MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
October 14, 1970

The fourth and final meeting of the 1970 Executive Committee was held at the Skirvin Hotel, Oklahoma City, on October 14, 1970. A quorum was present and the meeting opened with a discussion of the finances of the Institute. A third-quarter budget comparison indicated that income for 1970 is about $200.00 over anticipated, and expenditures about $500.00 under anticipated. There is every indication that the Institute will end 1970 with a balanced budget.

The matter of designation of specialties in the 1971 Membership Directory was again discussed. The Executive Committee had approved the addition of such designations at the July meeting, to be limited to one line of 30 characters, with a charge of $5.00 for an additional line if desired. Such designations are now considered to be important enough that the Executive Committee approved a change to three lines of 30 characters each at no charge.

The ad-hoc Committee on Professional Liability Insurance submitted a report, which stated that no insurance company willing to underwrite a group policy for geologists can be found. Policies may be obtained on an individual basis from some companies, but too much of the publicity on geology, particularly engineering geology, has been adverse. The ad-hoc committee has been charged with continuing research on this matter.

A report received from the Professional and Scientific Standards Committee states that the committee recommends the term "Affiliate" for the additional class of membership being considered, the educational requirements for the "Affiliate" to be the same as for Members as stated in the Bylaws, and the experience requirements to be two years after the baccalaureate degree and one year after the Master's degree. It was decided that the 1971 Executive Committee should determine when the question of the additional class of membership should be presented for a vote of the Members of the Institute.

It was reported that the Professional Employment Standards Committee has prepared a questionnaire for State Highway Departments regarding employment of geologists. The Executive Committee approved the mailing of the questionnaire.

The Advisory Board had recommended by a vote of 16 to 15 that the experience requirements for membership be reduced to five years of paid professional experience. In view of the close vote in the Advisory Board, the Executive Committee tabled the matter.

The Executive Committee approved the appointment of an ad-hoc committee to establish liaison with employers, for the purpose of discussing detrimental employment practices and what is reported to be a growing trend toward unionization.

The Advisory Board has recommended a change in the Bylaws to allow for more flexibility in the number of candidates required for each Institute office. This matter was referred to the 1971 Executive Committee with a recommendation that an appropriate Bylaw amendment be submitted to the membership.

The Advisory Board had recommended by a vote of 28 to 2 that the annual dues of the Institute be raised to $25.00. It was the decision of the Executive Committee that present conditions within the profession make this an inappropriate time for an increase in dues. The matter has been referred to the 1971 Executive Committee for consideration.

In response to a recommendation that The Professional Geologist be given wider distribution through State Sections, the Executive Committee voted to allow copies to be mailed to nonmembers named by the Sections at a subscription rate of $1.00 per year.

OHIO SECTION

The Ohio Section met on September 30 at Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus. Fifteen members were present. President Glenn Frank spoke on "Professionalism: Who Needs It?" Extended discussion followed the talk.

Newly elected officers are Ted DeBrosse, president; Bob Alexander, vice-president, and Bill Shafer, secretary-treasurer. Members of the executive committee are Russ Brant, Fred Knight, and Stanley Norris.
major oil companies, nine mining companies, four state organizations (three in California plus the Wisconsin Geological Survey), and four federal organizations. He has also taught in four universities.

Here is a thumbnail sketch of Ian’s career. He is not a “western Oregonian by birth, as many people assume, but was born in Bismarck, North Dakota. However, he moved to Eugene, Oregon, at an early age and finished grade and high school there. After one year at the University of Oregon, he enlisted in the army in World War I at the age of 17, serving as wagoneer in the 51st Ambulance Company in France, where he was involved in several engagements. During this phase of his career the only award he received, so far as I have been able to discover, was that of racehorse rummy champion of his company. At the end of the war, he re-entered the University of Oregon and graduated in 1922 with a bachelor’s degree in geology. In 1923, he drove a motorcycle from Portland, Oregon to Portland, Maine, and was awarded the Harley-Davidson Bronze Medal for this feat. He was also awarded a teaching fellowship at Northwestern University. After a year there, he went to Harvard for a year, and then to Louisiana State University, where he taught mineralogy, petrology, economic geology, and sedimentology for three years before returning to Harvard, where he received his doctorate in 1931. He was my predecessor at Louisiana State in these fields, and when I got to LSU I was subjected to frequent invidious comments about how much better Ian had done the job than I was doing. From 1931 to 1939, Ian was at Caltech, except for a brief period during World War II when we were associated at the University of California Division of War Research in San Diego. Since 1939, he has been with the California Division of Mines and Geology as State Geologist, retiring last October. Ian has received many other awards besides the ones mentioned: in 1962, the Hardinge Award of the AIME, and in 1969, the Scholarship Award of the American Federation of Mineral Societies and an Honorary Life Membership in the Pacific Section of the AAPG. These honors have not made Ian Campbell arrogant; on the contrary, he is a humble man. Perhaps this is in part due to the fact that he has had his failures as well as his successes. For example, it has always been a matter of some chagrin to Ian that he failed to win the pinochle championship of the University of Oregon — he was runner-up the year he graduated, but that was the best he could do. Such failures have been few, however, and Ian has never failed his students, his friends, or his colleagues. In the nearly 40 years I have known him, I’ve never known a time when he was too busy to take time to help anyone who needed it. He has joined some 20 geological and other scientific organizations not because he is a joiner, but because he thinks that worthwhile organizations should be supported, and he has supported them not only with his dues, but with his services as committee man and officer. Almost every year for the past ten to fifteen years, Ian Campbell has been contributing generously of his time and effort not to just one, but to several geological organizations simultaneously. I know of no one who is more deserving of the Ben H. Parker Memorial Award for outstanding service to the geological profession.

R. Dana Russell
"WHERE ANGELS FEAR TO TREAD"

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS - OKLAHOMA CITY, OCTOBER 16, 1970

I would like to make a little confession about the title of this speech. I normally do not write a speech at all, and rarely even think about it until about two days before I have to give it. I then scribble a few notes and go on from there. After the speech is delivered I sometimes wonder what the title should have been. However, in these circumstances, when the Oklahoma Committee wanted to get out a program and needed me for a title I pulled this one out of the air. It seemed to me that AIPG is an organization with enough gumption, and get-up-and-go, that it literally rushes in where angels fear to tread. Of course, when I really got to thinking about the speech I remembered that the entire quotation, as it is usually heard, is "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread."

I then was faced with the problem of trying to make a speech around the title which would not indicate that we are a pack of fools, so I had to go back to "An Essay on Criticism" by Alexander Pope, first published in 1711, from which the quotation is taken. It was then that I discovered that the title is not so bad after all, since the quotation goes:

"Nay fly to altars; there they'll talk you dead
For fools rush in where angels fear to tread.
Distrustful sense with modest caution speaks,
And still looks home, and short excursions makes."

I think one of the problems the geological profession has faced over the years is that it is too well imbued with distrustful sense, which with modest caution speaks, and still looks home, and short excursions makes. If we are to advance the profession of geology in the manner to which AIPG is dedicated, we cannot speak with modest caution nor operate with distrustful sense. We cannot continue to look home, and only short excursions make. We must be out in the forefront on long excursions, ahead of the pack.

Now I do not think that anyone in or out of AIPG has ever accused us of speaking with modest caution. If anything we are more likely to be accused of speaking with immodest brashness and as far as excursions are concerned we are more often accused of going too fast and too far, than too slow and not far enough.

Since we are wont to step forward and speak up, we have from time to time claimed to be the voice of the profession. This claim has been questioned by some, but I don't think that it is any longer a point of argument. In many instances AIPG has taken the lead and has demonstrated that whether others like it or not AIPG is, or AIPG members are, the voice of the profession.

How can this be? Of the 30,000 geologists, more or less, in the United States, approximately 17,000 are eligible for membership in AIPG. We have 2053 members; therefore 6.8 percent of the total, or 12 to 13 percent of the eligible geologists in the United States, are members of the Institute. This may not seem to be enough to constitute a speaking majority of the profession. As a matter of fact it is not a majority at all, but a minority.

Under these circumstances how can AIPG be the voice of the profession? The obvious, but not necessarily correct, answer is, by default of other societies. Take, for example, AGI. AGI, as you know, is not a society of individual members, but an organization of organizations. It was formed hopefully to champion all phases of the professional aspects of geology. Total membership of its member organizations is approximately 30,000, but in spite of this number AGI is drastically limited in what it can do. AGI is dedicated "to testing the proposition that the whole can be greater than the sum of its parts." Unfortunately it is also subject to the rule that "a chain is no stronger than its weakest link." The AGI is prevented from doing many of the things which we all hoped it could do because of the tax status, the antipathy towards political action, and the general reluctance of many of its member societies.

AAGP, with 12,493 members, is dedicated to petroleum geology. Of course, we all know that many members of AAPG are involved in other types of geology, but to those outside AAPG it is strictly a petroleum organization. Some AAPG members think that it is the only organization geologists need. It could have been if it had had less inertia and been more aggressive a few years ago when the first stirrings of AIPG were taking place.

GSA, with 7,801 members, representing all branches of the profession, has had to default as the voice of the profession because it is a scientific society and its tax position will not allow it to engage in the activities for which AIPG is eminently suited. All other organizations are either too small or too specialized to be truly representative of the profession of geology.

Then why is it that AIPG actually can speak for the profession? To answer we can plagiarize from AGI's credo, "the whole can be greater than the sum of its parts." Mathematically this may not be true; but look at a storage battery. No matter how many single cells you have, you still can get no more than two volts from each, but put them together in the proper order, and you all know the results.

If we want to analyze the power of AIPG we must examine the parts, or in other words, its members. Do their faces and their names seem familiar no matter where you see or hear of geologists taking an active part in the affairs of the profession, of politics, of society, or of anything else? Of course they do, you see them everywhere.

Geologists traditionally have been silent outdoor men - the same class of men as typified by the mountain men who were the early explorers of the far west. There were probably hundreds who knew the area west of the Great Plains like the palm of their hands, but who actually was responsible for the opening of the west? It was the few articulate explorers, like John Wesley Powell, who were able to explore the country and bring back the lucid (and sometimes lurid) descriptions that influenced the stay-at-homes to migrate westward and develop the country. Without the silent ones the country would not have
been explored, but without the articulate minority the word would never have gotten around.

We say that geologists talk only to each other; to a large extent that is true, but there must be those in the minority who have the ability and the inspiration to talk to someone else. No criticism of the silent ones is intended. We must have them, but we should not ask them to do something for which they have no inclination or ability. Those who can speak, must.

Of the total geologists in this country how many do you suppose are of the caliber to speak for the profession, or to speak out for anything else? How many do you suppose make up the silent majority and how many the articulate minority? I don't know for sure, but it may be possible to work backwards and come up with an hypothesis which is as good as some of our geological interpretations.

First we must start with some basic assumptions: (1) that in any organization the list of officers and committee members will come from the minority group of articulate members; (2) that the list of officers, etc., is not a representative sample of the "run-of-the-mine," but a true concentrate of high-grade ore, and (3) that the organization's leaders, and by that I mean officers, committee men, delegates, etc., can all be regarded as leaders of, and qualified to speak for, the profession.

Now let's run a few assays to see where AIPG members stand in the hierarchy of some other organizations. In other words, can AIPG members be classed as run-of-the-mine, or high-grade concentrate?

I would like to point out that the information on which the following paragraphs are based was obtained from the 1969-70 published directories, year books, or other publications of the organizations mentioned. Although by this time there may have been some changes in detail, the general percentages still prevail.

First we will take the largest organization - AGI. The total number of individual geologists who hold membership in AGI through their respective organizations is approximately 30,000. 2053 of these are AIPG members; therefore, AIPG constitutes 6.8 percent of the total membership of AGI. Please remember that percentage is 6.8 percent. In spite of this low number, AIPG members constitute 57 percent of the Board of Directors of AGI and 51 percent of the House of Society Representatives. (As an interesting sidelight, 100 percent of AAPG's six-man delegation and 100 percent of GSA's four-man delegation are AIPG members.)

The next largest group to be assayed is AAPG. The total membership of AAPG is 12,493. The number of AAPGs who are also members of AIPG is 1,393, or 11 percent of the total membership. Although AIPG members constitute only 11 percent of the total membership of AAPG, AIPG members make up 80 percent of the AAPG Executive Committee; 42 percent of the section and division officers; 46 percent of the living Sydney Powers medalists; 51 percent of the Honorary Members, including all five of those designated this year in Calgary; 65 percent of the National officeholders since 1950, and 70 percent since 1960; 80 percent of the chairmen of delegations to other societies, and 50 percent of the chairmen of trusteeships.

One hundred eighty-nine AIPG members are also Certified Petroleum Geologists. This amounts to slightly less than 10 percent of the Professional Division of AAPG. However, it is a credit to AAPG that when they want a job well done they know whom to choose for the task. Of the five-man Board of Certification of AAPG, as listed in the 1969-70 directory, four are AIPG members, whereas only three are Certified Petroleum Geologists.

Now let's go to GSA, which is the only large organization, aside from AIPG, that covers all disciplines of geology. The total membership of GSA is 7,901. Approximately 800 to 1000 of these are AIPGs. Therefore, AIPG members constitute approximately 10 to 12 percent of the total membership of GSA. However, 100 percent of the national officers of GSA, 41 percent of the officers and counselors, 31 percent of the 167 positions listed in the 1970 Year Book as "Committees and Representatives," and 26 percent of the officers of divisions and sections are members of AIPG.

Even in the most exclusive geological society in the country, the Association of American State Geologists, 22 of the 48 members, or almost 46 percent, are AIPGs.

In my home state of California there are approximately 3,000 geologists: 275, or less than 10 percent, are members of AIPG. However, of the six-member Board of Registration for Geologists, five are members of AIPG.

Now let's review the results of our assays. At least 50 to 60 percent of the leaders of the profession, as established in assumption No. 3, are AIPG members. If we assume that all AIPG members are leaders, this means that the total number of leaders in the profession can only be about twice the membership of AIPG or approximately 4,000. Therefore, I submit that 4,000 may well be the maximum desirable membership of AIPG.

Some say it would be advantageous to increase the dues-paying membership. This might solve some of our financial problems, but on the other hand, do we really wish to become a large and amorphous mass of inarticulate persons? The strength of AIPG lies in the fact that it is made up of Chiefs, not Indians, who, almost without exception, are willing to step forward and be heard. We perhaps may not say that AIPG itself, as an organization, runs the profession of geology, but it is difficult to deny that the profession of geology, and most of its organizations, are run by AIPG members. We contend, and correctly, that AIPG is the only geological organization which shows the leadership to get up and do something. This is because its members, themselves, are leaders of the profession.

Our propensity for assuming the lead has been called the "AIPG power play" in some quarters. As, for example, the Western Regional Conference on the Professional Status of Geologists, held earlier this year in Salt Lake City, and the registration bill for geologists in California in 1968, and the initiation of a program of accreditation of geological departments of universities, and another which is now in the planning stage, the evaluation of employment practices of companies. All of these have been called "AIPG power plays" by those who did not have the initiative and gumption to think of them themselves. If these be power plays, make the most of it. Someone must take
the initiative and assume the power to act, and this AIPG has
done and will continue to do. If the Institute were made up
of 10,000 geologists, instead of the present 2058, it is quite
likely that at least 6,000 would be those with "distrustful sense,"
who with modest caution speak; the quiet, thoughtful, reticent
type which make up the majority of many organizations. I do
not believe that the financial benefit of such a large organiza-
tion would offset the disadvantages of having our membership
diluted by those who only "short excursions make." It is my
opinion that the reason that AIPG is different from other geo-
logical societies is that AIPG is made up of the Chiefs, the
articulate minority, of the geological profession, and it is not
cumbered by the inarticulate masses -- who, though they are
indispensable in furthering the science of geology, contrib-
ute relatively little to its professional advancement.

In case anybody should criticize me for what I may have
implied about other organizations, let me say that I have been
a loyal and active member of AAPG, GSA, and both SME and
SPE of AIME for many years longer than I have been a member
of AIPG, and I will defend to the utmost the position and ac-
tion of those organizations in the phases of the science of ge-
ology to which they are best suited. It just happens that there
are certain functions of the profession which can be better done
by one type of organization than another; and AIPG, the or-
ganization which is made up of the Chiefs of all other geo-
logical organizations, and the profession at large, is the one most
eminently qualified to handle the professional problems which
face us today and in the future. The American Institute of
Professional Geologists is the only geological organization con-
stituted to rush in where angels fear to tread, and with confi-
dent assurance instead of modest caution speak, and look ahead,
instead of home, and long excursions undertake.

Henry H. Neel

INVITED SPEAKER

Your editor seems to think that because I have worked as
a company geologist, a consultant, an independent oil oper-
ator, and a college professor, I may have something of interest
to say concerning geology as practiced by these branches of the
profession.

My experience as a company geologist was rather short,
less than seven years, and the company was comparatively small.
Nevertheless, I experienced something of the specialization
which I have seen in the careers of other company geologists.
One does get a chance to do more intensive geology, but it is
often over a small area and there is danger of overspecialization.
On the other hand, companies often transfer men from district
to district, and from region to region, which is a great advan-
tage. Furthermore there is a strong tendency to make the geo-
logical job a nine-to-five proposition, with TV in the evenings
and golf on the weekends. This, of course, leads to rapid tech-
nical obsolescence and early retirement.

Another course leads into administration and management,
where one's geology usually becomes merely a background for
business decisions. The geological vocabulary is then utilized
only in reading reports by company geologists. In spite of the
temptation to follow this path, many company geologists find
a niche in their organization where their professional talents
are recognized and financial rewards are satisfactory.

In my own case I decided that the chance of attaining one
of these niches was small and that consulting work offered in-
dependence of thought and action, although I was under no illu-
sions as to the difficulty of earning a living. I soon found
that the independent operator with whom most consultants deal
was only mildly interested in the geological situation of a
property. Of necessity, he was concerned with the odds for
oil or gas production from the tract and how attractive the
prospect could be made for those to whom he must sell finan-
cial interests.

In the case of producing properties I soon learned that geo-
logical generalities had to give way to numerical values for
porosity, permeability, water saturation, recovery per acre,
and producing area. Many of the basic values had to be as-
sumed, but these seemed to serve just as well as real ones,
especially when they were reconstructed from oil recoveries
known from similar fields in later stages of depletion.

One of the other things I learned as a consulting geologist
was the difficulty of collecting large cash fees. It was easier
in many cases to obtain compensation in the form of working
interests or overrides. In the case of valuation reports this
situation often caused considerable strain on professional integ-
rity because of the necessity of insisting that a statement of
interest be included in the final report.

One of the most satisfying parts of independent geology is
working up prospects from one's own information. In this the
geochemist can apply his own theories of stratigraphy and oil or
gas accumulation to build up a prospect which in his mind is
worth drilling. Then he must assemble the leases either by
himself or in partnership with a landman of integrity and ability.
In this part of the proceeding he learns more about law and hu-
mankind than about geology.

With the lease assembly accomplished there is still the
problem of selling the prospect. Here I have found that the
independent has an advantage over the company man. If the
independent cannot sell his prospect to one operator he can take
it to another, whereas the company geologist's only customer
is his own management. Nevertheless, the independent geo-
ologist often gets tired of knocking on the doors of prospects.

All this adds up to the fact that the independent consulting
geologist spends about 2/3 of his time handling business affairs
and selling, as against about 1/3 in geological work. To one
who is interested in building a large estate this is very satisfac-
tory, but to a geologist interested in the earth and its history it
is very frustrating.

As might be expected, academic work has its frustrations
also. The university is as highly organized an institution as a
major oil company, but the relation between its parts is more
subtle. Because it is not built for action the university is diffi-
cult, although not impossible, to get moving. This is discon-
certing to one who is used to a fast-moving industry. In an ef-
fort to be fair to everyone and to give each a voice in the insti-
tution, many strata of departments, schools, councils, and as-
semblies have been laid down on top of one another. These
have high insulating value, and considerable practice is required to drill through them to the students beneath.

In spite of the many academic distractions I feel I am a geologist. I still keep active in oil geology with a consulting office, and take great satisfaction in the wider fields of geology in which I must now operate. Above all, I enjoy the young people. It is especially gratifying to help them with their problems, pointing out the practical consequences of their actions and trying to make some of them into geologists; perceptive, professional, and practical.

John M. Hills, AIPG
El Paso, Texas

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Sir:

A recent editorial in TPG points up one of the basic problems yet to be solved by the geological profession. It is the problem of our professional image.

Who needs a professional image? WE DO. And we must destroy the seemingly harmless image we now possess—many still think of the geologist as a rather seedy (albeit scholarly) type picking at an outcrop with his leather-handled Estwing. It's difficult to conceive of the work of such an individual as relevant to the "real world" of today.

A certain smugness in some corners of our profession perpetuates this ancient problem. No one can argue with the logic that a geologist who is a good man on a civic committee does more for the image of the profession than if he wore a purple uniform to work. However, this neatly avoids the real problem. More smoke is added by stating that any image necessarily must include the consultant, professor, company man, and laboratory researcher, among others. This approach fails to account for the fact that more than one profession may be involved here.

Geology includes a spectrum varying from a pure science on one hand to engineering (making practical application of the knowledge of pure science) on the other. Practical application ranges from a minimum at the purely scientific end of the spectrum to a maximum at the interface with engineering.

Geology is a "new" profession compared with the older established ones (medicine, law, religion, higher education and aesthetics). Because it is a profession, geologists tend to consider themselves professionals. This is not necessarily the case. True professional status requires the practice of a recognized profession in accordance with the ethics and standards of conduct required by that profession, and that a person be practicing at a professional level—that it is his life, so to speak. It is possible to be a geologist without being a professional, and vice versa. Further, possession of the title does not make a professional.

If the professor, consultant, company man, government man and lab researcher are considered in this light, the apparent conflict lessens considerably. A professor of geology may be a professional and a geologist at the same time and still not be a professional geologist. His professional status may come from his position in the field of higher learning rather than the field of geology. If teaching is his life, this is the case. The consultant usually is a professional geologist. He puts his name and reputation on the line daily, staking his livelihood on it. The status of a company man depends upon his position. If his skill and expertise are independent of his employer and if his employer accepts the role of client, there is no reason why the company man cannot enjoy true professional status. The government man is similar except that the security of employment might tend to blunt the challenge to pursue creative work (a requirement of professional endeavors). The lab researcher may be a professional and/or a geologist, or simply a highly-trained technician.

A professional image is cultivated by the true professional. The doctor is proud of his professional image just as the lawyer is proud of his. Men of the cloth even wear what might be considered a uniform. It's not purple, but there's no mistaking it. Geologists should be so lucky.

The problems inherent in fabricating an all-inclusive image for engineers have no counterpart in geology. A petroleum engineer has little in common with an aeronautical engineer—they apply knowledge of different sciences to different fields for different ends. They do not work with the same materials in the same environment. Engineering requires application—both ends are open.

Geologists, regardless of their specialty, share the same basic science, even though the application may vary considerably. The search for an all-inclusive image for "The Engineer" may well be hopeless, but should not be so for the geologist as a professional.

The need for a professional image is more acute at that end of the profession interfacing with engineering. Engineering and mining geologists are close to this interface—it is from these disciplines that we hear the cry for recognition (identification) loudest. This fact of life is the source of considerable friction between engineering and other geologists. As we move toward the other end of the spectrum, the need for an image disappears somewhere in the fog beyond the stereotype of the seedy scholar with the Estwing.

From out of this fog come the voices of the smug. These stalwarts of the Old Guard who long ago relegated their battered Estwings to the shelf more recently have opposed California registration, and even opposed the specialization of engineering geology in other quarters (because it would result in higher salaries for those deserving them). They attempt to dictate professionalism in spite of their having abandoned their profession long ago.

It's not naive to seek a professional image. It's naive to allege that geologists don't require one while trying to maintain a holier-than-thou attitude. We're not in a position to sit on our laurels—we've got damned few. We occupy a lower rung on the professional ladder than do those professions with some sort of image.

In this age of relevance and practical endeavor, let's set about creating a relevant image that will enable us to raise our profession to the level it deserves. Our workshop is the natural environment. What could be more relevant?

September 20, 1970
Fred L. Fox, AIPG
Berkeley Heights, New Jersey
Sir:

You say that "registration is coming" (editorial, Sept. 1970 TPG), apparently whether geologists like it or not, and imply that all geologists, or at least all members of AIPG, should heartily endorse the recent so-called Western Regional Conference which "went on record as favoring registration of geologists by legislative action in each of the western states" (Sept. 1970 TPG, p.3). Is it really so all-fired certain that registration of geologists is going to be required in a large number of states? More to the point, is registration of geologists really necessary or desirable in all of these states? Unless I'm mistaken, there are many geologists who think not. Just because California has passed a registration law doesn't seem to be a sound reason for other states to do the same. For one thing, it might be prudent for other states to wait and see how the California registration law works out over a period of several years before rushing to pass one like it. Already, the California law has struck a snag in that it failed to provide for geophysicists, who may not qualify as "geologists" under the strict terms of the definition. For another thing, whether reciprocity among the several states is agreed upon or not, one thing is certain, becoming registered and renewing his certificate periodically is going to cost the individual geologist an appreciable sum of money. The more states in which he is registered the more it will cost him. For a profession as nomadic as geology, this is something to think about. Also, the time required to get through administrative procedures is a matter to be reckoned with, as those who sweated out registration in California can testify. If you receive a job offer in another state in June but can't get your registration certificate until the following January, you probably have lost a remunerative position. More important by far than the above inconveniences would be the very real shackle placed upon the individual in professional practice. He may be forced to limit his professional activities to a "specialty," defined in narrow terms by politicians and lawyers, with (it is to be hoped) some guidance from geologists themselves. To those geologists who are generalists rather than specialists, such a restriction on scientific and professional development is abhorrent. Moreover, if a construction engineer needs advice on a certain foundation material whose properties depend upon its clay-mineral components, is an unregistered clay mineralogist less competent to advise him than a registered engineering geologist who has never worked with clays? Yet the registered man would be "legally" competent under the California law. One can visualize many discrepancies like this.

Finally, the main motive for registration seems to have been to exclude incompetent and unethical persons from practicing as geologists, at the same time enhancing the professional "image," to put geologists in a class with doctors, lawyers, and engineers. California had a problem with incompetents and charlatans, but are these so rampant in other states as to constitute a serious menace to the geological profession? Is the fancied enhancement of the geologist's "image" so valuable that it is worth accepting the restrictions and inconveniences of legal registration?

All geologists, especially members of AIPG, should think twice before rushing like sheep into the registration corral: I seem to recall that AIPG was organized originally as a national alternative to registration in individual states. Why have the voices of AIPG's founding fathers become strangely silent of late?

Robert B. Hall, AIPG
October 21, 1970
Golden, Colorado

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ETHICS COMMITTEE

During the past two years the Ethics Committee has concentrated its efforts toward establishment of guidelines and procedures for handling unethical and/or incompetent professional practices. The committee has been concerned for some time that such procedures were nonexistent.

Attached hereto is a procedural manual, the format and general outline of which have been adopted from a similar manual prepared for the California Section of AIPG by Henry H. Neel. It is the Ethics Committee's recommendation that this manual be adopted by resolution of the Executive Committee.

Frederick L. Stead, Chairman
Editor's Note: The manual was accepted by the Executive Committee and after editing will appear in TPG and be added to the Duties Manual recently assembled by the Headquarters office.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

It is good to note that expenditures of AIPG through the third quarter of 1970 are slightly less than anticipated and receipts slightly more. This does not mean, however, that we are in great shape. There are many programs that need better financing.

A "Tentative Budget for financing Optimum Institute Programs" was recently drawn up which is approximately three times our 1970 anticipated expenditures. To implement even part of these programs will certainly require additional financing.

Three basic ways to increase Institute income have been suggested: (1) by increase of membership, (2) by increase of dues, and (3) by obtaining money from donations, endowments, foundations or other similar sources. The first item would require increased efforts by our members to recruit qualified geologists. Lowering of requirements might help in this effort, but it is not the sole answer. A second class of membership could also increase membership. The second item certainly seems necessary, although the amount of increase is subject to question. The increase should not be so great to run off our present members or make recruitment of new members too difficult. The third item certainly deserves pursuing. There may be tax considerations in this matter, but these are probably not insurmountable. Locating donations or endowments may be more difficult.

It has been suggested that some of our programs could be self-supporting. For instance, the Mississippi Section finances a good annual report, which includes a directory, solely through a few small advertisements. The Mississippi Geological Society,
and I am sure others, now issues a monthly newsletter of quality which is supported by a number of small professional cards. The Institute directory and/or The Professional Geologist could be financed similarly. The Institute might consider publishing certain reports which could be sold to members, banks, and other interested parties.

Another suggestion is that of instituting a "sustaining membership." For example, a member could become a sustaining member by paying annual dues of $100.00. This would be strictly voluntary. If 10 percent of our members chose to become sustaining members, an additional $15,000.00 per year would come from this source.

The Finance Committee makes no firm recommendations, but offers these suggestions for consideration by the Institute.

H. E. Karges,
for G. W. Gulmon, Chairman

COMMITTEE ON MAN'S GEOLOGIC ENVIRONMENT
This report summarizes some of the activities by AIPG members directed toward the better use of geology in solving problems of the environment. The list is by no means complete and is presented to indicate the varied applications of geology that can be made in this field.

Earth Day Program. - Dick Jahns of Stanford addressed some 500 students at Portland State University as a part of this program. He later discussed environmental problems in western United States with groups of engineers, planners, and architects. Exhibits. - Exhibition booths were sponsored by the New York Section at two meetings, the American Society of Planning Officials in New York City on April 5-9, and the New York Planning Federation at Spring Glen on October 11-14.

Policy Statement. - Ruth A. M. Schmitt, chairman of the Alaska Section's Committee on Man's Geologic Environment, has submitted a policy statement to the Alaska Legislative Council on a commission by the Brooking Institute to prepare a series of seminars on the planning of Alaska's future.

Civic Groups. - Hugh Montgomery has presented a one-day course for the past three years on the subject of environmental geology, these being parts of a week-long program on the environment; the participants are Girl Scouts in the Irwin, Pennsylvania vicinity. Hugh requests examples of the need for geologic studies from geologists in the 50 states, these examples to be worked into future presentations. Samuel Mozes, of New York State's Bureau of Urban Affairs, addressed the New York State Section of AIPG as a representative of the American Institute of Planners. Jim Dunn, at the request of Mr. Mozes, reviewed Peter Flawn's Environmental Geology for the New York Planning Review.

President's Conference on Environmental Geology. Several meetings of the steering committee have been held, at which AIPG was represented by John Galey, Jim Dunn, and Frank Byrne. The conference has been scheduled for early 1971 and will be held in Washington. Planning Symposium. - A three-day symposium will be presented at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, on January 27-29, 1971. The symposium will be attended by students and by planners associated with local, regional, state and federal agencies in the northwestern Great Lakes Basin area.

The Wisconsin-Minnesota Section of AIPG will be one of the sponsors, and several members of AIPG will present talks and serve as panelists and moderators during the symposium.

The Committee requests that members of AIPG report examples of the uses of geological information in problem-solving in the areas in which they are interested. By this mechanism the committee can act as a clearinghouse and, by annual reports to AIPG, present useful contributions of geology to the public benefit.

James R. Dunn, Chairman

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE
At the end of 1968 there were 1820 active members; at the end of 1969 there were 1954, and as of August 31, 1970, there were 2032. The 1969 membership increase was 7.5 percent; the forecast for 1970 is 10 percent. In 1970, 104 new members had been approved as of September 30, and 25 will be added on October 1 if written objections are received by Headquarters.

Four AIPG programs were conducted before other societies to recruit members during 1970. Two of these were in Region 2 and two in Region 4. Six local AIPG meetings were held in Region 2, twelve in Region 3, nine in Region 4, and three in Region 5. I do not have information on meetings held in Regions 1 and 7.

A summary of the work of regional co-chairmen follows. In Region 1, Otto Hackel made a mailing to geologists in California last fall inviting them to consider applying for membership in AIPG. On March 10, 1970, Art Brunton reported that this had resulted in 215 requests for application packets and 10 applications for membership.

In Region 2, Bill LeMay set up an AIPG recruiting booth at the spring meeting of the New Mexico Geological Society; wrote letters and made phone calls to active geologists in the state who are not AIPG members, and sent the May newsletter of the State Section to all geologists in New Mexico. Bill mentions AIPG whenever possible at speaking engagements. In a recent address to the geological society at Los Alamos, he put in a five-minute pitch for AIPG and provided brochures. Bill has received the services of Virgil W. Carmichael to act as membership chairman and state coordinator of North and South Dakota. Virgil has started an active campaign to form a joint Dakotas State Section. Bill is looking for a volunteer state coordinator to do the same in Arizona.

In Region 3, Meredith Ostrom has obtained a state membership chairman in all seven states under his jurisdiction. He reports that the Minnesota-Wisconsin Section is in the process of organizing and is currently holding a mail election of officers. This Section is actively attempting to build membership by distributing lists of potentially eligible geologists to all AIPG members asking each to contact those he personally knows. The names have been taken from SEG and GSA membership lists.

One of the major accomplishments in Region 4 is the number of local AIPG meetings that have been held this year. One was held at Urbana, Illinois, on February 27, with 46 persons in attendance, of which only 19 were AIPG members. Many of the nonmembers picked up application packets. The Illinois
Section will work with the AIPG state coordinator for Indiana and help him build membership and a new State Section. The Mississippi Section held its quarterly meeting on March 17 with 21 in attendance. The Lafayette and New Orleans Chapters of the Louisiana Section held local meetings regularly. The Lafayette Chapter meets monthly and at its September meeting had 14 members and two guests present.

Fred Mellen, co-chairman of Region 4, contacted all the members and many potential members in an attempt to help form an Arkansas State Section and to increase their membership. He has devised a good public-relations technique for gaining new members and properly initiating them into AIPG. This is a news release with photos for each new geologist certified by AIPG, this information being released by the State Section president and the institute president. Fred reports that he still has been unable to get state membership chairmen in Arkansas, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Indiana. Also, he is not receiving pertinent membership statistical data from these Sections. Anyone know someone in these states that could and would accept this responsibility? If so, please let Fred know. Fred also plans to pursue AAPG, SEPM, and GSA lists for potential members, and to put their names on a list for distribution to all AIPG members in his region so that appropriate contacts may be made.

Although Ted Mullin, co-chairman of Region 5, was transferred to Las Vegas, Nevada, early this year, he has succeeded in establishing liaison with all the State Sections in his region and has state membership chairmen in four out of seven of the states under his jurisdiction. Alabama has conducted programs before other geological societies in spreading the AIPG gospel and recruiting potential new members. Georgia, North and South Carolina, Florida, and Kentucky failed to report progress for the third quarter. Alabama and Tennessee were the only states in Ted's region to comply. Ted still needs state membership chairmen for Florida, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

Jon Rau has taken a teaching position at the University of British Columbia and therefore resigned his position as regional co-chairman of Region 6. I am sorry to lose him and he will be hard to replace. I have asked Glenn W. Frank and Roy H. Reinhart to accept this position. Glenn could not accept and as yet I do not have an answer from Roy.

Jim Skehan, co-chairman of Region 7, is the only one that purportedly is receiving communications and statistical data from all the states under his jurisdiction. This is tremendous. I hope other regions will emulate his shortly!

At the beginning of 1970 the Membership Committee's goal was to increase membership 20 percent for the year. Actual growth for the first three quarters was 7.5 percent; if projected at the same rate for the rest of the year this should yield 10 percent for the year. As this is only 50 percent of our goal, I am asking each of my co-chairmen to institute a systematic procedure whereby each AIPG member is requested to agree to recruit at least one new member by December 31, 1970. This will be the only request that many AIPG members have received to help the Institute this year. If this plan is appropriately executed, the maximum result can be a doubling of our present membership. Even though a maximum may not be reached, we certainly should at least increase our membership by 20 percent. Further, such a request should not unduly burden anyone in the Institute. Each co-chairman will be asked to report the results of this project in his report for December.

Vito Gotaatus, Chairman

PUBLIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The program this year was devoted chiefly to furthering activities started by prior committees and to the development of a public-relations plan. All these areas need a more concerted effort if we are to create the desired image. The wide geographic distribution of the PR Committee posed some communication problems, but these did not prove to be insurmountable. Exchange of ideas developed slowly but surely and we submit the following report.

A series of questionnaires on geological education was prepared to send to geoscience departments, state geological surveys, and AIPG State Sections. However, these need to be held in abeyance until specific objectives and direction of effort are more clearly defined by the committee. Once this has been accomplished, effort in this area will be, upon the approval of the Executive Committee, directed toward submission of the questionnaires and evaluation of the results for eventual completion of this area of public relations effort.

Work was continued on trying to develop a suitable AIPG display for national or other meetings. Once the type of display is decided on, a design will be drafted and presented to the Executive Committee for approval and adoption. Jack Simon has graciously offered to put the display together for the Institute's use. The method of shipment and calendar of meetings will also have to be decided on. The PR Committee intends to complete this project during the ensuing year.

We were fortunate in having been able to develop, as the result of Gary Melickian's effort, an outline for preparation of a long-range public relations plan. This outline sets forth a procedure to define public relations as to our professional needs, and suggests a plan to organize the PR effort, assign responsibility, and audit the results. Copies are available for review and the committee would appreciate any input you might care to provide.

We are proceeding to develop PR material for the Section level that will be included as part of the Duties Manual now in preparation. Of primary importance is the assignment of priorities, and here the committee will attempt to place the sequence of PR efforts in definite order for the successful achievement of goals. There is still much to be done and the committee is always open to suggestions for improving our efforts in public relations.

Thomas A. Simpson, Chairman

COMMITTEE ON STATE SECTION ORGANIZATION AND AFFAIRS

At the beginning of the year, twenty-seven State Sections had been chartered and ten additional states having more than ten resident members were eligible for Section status. No new Sections have been admitted in 1970. However, several states are about ready to make application to the Institute for admission.
Members in Indiana are actively pursuing the formation of a State Section through the efforts of Allen Perry as state coordinator. Their first organizational meeting was held in mid-June and it is hoped that they will be ready to apply for admission before the end of this year. In Arizona, Walter E. Heinrichs, Jr. has taken steps toward forming a State Section. William J. LeMay reports that he is sounding out members in North and South Dakota about their interest in a joint Section. New state coordinators for South Carolina (Norman K. Olson) and Georgia (Frederic B. Mullin) have been appointed. Members in Wisconsin are considering a possible affiliation with the Minnesota Section, and a majority have voted to seek such an affiliation. Carl Supp is seeking the formation of a Maryland-Delaware-District-of-Columbia section.

With the admission of these new Sections to the Institute, most of the states having ten or more members will have achieved Section status. In the coming years the activity of this committee will necessarily shift from that of assisting in the organization of new State Sections to that of promoting intersectional cooperation.

Frank A. Exum, Chairman

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON EVALUATION OF GEOLOGICAL DEPARTMENTS FOR CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR GEOLOGISTS

You will recall that this committee reported at last year's meeting that of the 700 geology departments listed in the AGI directory, 200 were put on the approved lists, 143 appearing on the inclusive 1960-1969 list and 57 appearing on the 1960-1969 list. This report appeared in the December, 1969 issue of The Professional Geologist. This committee's charge and its operating instructions from the Executive Committee appear in the published report.

The purpose of the current (1970) report is to conclude some unfinished business. Specifically, the vote tallies collected for the first report revealed some problematical cases. Such cases included, for example, those in which there were not enough positive votes to accept and there were no votes to reject, as specified by the Executive Committee's guidelines.

The committee has now voted again on the problematical cases, using the same guidelines as applied last year. Of 58 departments so considered, 12 have been added to the approved lists. One of the 12 has been added to the inclusive 1950-1969 list and 11 have been added to the 1960-1969 list. These additions are being treated with the same confidentiality as applied to the lists prepared last year. A report has been sent to the California State Board of Registration for Geologists.

It is requested that this ad-hoc committee be discharged. The committee was appointed to help the California Board process the initial heavy surge of applications. From here on, AIPG's role could well be to provide solicited advice to the Board on special problems; such advice could be given by standing committees or by individual AIPG members appointed by the President.

Howard J. Pincus, Chairman

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON LIABILITY INSURANCE

This committee came into being as a consequence of numerous requests for an Institute insurance program providing professional liability and malpractice coverage for the membership. The first order of business was a membership survey to determine that segment of the Institute which was interested in or had a specific need of this coverage. Questionnaires were mailed to all members. Fifty replies were received: 37 yes, 11 no, and 2 maybe. Using the 37 as a nucleus for a group plan, we contacted an insurance broker to investigate the matter further. Attached hereto is a copy of the letter received from this broker which I believe is self-explanatory.

Unfortunately we do not have a program to submit at this time. It is the plan of the committee to continue its investigation. Our general concept has merit and we are prepared to pursue it further if this is the desire of the Executive Committee.

Frederick L. Stead, Chairman

Editor's Note: According to the letter mentioned by Chairman Stead, "Our consensus from these inquiries is that the underwriters do not have enough knowledge of the operations of geology to properly rate a group and further we feel that they are aware of some adverse published articles in this field when the good results are never advertised."

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFINITIONS

Members of this committee are Norman H. Donald, Jr., representing AIME; Lowell B. Moon, representing SEG, and Armine F. Banfield, representing AIPG, chairman. Members met several times this year and will continue to meet, at monthly intervals when possible.

The committee decided to restrict its activities for the present to the following terms in common use in the metallic and nonmetallic mineral industries: ore; ore reserves; reserves; categories of ore reserves; exploration, and development. As a first step, the committee decided to accumulate as much data as possible on the definitions now in use in the mining industry; in Federal and state agencies, particularly bureaus of mines and geological surveys; in the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (and perhaps some state regulatory agencies); in the Internal Revenue Service, and in courts of law up to the Supreme Court.

The committee expects to complete this phase of the investigation early next year. The next phase will depend upon the results of this work.

Armine F. Banfield, Chairman

"If you have great talents, industry will improve them; if moderate abilities, industry will supply the deficiencies. Nothing is denied to well-directed labors; nothing is ever to be attained without it."

...Joshua Reynolds
Exhibit prepared by Paul DuMontelle of the Illinois Survey and Robert Brownfield of the Illinois Division of Highways, for display at meetings of amateur geologists and other nonprofessionals. From left to right in the top row of pictures, geologists examine a soil sample at a highway location; study an oolitic limestone with an image-analyzing computer; describe a rock outcrop, and attend a class on environmental geology. In the lower row, geologists test physical properties of soils; examine cores; identify and catalog fossils; prepare fossils for an exhibit; take soil samples with a power auger, and run an electrical survey for depth of water table and bedrock.

Photo courtesy of Jack A. Simon, president, Illinois Section, AIPG
ADVISORY BOARDS MEET

The 1970 Advisory Board, with an attendance of 31 delegates representing 21 states, met on October 14. Major issues considered were the following: A motion to put a three-year cloture on debate of proposals that are turned down by a 60-percent vote of the membership was defeated. Departure from the rigid 2-candidate slate of officers was recommended, in favor of a flexible ballot depending on availability of persons willing to run for office. Reduction of the experience requirement for membership, from 8 years to 5 years, was barely approved on a roll-call vote, 16 to 15. Action in regard to affiliation of undergraduates was deferred until after the matter of an additional class of membership has been voted on.

Much discussion centered on financial matters. Three motions were passed, recommending that the Executive Committee (1) submit annually to the membership a list of desirable goals, with costs, and ask which ones should be supported; (2) amend the Bylaws to raise the dues to $25.00 effective the coming dues year, and (3) allow State Sections to have The Professional Geologist sent to geoscience departments and eligible students at a charge of $1.00 per year.

In regard to the "Attrition Report" of the Professional Employment Standards Committee (TPG, October), a motion that the Executive Committee should take action on the committee's three recommendations was defeated. The Executive Committee was requested to appoint an ad-hoc committee to study employment practices and make proposals for possible future action. It was voted that the Board recommend to the Executive Committee the appointment of a select group of Members to an ad-hoc committee charged with meeting with top management of companies singled out as having conducted abusive employment practices. The purpose of such meetings will be to brief top management concerning the findings of the Professional Employment Standards Committee, and to determine if top management can or will ameliorate past practices to avoid certain unionization. AIPG is opposed to unionization and this is the sole purpose of the visit with top management.

The 1971 Advisory Board convened briefly to elect four members to the 1971 Executive Committee. Those elected were:

Richard Chojnacki    Leroy Gatlin
Paul L. Hilpman     John W. Rold

PROFESSIONAL PARAGRAPHS

JAMES E. SIOSSON, AIPG, has been selected as one of the "Outstanding Educators of America" for 1970, in recognition of "contributions to the advancement of education and service to community, state, and country." He has also been elected chairman of the Los Angeles Section of AEG, and serves on the Geologic Review Board of Ventura County.


H. W. THOMS, AIPG, will give a file of the AAPG Bulletin for 1938-42 to anyone who will pay transportation. Interested persons should get in touch with Mrs. Alice B. Thoms, 224 Pacific Street, Bakersfield, California 93305.

JAMES W. DEAN, AIPG, lead engineer in the Skylab Project of Martin Marietta Corporation in Denver, was voted Skylab Employee of the Month for July, 1970. This was the first time the award had been made. Dean was chosen over 11 other nominees.

JAMES P. SPILLERS, AIPG, Royal Resources Corporation, has been named special assistant to the president.

THOMAS D. MURPHY, AIPG, has returned from Australia and may be reached at 300 Lakeside Drive, Oakland, Calif.

ARTHUR H. TROWBRIDGE, AIPG, is now a consultant in Shreveport, Louisiana. He was formerly employed by Humble in New Orleans.