EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
March 26, 1971

The second meeting of the 1971 Executive Committee was held in the Shamrock Hilton Hotel, Houston, Texas on March 26, 1971. All necessary business was conducted and available committee reports were read. Highlights of the meeting are summarized below.

A comparison of our first-quarter anticipated income and expenditures relative to actual income and expenditures shows that we were $1227.95 ahead in income, and have expended $512.06 less than had been expected. This is comforting, but offers no inducement for over-confidence in view of the fact that we have only one quarter down and three to go.

The old business conducted boiled down to housekeeping chores and a discussion of standards relative to review of applications. The chores were handled routinely, and it should be of interest for the members to know that acceptance of the applications is anything but routine. The Excom is impressed by the fine job of local application screening and the response of members who send in comments on applicants when the lists are published. The high standards of membership qualifications doubtless contribute to the low number of complaints of unethical conduct by AIPG members.

Reports for most committees were read. Finance - actively pursuing ideas to reduce expenses and generate necessary income (of comfort to the concerned --- AIPG is in no imminent danger of losing its tax-free status as a nonprofit organization). Interprofessional Relations - actively pursuing one matter of concern with a Federal Agency and working on its section of the AIPG Procedures Manual. Man’s Geologic Environment - pursuing the concept of establishing Regional Associates who will keep track of environmental matters in 12 groups of states; proposes community service activities, a "Brochure on Man’s Use of His Environment," and regional symposia on environment. Hank Neel presented a brief, informal review of the conference "Planning a New Town's Environment" held in mid-March by AIPG through a grant from the National Science Foundation. Professional and Scientific Standards - continuing its program of invited evaluation of university geology departments as a very significant service to higher education and the profession. Professional Employment Standards - currently conducting a poll concerning employment conditions of about 3000 geologists. Public Relations - working on its section of the Procedures Manual. (This manual is being prepared for guidance of each committee's activities and duties. Sections of the manual are being supplied to State Section Presidents.) Regulatory and Legislative - reported on progress of legislation in Idaho, Nevada and Colorado. State Section Affairs - acceptance of Indiana State Section proposed, and approved by Excom. Ad Hoc Committee on Resources Development and Environmental Compatibility (CORDEC) - very actively pursuing environmental matters directly related to resource development as influenced by government and industry.

Perhaps the most significant and far-reaching action of this Excom meeting was the adoption of the following resolution for presentation to AGI member societies.

"The Executive Committee of AIPG proposed that representatives of all interested national geological societies be convened at a constitutional convention for the purpose of establishing a single professional society which will be the consolidation of all professional activities and memberships of the existing geological professional organizations and will provide for the inclusion and representation of all geologic specialties."

This resolution grew out of joint consideration by AAGP-AIPG in investigating the feasibility of merging their certifying interests. (See January 1971 issue of TPG, Report of the Joint AAPG-AIPG Liaison Committee.) Although the AAPG Executive Committee did not adopt the resolution, it was presented to the AGI House of Society Representatives on March 28th.

Although there was no need for any formal resolution by the Excom, the spirit which pervaded the meeting was of growing strength and stature in professional involvement and impact, and in worth to the geologic community.

John B. Ivey, Secretary-Treasurer

Note: The word "Excom" used above abbreviates Executive Committee, and not ex-communist.
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NEWS FROM THE SECTIONS

NEW MEXICO

The Northeast District of the New Mexico Section has been established by the Executive Committee and Wally Bejnar has been appointed District Representative. Wally and Bill LeMan were instructed to work out details and prepare an outline of the area.

Excerpt from the President's Letter - THE NEW MEXICO CERTIFIED GEOLOGIST:

"Since most of the New Mexico geologists are concerned with the extractive industries, and since A.I.P.G. includes all disciplines of the profession it is my feeling that the New Mexico Section should be more active in the protection and control of our State's environment. Certainly we should let the public know what geologists are doing and can do to make better use of our resources, and how the process can be compatitive with the protection and control of the environment. We need more publicity and better public relations than we have enjoyed in the past."

Lee W. Kilgore, President

LOUISIANA

In the February-March, 1971 issue of The Professional Geologist, it was reported that the Lafayette Chapter of the Louisiana Section elected STATE officers for 1971. This is in error since we are only a LOCAL chapter. The following were elected officers of the Lafayette Chapter only, not the state section:

President ....................... Burns M. Crotty
Vice President .................... James L. McCoy
Secretary .......................... Rolland E. Fisher

Roland E. Fisher, AIPG

NEW YORK

The New York State Section of AIPG held its semiannual meeting on April 22, at the Brass Rail Restaurant in New York City. Following the dinner, a panel discussion was held on the subject of the "Geologist's role in interaction of society, government, industry, and university relative to projects affecting the environment." Members of the panel were Carl Thompson, of the public-relations firm of Hill and Knowlton; James Geraghty, AIPG, of Geraghty and Miller, ground-water consultants, and Declan P. Ford, AIPG, of the Internal Revenue Service. Thompson in his remarks stressed the importance of industry taking the initiative away from poorly informed environmental activists by publicizing what it is doing to safeguard the environment. Geraghty pointed out the geologist's familiarity with an ever-changing earth. He also said that geologists should speak out on environmental issues but, in order to do so effectively, they must broaden their perspective by learning how human beings are affected by changes to the environment. Ford's remarks were concerned with reminding the geologist of the interdisciplinary approach that is needed to solve most environmental problems. He said we must strive to get the confidence of the public, and we can best do this by recognizing our limitations and not overstepping our somewhat narrow field of expertise. The panelists' remarks sparked a lively discussion from the members.

John Vecchioli
Editor, New York Section, AIPG

OKLAHOMA

Sign on Oklahoma City Oil Field Dedicated

A sign commemorating the discovery and depicting the geology of the giant Oklahoma City oil field was dedicated on January 16, 1971, in a ceremony held just south of the State Capitol Building. The dedication paid tribute to a number of individuals and organizations responsible for completion of this first in a series of 16 signs to be erected throughout Oklahoma pointing out significant geologic features and resources. The Oklahoma Section of AIPG has been a principal supporter of the projects. Jerry B. Newby, general chairman for the geological sign project, explained that it was inspired by the Arkmore Geological Society's geological markers along U.S. Highway 77 through the Arbuckle Mountains in southern Oklahoma. For more information on geology signs, please contact Jerry Newby.

UTAH

The Utah Chapter of AIPG was successful in the support of a Salt Lake City ordinance which in effect requires a geological report for approval of subdivisions or building on hillside lots of more than 25% vertical rise. Soils, drainage and other natural hazards are to be included.

The ordinance passed on February 25, 1971, is the first successful step in what AIPG members regard as a long climb of progress in Utah.

G. S. Campbell
Publicist, Utah Section AIPG
Concerted action to solve professional problems should be the concern of all geologists, but united effort has not always been possible. One of the barriers to full cooperation is the existence of two organizations for professional certification - the AAPG certifies Petroleum Geologists and AIPG certifies Professional Geologists without designating specialty. Thus, the foremost professional problem today is the division of geologists themselves into two major camps.

Of the two groups AIPG is by far the larger with 2100 members as compared with 1200 certified members for AAPG. Still a third group, SIPES, represents a smaller number, perhaps 250, and not all of those are geologists.

A first step toward unification of professional geologists was taken in 1969 when AIPG and AAPG formed a joint committee to investigate "matters of common interest," specifically the problem of certification. The committee was composed of equal numbers of AIPG and AAPG representatives and was chaired by Ben H. Parker, a man who was highly respected by all geologists as well as a former president of both organizations. After Ben's death in 1970, the committee's work was completed under Larry Sloss, and a final report was received last December (The Professional Geologist, January, 1971).

The major conclusions of the Sloss Committee are that AAPG and AIPG should accept a single professional program, and further, they should agree to merge their professional activities. This report is remarkable, not only for its recommendations but for its near unanimity of opinion. On its eight recommendations, there was dissent by only one of the seven members on only one issue. This demonstrates that when faced by important problems, most geologists can agree on a course of action.

The most important recommendation of the committee was that only one organization should be a certifying body and that the one organization should be AIPG. This recommendation is clear and concise - the Institute is best qualified to deal with professional affairs that affect all geologists.

Of course, this recommendation was the single source of disagreement. This single dissenter considered this suggestion to be unacceptable to the AAPG membership because it would eliminate the Professional Division of AAPG. As an alternative, the minority suggests continuing the two certifying bodies - in other words, no change in the present divided effort.

Such a suggestion does not offer a solution to the main problem, that is, multiple certification which can only serve to divide the profession, confuse the public, and generally prevent the presentation of one geological voice in public affairs.

Now, a second move toward cooperation has been offered. AAPG and SIPES have signed an agreement which provides for a type of membership reciprocity (AAPG Newsletter, Jan. 1971). The two organizations will recognize each other's members as fully qualified so that the application effort will not have to be duplicated by those who wish to join both SIPES and the Professional Division of AAPG.

A similar agreement has now been offered to AIPG. Both Bill Curry, AAPG President, and Jim Lewis, Professional Division President, sincerely desire further cooperation among certifying organizations, and they view the reciprocity agreement as a desirable initial step. If some such forms of cooperation can be agreed upon now, then future cooperation in other matters of mutual interest becomes a real possibility.

The reciprocity suggestion sounds good and must be accepted at face value - a first step in the right direction. But what about the Sloss Committee report? What about the recommendation for one certifying organization?

Any type of reciprocity continues the existence of two main certifying bodies - AIPG and AAPG. It will not solve the problem. In fact, the offer of reciprocity by the AAPG Executive Committee - coming fast upon the heels of the Sloss report - suggests that the joint committee recommendations have not been fully accepted by the AAPG and the coexistence of two certifications is expected to survive indefinitely.

The recommendation for one certifying organization is a sound proposal. Its benefits cannot be doubted in terms of efficiency and effectiveness for the entire profession. It makes little sense to argue about what that organization should be, or what it might be called, or whether specialty certification is really necessary. The heart of the problem is professional fragmentation, and the solution is to find a way to unite all geologists under one professional banner. All other questions become minor in comparison; and remaining problems must be solved by mutual consent and concession.

Certainly a first step is necessary, but perhaps this first step should also recognize the eventual goal - that a single certification by one body is the ultimate objective - desired by a majority and of greatest benefit to all geologists.

Robert R. Berg

PRESENT MEMBERSHIP

2078 Members
75 Active Members

CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS

Copies of the Constitution and Bylaws are available to State Sections from the headquarters office. Please let Art know how many you need. All requests for copies should funnel through the State Sections.

OBITUARIES

JEAN EDWARD JOUJON-ROCHE. "Ed" was the San Joaquin representative to the California Section. Details are not known by TPG.
A conference entitled "Planning a New Town's Environment" was held on March 14-16, 1971, at Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia. It was sponsored by AIGP and funded by the National Science Foundation. Convener and general chairman was past-president John T. Galey.

Purpose of the conference was to allow geologists to acquaint key planners, engineers, architects, and landscape architects with geologic aspects of the environment and with the information and services that geologists can supply. Attendance was by invitation. Of the 56 registrants, 24 were members of AIGP, and 30 belonged to such organizations as the American Institute of Planners, the American Society of Civil Engineers, and the American Institute of Architects.

The conference assembled on Sunday evening, March 14, for a reception and a keynote address. Richard H. Jahns, keynote speaker, illustrated his talk with slides and discussed examples of geologic hazards, mostly from California. He suggested methods of solving such problems through joint action by geologists, engineers, and public agencies such as planning boards.

On Monday morning, James E. Slosson spoke on the significance of terrain analysis in urban planning; Robert L. Bates, on mineral resources for the new town; Philip E. LaMoreaux, on problems of water supply; and Paul L. Hilpman, on management of liquid and solid wastes. These presentations were brief, as copies of the papers had been distributed to participants in advance of the conference. Carl Rampasak of the U. S. Bureau of Mines then spoke on the Bureau's research on waste disposal, and Paul Streight, an architect, gave an illustrated talk on the Finnish planned community of Tapiola.

In the afternoon, Richard H. Jahns explained the "new town" part of the program. The assignment was to plan a large community from scratch, to be located in the Mifflintown area in the folded Appalachians of central Pennsylvania. This area had been chosen because it is in the northeastern part of the country, has appreciable topographic relief, and includes a major stream (the Juniata River); and because modern geologic, hydrologic, and soil surveys are available for the area. Jahns laid down the following ground rules: disregard present man-made facilities; assume a population goal of 300,000 in ten years, and do not include any heavy industry in the overall plan. By general acclaim, the new community was named Galeyville.

The conference was then divided into four groups, each of which had representatives of all the professions participating. Two of the groups were chaired by architects and two by planners. Maps and pertinent literature on the Mifflintown area were available for each group. Monday late afternoon and evening were spent by the groups in formulating their ideas on how the community could best be developed in the assigned area.

On Tuesday morning, each group made a presentation before the conference, showing its proposals with regard to Galeyville. Three of the four groups utilized large tripods and drawing paper to sketch their ideas of how the community might best be adapted to the rather rigorous valley-and-ridge topography, the Juniata River, transportation routes, and so forth. Each group gave attention to matters of water and mineral supply, waste disposal, and best utilization of the terrain. The reports gave much evidence of give-and-take among the various professions represented.

In general there was fair agreement on how best to fit the new town to the geological realities. There was also a strong feeling, especially among the nongeologists, that the objective of settling 300,000 people in a new community in ten years was highly unrealistic. In fact one of the groups got so hung up on this point that their report was somewhat unfocused and less effective than the others.

In the general wrap-up session that terminated the conference, it was agreed that the meeting had been beneficial for nongeologists and geologists alike, that each group had learned from the others, and that at least a beginning had been made in opening communications between professional geologists and other professional men who so often need their assistance. Before adjournment there was a unanimous vote of commendation to John Galey for perceiving the need for such a conference and bringing it to reality.

The sessions of the meeting were transcribed, and it is hoped to publish a proceedings volume to include these minutes and the four principal addresses, with illustrations.

Robert L. Bates

NOTE

It has been suggested that some of the State Sections may wish to hold formal or informal meetings -- breakfast, lunch, etc. -- in conjunction with the 8th Annual Meeting of AIGP in Denver on October 8-9. This may afford some of the State Sections who find it difficult to hold regularly scheduled meetings the opportunity of getting together for socializing -- or even conducting Section business.

If your Section is considering such a gathering, the Annual Meeting Committee will be pleased to assist in making arrangements for time and meeting space, and also hopefully to coordinate activities so that we may avoid some of the duplications and complications which generally arise. Will you please advise Howard E. Simpson, Housing Chairman, or Secretary Art Brunton, as soon as convenient, if you plan to hold a State Section meeting in conjunction with the Annual Meeting. Early reply will immediately qualify you for an honored position in our gallery of appreciated persons!

With best wishes and the hope of greeting you on October 8-9.

Sincerely,
Robert M. Lindvall, AIGP
A meeting of the Advisory Board of the American Institute of Professional Geologists was held in the Shamrock Hilton Hotel, Houston, Texas, March 27, 1971, pursuant to notice given by Chairman Henry H. Neel.

Chairman Neel called the meeting to order at 9:00 A.M.

The following is a list of Delegates or Official Alternates present at the meeting:

- California
  - William C. Gussow (OA)
  - Howard T. Anderson (D)

- Colorado
  - Richard D. Holt (D)
  - John B. Ivey (OA)
  - John W. Rold (D)

- Florida
  - F. Michael Wahl (OA)

- Illinois
  - Wilson G. Harris (OA)

- Kansas
  - Paul L. Hildman (D)

- Louisiana
  - Kenneth A. Harlan (D)

- Mississippi
  - Harold A. Karges (D)

- Montana
  - John T. Rouse (OA)

- New Mexico
  - Frank A. Kortlowski (D)

- New York
  - Sherman A. Wengerd (D)
  - Charles H. Behre, Jr. (OA)

- Oklahoma
  - Hans W. Schreiber (D)
  - Leroy Gatlin (D)

- Tennessee
  - Robert E. Hershly (OA)

- Texas
  - Max M. Crunk, Jr. (OA)
  - Wm. B. Heroy, Jr. (D)

- Utah
  - Robert R. Roady (OA)
  - J. A. Wheeler (OA)

Chairman Neel declared a quorum of the Advisory Board to be present and opened the meeting with a brief discussion of the report of the AIPG-AAPG Liaison Committee regarding the dual certification programs. Neel read the recommendations of the Committee and stated that it had been reported to the AIPG Executive Committee that the AAPG Executive Committee had not accepted the report as written. Neel then reported the action taken by the Executive Committee after discussions with James Lewis, President of the AAPG Professional Division. The Executive Committee of AIPG passed the following resolution:

"The Executive Committee of the American Institute of Professional Geologists proposed that representatives of all interested national geological societies be convened at a constitutional convention for the purpose of establishing a single professional society which will be the consolidation of all professional activities and memberships of existing geological professional organizations and will provide for the inclusion and representation of all geologic specialties."

Holt asked if it was planned to have the new organization under or a part of AGI. Wengerd reported that AAPG did not consider professional activity to be feasible under AGI. Harlan asked which organizations would be considered for participation.

Neel answered that it was assumed that all AGI Member Societies would be invited, but that AEG, SEG and SME would be prime participants because of increasing political problems.

Behre asked if the new society would include foreign members of present societies.

Neel stated that it was anticipated the new society would be an organization of individuals rather than of societies.

Heroy reported that legal counsel for AGI has issued the opinion that AGI can have a professional division without risking its tax status.

Gatlin expressed the opinion that the professional society must remain autonomous for the purpose of maintaining its professional flavor, particularly as regards political activity.

Schreiber stated that it should be agreed here that the new society must not be under or a division of any other organization.

Gussow expressed his opposition to the proposition for the reason that AIPG has been doing a good job in the professional arena, and the AAPG Professional Division will slowly phase out.

Crunk agreed that he expects the parallel certification program to "die-on-the-vine."

Hildman explained that too many emotional prejudices had developed, and that a new organization would overcome these prejudices.

Ivey stated that it is imperative that geologists unify under one professional organization now if they are to fit properly into the professional community.

Motion: Rouse Second: Wheeler

The Advisory Board endorse the resolution of the Executive Committee, and resolve to support any future action taken by the Executive Committee to bring about a unification of the profession.

Ayes - 20
Nays - 2

Chairman Neel called on Chojnacki to give his report on current legislative matters.

Chojnacki reported that a registration bill for geologists had been passed in Idaho and was awaiting the governor's signature. Nevada geologists are planning to submit a registration bill, as are the geologists in Oklahoma. A chartering bill has been introduced into the legislature in Colorado, but it is not expected that the bill will be acted on this year.
Rold explained that the geophysicists will be included in the Colorado bill at their request. Schreiber suggested that copies of all bills introduced in legislatures be distributed as soon as available. Gatlin suggested that notification of pending bills be printed in The Professional Geologist with information on how to obtain copies.

Motion: Schreiber Second: Gatlin

The Advisory Board recommended that the Executive Committee establish procedures whereby information regarding legislation is made available to State Sections at no cost to AIPG.

Ayes = 22 Nays = 0

The meeting was recessed at 12:00 Noon for lunch. The meeting was reconvened at 1:15 P.M. with a discussion of membership growth.

Karges stated that very favorable results were being achieved in Mississippi through personal contacts with prospective members. Delegates from the other states gave summaries of activities in their areas.

Gatlin brought up the question of requiring membership in an AGI Member Society as one of the qualifications for membership in AIPG. Gatlin suggested that a study of local societies be made to determine which are active enough to satisfy the requirement.

Brunton explained that such a study had been made in the past, and that some local societies had been approved as fulfilling the requirement, but some members of the Institute took quite vociferous exception to this new practice and it was discontinued. It was noted, however, that the Bylaws had been changed to allow the Executive Committee to approve a specific local society for a specific applicant.

One of the State Sections had questioned whether or not the Institute was concentrating too much effort on economic and employment problems and not enough effort on upgrading professional standards and conduct.

Karges stated that the Institute needs more members willing to work as hard as those conducting economic and employment studies, and equal results would be achieved in other areas.

Hilpman suggested that the answer lies in the fact that the work of the Employment Standards Committee is highly visible, and the work of other committees is less visible but no less energetic or effective.

Gatlin reported on the recent efforts of geologists in Oklahoma with regard to a proposed increase in taxes on natural gas. It was suggested that some of the problem probably resulted from a lack of strength in the state survey. Gatlin recommended that the Institute conduct evaluations of state surveys for the purpose of helping surveys to gain funds and strength to accomplish necessary projects.

Rold suggested that each delegation give a short report on possible employment problems in their areas.

**California**: One or two district offices have been shut down, but employees have usually been offered two choices of transfer. There is some anxiety regarding the slowdown in exploration activity.

**Colorado**: There is no immediate major problem. The decline of King Resources has created some unemployment and a few small companies have reduced staffs.

**Florida**: The employment situation in Florida appears to be stable for the present.

**Illinois**: Illinois exploration activity has been reduced to a very low level, and the number of geologists has stabilized at a low level.

**Kansas**: Employment situation is stable for the present except in state government. Reclassification of civil service grades has created dissatisfaction among geologists, some of whom are leaving.

**Louisiana**: There are no large scale problems. There were some inequities resulting from the Atlantic-Richfield-Sinclair mergers. The USGS is looking for qualified men.

**Mississippi**: Few major companies have offices in Mississippi. Most have moved out without wholesale layoffs.

**New Mexico**: The New Mexico Section keeps tabs on all geologists in the state. There has been a large influx of mining geologists, while most petroleum geologists in the southeastern part of the state have been transferred to Texas.

**New York**: New York is stable, primarily because it is headquarters area rather than an exploration area. Behre mentioned that there is a problem with regard to the large influx of foreign geologists who are immigrating to this country under the impression that there are many jobs available. Companies hiring these geologists have had difficulty because of language barriers.

**Oklahoma**: Many major companies are closing offices and many geologists have turned to consulting and are having difficulties staying in business. Most consultants would take salaried jobs if they were available.

**Texas**: Texas was hard-hit by the Atlantic-Richfield-Sinclair merger. Many senior geologists were let out and many would accept employment if offered. The situation in Houston and Midland is serious.

**Utah**: Utah is now relatively stable. Several years ago there was a major upheaval when oil companies moved offices out of the state. Mining exploration is on the increase, but budgets are still tight.

Anderson mentioned that a number of members in California were not entirely satisfied with the amendment to the Institute Bylaws regarding the requirement of a Master's degree.
COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS

Comments on Professional Problems from Petroleum Society Dropouts

A brief study was made to determine if there were professional reasons that caused geologists to resign from certain society affiliations in the petroleum industry. The study was supplemental to an earlier one titled Attrition among Geologists (The Professional Geologist, Oct. 1970) that showed that most ex-geologists had worked in the oil industry. Both studies were done as part of the work of the Committee on Professional Employment Standards of the American Institute of Professional Geologists. Opinions expressed here are those of the authors, and may not resemble the views of the Institute.

This review is based on (AAPG) reports from dropouts from the American Association of Petroleum Geologists during a three-year period. From 1966 to 1969, 1068 persons apparently left the AAPG for reasons other than death. Their names were obtained by manually comparing AAPG directories from one year to the next. The AAPG previously had declined to furnish us with names of dropouts. Of the total, 172 letters were returned because of bad addresses, leaving an inquiry of 896 persons, of these 192 replied, or 21 percent. Our attrition study provided us with 24 additional former society members from a University of Texas list. This response is lower than is usual for our inquiries and may reflect unwillingness by the recipients for discussions of their former society associations. The sample of 216 geological society dropouts was distributed as follows: 92 presently employed as geologists, 99 former geologists, 21 returned, and 4 unemployed.

More than 85% of ex-geologists left the profession between the ages 27 and 46, with the greatest withdrawals in the age periods 29-32 (25%) and 39-44 (19%). These people have been out of geology for periods ranging from one to 23 years. Four-fifths of this group left the profession three to ten years ago.

Financially, are these people better off outside geology? The table below suggests that those who left geology before age 35 have done significantly better than those who stayed. It further suggests, as have data collected for earlier studies, that years of experience have very little worth in terms of dollars. In 1970 the median starting salary for geologists with a master's degree was $10,500, according to figures published by the American Geological Institute. Geologists 30 years older earn about $4500 more, a difference of about 1.2% per year of experience. Note that the earnings of ex-geologists bear even less relationship to age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Geologists</th>
<th>Ex-geologists</th>
<th>Years Away from Geology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>17,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>18,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>19,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>14,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-55</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>17,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>14,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of those who remained in geology work in oil (46%), education (19%), mining (10%), and ground water (7%). Few earn over $25,000; four of these are "independents" and one a government hydrologist. Most of the ex-geologists are employed in nine categories. Those in teaching (15%), engineering (10%), insurance (4%), and sales, aside from retail and real estate (4%), generally have below average incomes; while those owning businesses (8%), in real estate (6%), in agriculture (4%), and in computer-related occupations (4%) are generally above average. About 6% are in management positions, with average incomes. Fifteen of the ex-geologists earn over $25,000. Four of these own businesses; four in real estate; two engineers; and the rest include a dentist, an insurance agent, a farmer, an educator and an "ad" man.

Why did these people leave their geological societies? Two-thirds of them indicate that their interests changed; that they are no longer interested in geology. Most remained members of AAPG for some time after leaving geology, and of course many people in AAPG today are ex-geologists. This survey turned up one man who had never practiced geology, but who had been an AAPG member for 30 years.

Why did the geologists leave AAPG? More than 40% indicate that the cost of dues is the main factor; whereas, only 18% of ex-geologists give this reason. Interestingly, this 40% had a higher average income from geology than did those who gave other reasons for leaving AAPG, and included one man who makes $55,000. About 30% of AAPG dropouts have changed specialties, such changes often having been induced by layoffs from petroleum geology and entry into teaching, mining, data processing and other pursuits within the realm of geology. A number of men dropped out preparatory to retirement. A few had complaints concerning the quality of the AAPG Bulletin. Summing up all statements, the consensus is that the reason for holding AAPG membership is receipt of the Bulletin, and that this bulletin now costs too much in view of present content and interest. Those who dropped AAPG generally did so on a selective basis, continuing as members of other geological societies. Of the 92 geologists, 83 are, or have been, members of more than one professional society. Of the 92, 63 dropped AAPG only. Twenty-nine dropped more than one society, and twenty-one dropped all.

Most of these geologists and ex-geologists feel that American Institute of Professional Geologists (AIPG) could be helpful in bettering the lot of geologists. How? The suggested ways, in order of importance, are: (1) as an employment agency and personnel data bank, (2) by dealing with employers as a bargaining agent, (3) by public relations activities and lobbying, (4) by raising professional status, (5) by informing students of the realities of geological employment, and (6) by helping universities to broaden geological education.

Some remarks are: "This is the optimum time to publicize geology and to organize geologists into effective lobby-pressure groups, yet there is no indication that any of our professional organizations are active in this type of movement."
"The profession needs one sound and strong organization to grant a license to practice."
"One national organization should be the leading force to rally the cooperative efforts of industry, manpower and education." "Establish a professional society similar in power and status to the medical society."
"Encourage geologists to register as professionals."
"License geologists." These feelings are not unanimous of course. One respondent says, "Remove restrictions placed on geologists by any kind of registration or licensing."
Inasmuch as only six people in this study are or were ever AIPG members, the comments are free of preconceptions that have affected AIPG members. Nevertheless there is a consensus. A society which would improve the lot of geologists, and especially petroleum geologists, would have to lobby for them, raise their compensation and status (partly at least by raising their standards), deal with industry in their behalf and control the number of geologists produced each year. Considering the various groups in America today ranging from the American Medical Association to the Teamsters' Union that have done and do exactly these things, there is no reason whatever why some organization should not do the same for geologists.

This is not to say that such a society will develop. Today, no group extant imagines that it can do these things for geologists, and hence none can. A goodly proportion of geologists responding feel that somehow their dignity would be impaired if they acted in their own behalf rather than accepting what is offered them. This proportion may be shrinking but is undoubtedly highly influential in the direction of existing geological organizations.

Would the 99 ex-geologists return to the profession if they could? Surprisingly, 42 say that they would. This does not mean that they would return to their old jobs. Their affirmative responses are often followed by conditional clauses such as, "...if the pay were better." There is also a component of nostalgia present in some replies, and we must discount the remarks of the people making $25,000+ who talk of a return to field geology. Those who would not return generally cite cyclic employment, instability and low pay as their reasons. Many have grown to like their new work better than they did geology.

Would they become geologists if they could again choose their profession? Two thirds of those who are presently geologists would do so, generally because they find the work stimulating and challenging, or like the fact that it is varied and that at least part of it is outdoors. Many also enjoy the associated travel opportunities. More than 40% of the ex-geologists would choose geology again. The reason most often mentioned is the challenge and stimulation of the work. Almost as many mentioned the outdoor nature of the work, a far higher proportion than among those presently employed as geologists.

What do or did these geologists and ex-geologists find disappointing about the profession? The factors mentioned most often are the layoffs and lack of public, professional and intra-company image or status. These two reasons comprise half the replies. Close behind are two others, low income and lack of opportunity for advancement. Those account for more than a third of the replies. Most of the remainder mention boredom, unwanted travel, and ethical problems. A man who was laid off ten years ago at age 33, and who had to reestablish himself outside the profession, offered a most eloquent and poignant
COMMITTEE ON DEFINITIONS

The Joint AIPG-SEG-AIME Committee on Definitions solicits your definitions, with comments, on the following terms from those interested in matters pertaining to ore reserves:
- Ore
- Ore reserves
- Reserves
- Exploration
- Development

Categories into which reserves might be subdivided

Please reply to:
Committee on Definitions
A. F. Banfield, AIPG
Suite 963
11 Broadway
New York, New York 10004

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Mr. Editor:

You will recognize soon enough that you and AIPG are not the target of my concern, but it is possible that you share it. The report of the Joint AAPG-AIPG Liaison Committee stated in part that

"There is a widespread feeling that AIPG dues are too high. Geologists certified by AIPG are reluctant to become members of another organization that requires twice as much in annual dues."

May I comment on that attitude from the standpoint of 34 years of AAPG membership and charter membership in AIPG. The comment is this: you can’t get something for nothing. This is not exactly news. However, reluctant AAPG members should keep these things in mind:

1. AAPG’s recent Executive Committee report notes that "...it costs $65 per member to operate our business; $22 comes from members’ dues. Other sources are advertising, publications, and subscription sales, plus convention income, for reasons that should be obvious, so its $25 national plus-local annual fee seems modest in comparison.

2. AAPG’s program of certification was originated in an attempt to strangle AIPG at birth. This unfortunate action was taken by a handful of AAPG members who improperly deemed AIPG to be a rival organization. Since it is not a rival, this bit of history is relevant to current problems, as history often is.

3. Despite the founding of AAPG’s certification program and the founding of SIPES, AIPG has maintained its leadership in purely professional, legal, and legislative affairs simply because that is AIPG’s sole business. It is not and cannot be AAPG’s business.

4. Some of our worst problems in California arose because, when faced with a statutory crisis, a number of people insisted that they were not just geologists, but instead were engineering or petroleum or mining geologists. Our experience here in professional divisiveness should be a lesson to anyone who pauses to think about it.

Miles Rader, E. L. Krinitzsky
Geologists need AIPG, even if it does cost each member a crippling $2.00 a month. AIPG is a classic case of something’s having been invented because it did not exist but a crying need for it did. It is remarkable that some geologists remain unconvinced and uncommitted.

Sincerely,
Robert H. Paschall, AIPG

Sir:

The February, 1971 issue of the AAPG Bulletin contains a lead article by Mr. Willis G. Meyer on an Environmental Geology Program. I would heartily recommend that all geologists and especially members of the AIPG read the article and consider their responsibility in this age of growing environmental awareness. Mr. Meyer’s article points out the fact that geology is indeed one of the fundamental disciplines relating to our environment. If geologists will not become proficient and leaders in environmental issues, our profession will take another regressive step towards becoming a nonprofessional trade.

I have been actively engaged in petroleum exploration and development for nearly 25 years. I am also actively concerned, in a geologic-related sense, with environmental matters and I have been a so-called conservationist for a greater length of time. I see no conflict between the two pursuits. However, as environmental issues become more acute and as more information becomes available, I have found most professional and industry associates becoming more and more polarized into frightening and often abysmally ignorant prejudicial attitudes.

I really do not know how to stem this tide but I would much prefer that professional geologists had the ability to carry the torch of environmental knowledge and rationality forward rather than tossing it at the feet of the rapidly increasing numbers of environmentally concerned citizens who are earnestly seeking answers.

Very truly yours,
Gerald Ganopole

PROFESSIONAL PARAGRAPHS

GARTH M. CAYLOR, AIPG, has been named to the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission by the Mayor. This is a direct result of activity by Tulsa AIPG members.

MICHEL T. HALBOUTY, AIPG, internationally known geologist and petroleum engineer, Houston, has been selected as the 1971 DeGolyer Distinguished Service Medalist by the Society of Petroleum Engineers (SPE) of the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical, and Petroleum Engineers (AIME).

HERBERT S. MAYBERRY, AIPG, has been elected as a Vice President of McAlester Fuel Company. He joined the company in 1966 as Assistant Secretary, was elected Secretary in 1968 and appointed to the Board of Directors in 1970.

FREDERIC F. MELEN, AIPG, spoke February 25 to the Sigma Gamma Epsilon chapter in Department of Geology and Geography, Mississippi State University, of which he is an alumnus. His subject was a comparison of the Carboniferous rocks of England with those of the Black Warrior Basin of Mississippi and Alabama.

E. R. POHL, AIPG, has been appointed Adjunct Professor of Geology at Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, the first use by the University of the Adjunct status. His work in Paleozoic stratigraphy was recognized.

FRANKLIN J. WEISHAUPL, AIPG, formerly manager of resource development for American Potash and Chemical Corporation prior to the company’s merger with the Kerr-McGee Corporation, has moved to Singapore and opened an office on Scotts Road as a representative and regional project geologist of Southeast Asia for United States Steel International (New York) Inc. His regional office will be concerned with business and mineral opportunities throughout Southeast Asia, involving joint ventures as well as corporate ventures.