), I voted against a second class of AIPG membership and then changed my mind. I don't agree with Mr. Jacobeen's suggestion to apply the name "Member" to the second class of membership, thereby leaving the senior AIPGers with the awkward and ambiguous "CPG" designation. The objection to this idea was given a full airing in the editorial of the same issue, so there is no point in laboring it here. What's wrong with "Associate" member? The AEG uses this to designate those members who do not have all the experience needed for full membership. (AEG also has "Affiliate" members, those deemed not qualified by background or experience for either full or associate membership, but who have an interest in engineering geology and wish to affiliate with AEG. It would seem that AIPG has no place for "affiliates" in this sense.) AIME has had "Junior" members for many years and those are elevated to full membership after they qualify through experience. I do not know anyone who was a Junior member of AIME who found the term "offensive." However, Associate seems preferable to Junior. Whatever we call them, we should admit younger less-experienced geologists to AIPG, and the sooner the better, because we need them and they need AIPG.

Robert B. Hall, AIPG  
February 17, 1970  
Medellin, Colombia S.A.

Sirs:

Regarding the possible classification for younger, or inexperienced, geologists: I agree that we need a program to interest these people in our organization. Most of us have a certain pride in being a Certified Professional Geologist and I believe the key word is "Professional." Any geologist who cannot meet the requirements should not be termed a "Member" since this implies the requirements have been met.

My suggestion for a "Junior" classification is Associate or Affiliate of the Institute. The stipulation should also be made that being an Associate, or Affiliate, would in no way insure full membership at a later date. The rigorous requirements for membership should remain the same for anyone desiring to be a Certified Professional Geologist.

Russell G. Clauwing, AIPG  
February 18, 1970  
Plainfield, Indiana

Sirs:

I think I have a solution to the quandary raised by your editorial. The young fledgling should get the title reflecting his status in the Institute. Any of these would do: 1. Apprentice member; 2. Member, certification pending; 3. Member (as opposed to certified professional member); 4. Candidate or candidate member; 5. Tenderfoot.

(continued on page 4)
THE PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

HERE WE GO AGAIN

It seems that periodically some company or other finds itself in a tight budget position where something must be cut. Unfortunately, all too frequently the function that gets the axe is exploration. This, of course, is very disturbing to our profession. But let's consider for a moment the plight of management. Obviously it is not going to cut down on sales, from which its immediate income is derived. It cannot cut down on manufacturing, because refining capacity is essential to marketing. Production is necessary to feed the refinery, and obviously cannot be reduced. What is left? Nothing but exploration. When exploration is discontinued the cash flow looks better, the balance sheet is improved, and from the standpoint of that year's annual report the stockholders are satisfied.

Few people seem to realize that the ultimate fate of the company has not been altered. Management has merely substituted death by starvation for sudden death by some other means. The result will be just as fatal.

In the AAG Bulletin for October 1969, Kenneth Crandall pointed out in his article, "Putting Exploration Back Into Focus," that one reason behind the decline of exploration and discovery rates from 1957 until 1969 has been the soaring cost of manpower and equipment, whereas crude prices have remained essentially the same. Admittedly the cost of manpower for well drilling and other types of labor has soared, but the cost of geological manpower has not increased with anything like such rapidity. Since the cost of drilling the well has increased so tremendously, corporate expediency would seem to dictate that the maximum geologic effort should be expended on each prospect before a location is made and a well is drilled. Perhaps more money spent on geologic talent and less on just drilling would improve our lagging discovery rate and postpone the inevitable day when we will actually run out of producible oil and gas.

An honest evaluation by management of the relative costs and values of various items in the exploration budget would be a healthy project for any oil company. Compare the salaries of geologists hired with the bid on one offshore parcel. Or compare the cost of the geologist who interprets geophysical information with the cost of obtaining that same information. I seriously doubt that any company would elect to test out a proposal I would like to make, but it is interesting to contemplate the hypothetical case. Suppose company A elected to spend one million dollars on geophysical surveys and nothing on geologic interpretation, and company B elected to spend one million dollars for geologists and zero dollars for geophysical information. I dare say, and I don't think many could contradict me, that the company with one million dollars' worth of information and no one to interpret it would come out second best to the company with one million dollars' worth of geologic thinking time even though the geologists had no geophysical information on which to base their thinking.

It has been said correctly that every oil field that has ever been discovered was first discovered in the mind of a man. As yet no one has invented that ultimate machine which will go out and discover an oil field by itself.

When company management is faced with the absolute necessity of cutting the budget, what else can it do but cut the portion which will have the least immediate effect on the company welfare? There is nothing wrong with cutting the overall exploration budget when faced with such a necessity, but wouldn't it be healthier to make that cut in the size of the next bonus for offshore leases? One percent of the money spent in bonuses in the last four sales, Louisiana, Santa Barbara Channel, Texas, and the North Slope, would be sufficient to pay the salaries of 1300 geologists for one year.

It is easy to blame our troubles on management. We say that management is no longer exploration-oriented. But whose fault is this? Twenty to twenty-five years ago the percentage of exploration people, principally geologists, in top management in the oil industry was much higher than it is today. The favorite excuse that is often heard around geological gatherings is that the present-day corporate management no longer looks to geologists for sources of material for promotion into managerial positions. This is sheer nonsense. I've had considerable experience in management and have never seen an instance when a man's training took precedence over his initiative and drive as a reason for promotion into a managerial position. When top management is looking for a younger man to join its ranks they are more concerned with how he does than with what he does.

Those geologists who have gone on into managerial positions are often heard to lament that they have gotten out of their profession and miss the excitement of exploration. This rarely is true. If they are true geologists, and managers, they take their profession with them, to the ultimate benefit of their company.

Let's do our utmost to advance the profession and make Management exploration-minded by getting more exploration people into management. This will do little for the geologist caught in this year's budget cuts, but it can help in the future.

PROFESSIONAL LIABILITY INSURANCE

The ad-hoc Insurance Committee is in the process of investigating the area of professional liability insurance for the membership. In order to determine the unit cost for this coverage, and the desirability of this protection, we are soliciting your cooperation. If you are interested in this coverage, please complete the enclosed survey form and return it at your earliest convenience. All replies will be confidential.

When the information has been compiled, it will be submitted to the interested insurance carriers. Those of you participating in the survey will be advised of their quotes and offerings. Naturally, the greater the response the lower the rates! Your prompt replies will be appreciated.

Frederick L. Stead, Chairman
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR (continued)

If it is the wish of the group to give him a title with the word member somewhere in it, I think he should receive no certificate at all, and I would favor the designation Candidate Member. This might keep out some of the promoter types, but I think they need us more than we need them. The reputation of the Institute must not be made available to any one that has not earned it.

B. W. Brown, AIPG
Hattiesburg, Mississippi

February 22, 1970

Sir:

I have expressed myself several times on the necessity for attracting young geologists into AIPG if the organization is to thrive, and I will confirm that belief again. On the question of nomenclature, let's not use "Member." In GSA, it doesn't matter what the categories call themselves, because nobody outside GSA cares, but AIPG deals with the public, and to the public "Member" means full member. Personally I see nothing wrong with "Junior Member"; law firms have junior partners and companies advertise for junior geologists, and it could even be argued that "junior" has more positive connotations than "senior" these days.

Anyway, a recruit for AIPG "by any other name would smell as sweet."

Robert Greenwood, AIPG
Camden, New Jersey

February 26, 1970

PROFESSIONAL PARAGRAPHS

FRED L. SMITH, JR., AIPG, has been elected president of the Gulf Coast Section of the SEPM.

PHILIP E. LAMOREAUX, AIPG, has been elected to the AAGP House of Delegates from the Alabama Geological Society for 1970-72.

President of the Albuquerque Geological Society for 1970 is BEN DONEGAN, AIPG.

Bendix Aero Space Systems of Ann Arbor, Mich., and Heinrichs GeoeXploration Co. (W. E. HEINRICH, JR., AIPG) of Tucson, Ariz., are exhibiting the results of an airborne infrared sensing experiment over the Lone Star mining district near Safford, Arizona.

Officers of the GSA for 1970 who are AIPG members include JOHN RODGERS, president, RICHARD H. JAHNS, vice-president, MORGAN J. DAVIS, past-president, and ROBERT E. KING, treasurer. Since the retirement of R. C. Becker on December 1, 1969, EDWIN B. ECKEL, AIPG, has been serving as acting executive secretary.

WILLIAM T. PEACOR, AIPG, director of the U.S. Geological Survey, was named on December 1 as one of the seven winners of the Rockefeller Public Service Awards for 1969. The awards are given annually in recognition of distinguished service to the government of the U.S. and to the American people.

HENRY WALROND, AIPG, manager of exploration for Sunland Refining Corp, for 12 years, has joined the Norris Oil Co., 924 Truxtun Ave., Bakersfield, Calif. 93301.

ROBERT E. VANDERPOOL, AIPG, has joined Pubco Petroleum in Midland, Texas. He was formerly with Skelly Oil Co. at Denver.

THOMAS A. SIMPSON, AIPG, is serving on the AGI's visiting geological scientists lecture program this year. In addition, he has been selected as U.S. representative on the new international commission for the Hydrogeology of Kans.

JOHN H. DOLLOFF, AIPG, is acting manager of Champion Petroleum's southern Rocky Mountain district office in Denver.

JACK KUME, AIPG, is co-author of a report on geology and ground water of Grand Forks County, N.D., published by the state survey.

GEORGE W. SWINDEL, AIPG, is a member of the committee on pollution of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

JACK A. STARKWEATHER, AIPG, formerly with McAlester Fuel, is now a consultant at 1222 North 27th St., Billings, Mont. 59101.