EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

The second meeting of the Executive Committee for 1972 was held in Denver, Colorado on April 15. All members of the Committee were present and, in response to the standing invitation that Section Presidents attend, Ray Marvin of the Colorado State Section was present.

The first quarter 1972 Budget Comparison was presented by the Executive Director. Dues payments for 1972 are slightly ahead of what had been anticipated when compared with previous years. It was pointed out, however, that 112 members had not paid their 1972 dues as of March 31. Expenditures for the first quarter were almost exactly what had been anticipated.

President Rudd informed the Committee of his suggestion that the Executive Director make a tour of the western State Sections if funds could be made available. Brunton reported that the Institute had accumulated a small cash surplus during the four years since all Institute debts had been paid, and suggested that these funds could be used for this purpose as well as helping to defray the expenses of members of the Executive Committee for visits they might make to State Sections. President Rudd told the Committee that he intended to visit most, if not all, of the State Sections not covered by the proposed tour of Brunton.

The Executive Committee approved an expenditure for Brunton to visit Wyoming, Montana, Washington, Oregon and Utah in April-May, and to visit California, Nevada, Arizona and New Mexico in June. The Executive Committee also approved a budget item of $1,500 to help defray the travel expenses of Executive Committee members for visits to Sections.

Brunton reported that there had been some difficulty with applications which were prepared in an illegible manner. The Executive Committee instructed the Headquarters staff to return all illegible applications for proper preparation, and to take steps to inform future applicants of this new policy.

The Committee discussed the proposal for a change in the dues structure of the Institute to a graduated dues, and the possibility of an across-the-board increase in dues. It was decided that any action to be taken with regard to dues should be held in abeyance pending the outcome of negotiations with AAPG regarding a single professional society.

Hershey reported that the Tennessee Section had endorsed a proposal for the establishment of certification of earth science teachers in the State, and suggested that the Institute endorse a national program. It was decided that such a program should be discussed with the National Association of Geology Teachers.

The Committee voted to approve the proposed new bylaws and governing structure for AGI, and instructed the Delegates to the AGI House of Society Representatives to vote in favor at the House meeting on April 16.

President Rudd conveyed the recommendation and request of the Illinois Section that the experience requirements of the Institute be clarified and reduced. The Committee agreed that this recommendation should be an item for discussion at the October Advisory Board meeting.

It was reported that the Regulatory and Legislative Committee has been studying the question of legislative monitoring on a national or federal level. It was noted that the American Association of State Geologists have also been giving thought to this question. It was decided that the cost of such a program should be determined, and consideration be given to a joint effort by AIGF and AAGG. President Rudd agreed to meet with members of the Institute familiar with such projects, Faggiali in New York and Helmig in Washington.

The Committee approved a Louisiana Section recommendation that the Institute submit the names of three members for consideration by the Department of Interior for appointment to a committee to advise the USGS on the outer continental shelf problems. The members to be recommended are John C. McCampbell, Joseph D. Martinez, and Rhesa M. Allen, Jr.

The West Virginia State Section had recommended that small contiguous Sections be allowed to combine even though the Sections had more than ten members. This recommendation was tabled pending a study of Institute structure being conducted by a Committee on Goals and Strategy chaired by Henry Neel.

The Committee approved a presentation at the 1972 Annual Meeting of a certificate of recognition for the moon astronauts and the NASA geologists responsible for their geologic training.

(continued on page 4)
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STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL CONDITION
DECEMBER 31, 1971

ASSETS

Current Assets:
- Petty Cash: $25
- Cash in Bank: $5,717
- Certificate of Deposit: $36,000
- Prepaid Rent: $356
- Prepaid Expense - Annual Meetings: $900

Total Current Assets: $42,998

Property and Equipment:
- Office Furniture, At Cost: $2,160
- Less: Accumulated Depreciation: $1,700

Total Property and Equipment: $460

Total Assets: $43,468

LIABILITIES AND MEMBERS' EQUITY

Current Liabilities:
- Accounts Payable: $1,313
- Accrued Payroll Taxes: $605
- Dues Payable to State Sections: $4,776

Total Current Liabilities: $6,694

Deferred Income:
- 1972 Dues Received in Advance: $27,496
- Suspense Dues, Note: $1,760

Total Deferred Income: $29,256

Members' Equity:

Total Liabilities and Members' Equity: $43,468

NOTE: Dues paid by applicants are credited to the Suspense Dues Account until such time that they are approved or refunded.
GEOLoGY AS A PROFESSION
(Excerpted from a speech by President Rudd to the Annual Meeting of the Illinois Oil & Gas Association, February 4, 1972)

The words profession or professional are widely misunderstood and misused. Profession is not synonymous with vocation. A person whose life work is installing rivets is not a professional riveter, not in the true meaning of the word. He is a vocational riveter. There are three marks of a true profession. The first is possession of a large fund of specialized knowledge, substantially above and beyond that which one could expect to obtain without extensive study and training. The second mark is the willingness to make use of this knowledge for the benefit of others.

The third mark is the logical consequence of the first two. If the fund of knowledge required of a professional is beyond that which can reasonably be expected of intelligent members of the general public without intensive training and experience, and if the application of this knowledge is vital to the personal and economic well-being of society, who is to judge whether the services are competently performed to the best interests of the public or the client? For example, my knowledge of medicine is probably about average for the general public. I occasionally read the medical columns in the newspapers and magazines, I've spent some time with doctors and medical staffs and I can drop a few polysyllabic medical terms. The fact is that I don't know much about medicine nor would I have the first idea how to select someone to treat me nor how to judge whether I was being properly treated without some guidance from the medical profession itself. Even experience with a given doctor wouldn't necessarily help since, happily, most of my complaints are rather simple ones. Suitable experience at this level does not guarantee competence at a more involved level of medicine. I would hate to have to have a heart attack in order to determine whether our family doctor was competent to diagnose and treat such an event. If I can't trust my own knowledge and am unwilling to gamble on the test of experience, I must rely upon the willingness of those who have adequate knowledge and experience to provide me with a means of recognizing those who are competent to provide treatment. This means that they are going to have to undertake the responsibility of putting labels on competent practitioners and preventing those who are not competent from using such a label. They are going to have to define what makes good medical practice and enforce it. This is the third mark of a true profession, the willingness to accept the responsibility for self-regulation which is imposed by special knowledge used for the benefit of others.

Of course, some doctors are better than others but when a man hangs out his shingle saying "John Jones, M.D." I can assume that he is in possession of at least some minimum level of knowledge far beyond that which I can expect from members of the general public and that his medical and business practices fall within the standards accepted by the majority of his medical colleagues. I can have this confidence because I know that his M.D. means that he has successfully completed training under professional medical men, in a school accredited by professional medical men, and has received his license to practice and is under the authority of a state board composed of professional medical men.

An understanding of what has happened and is happening in professional geology depends upon an understanding of these three marks of a true profession: the possession of unique and superior knowledge, the willingness to provide services to others based upon this knowledge, and the recognition and acceptance of the responsibility to assure that this knowledge is used to the best interests of the public to whom it is offered. All three marks are essential to truly professional status. It is entirely possible to possess the requisite knowledge and not be a true professional. There are many individuals of great scholarship in all fields who fulfill the first requirement but are content with knowledge for knowledge's sake or for their own personal use and make no offer or profession of their services to the public. The study of the earth is so fundamental to so many of Man's requirements and enterprises that professional service has been characteristic of geology from the very beginning; nevertheless, until the early part of this century geology was largely a scholarly pursuit. Commercial geological services were provided primarily by teachers and scholars on a part-time basis. There were relatively few consultants or industrial geological staffs. With some oversimplification it may be argued that, prior to the early twentieth century, the science of geology had only one of the marks of a profession.

Then, very rapidly, the search for oil, and to a lesser extent other minerals, created a demand for geological services far exceeding the supply of part-time professors. A new type of geological scientist became important, one who was oriented towards both scholarship and service. Geology had obtained the second mark of a profession.

The third mark has been long in coming. There have always been individual geologists, the vast majority, who were fully professional in their practice and who have accepted not only personal responsibility but who have tried to encourage segments of the profession to accept joint responsibility for proper geological service. Several geological organizations took the first important steps; first, recognizing the problem and second, establishing minimum standards for professional stature and providing a means of identification. For example, election as a Fellow of the Geological Society of America has long been a greatly prized mark of professional accomplishment. But these were only first steps towards attainment of the third mark of a true profession in that they were internal and passive standards, largely unknown outside scientific circles. Anyone could, as they still can in most states, style themselves a geologist and undertake geological employment with no training whatsoever in the field. If a geologist's work was incompetent or resulted in personal or economic damage, that was unfortunate but the profession itself took no responsibility for it.

Only in the last decade have we seen the beginning of full acceptance of the third mark of the profession. Geologists are now recognizing their professional identity and responsibility. Even if they did not do so willingly, it would be imposed upon them. The role and importance of geology in many areas of activity is increasingly being recognized by the public. With this recognition comes a natural public concern about the
caliber of the geologist performing the work. But our profession can take pride in the fact that it did not take external pressure to make us adopt the third mark of professionalism. First on the local level and then nationally, geologists have begun to accept the responsibility for judging the competence and regulating the practice of those who claim geology as their profession. That is the significance of the letters A.I.P.G. which many of us proudly append to our names. They stand for the American Institute of Professional Geologists, a national organization representing geologists in all fields of endeavor working jointly on mutual professional problems. This organization has, more than any other organization, accomplished the third mark of professionalism for geology. It has provided the "label" by which the nongeological public can recognize those who possess minimum educational, experience, and character requirements for geological practice and means and framework for professional regulation. Certainly the A.I.P.G. serves geologists but, more important, it serves geologists in truly serving the public. In accepting this responsibility to society, geology has at last attained the status of a true profession.

COURAGE, CONVICTION, AND CONCERN THE BASES FOR SCIENTIFIC PROFESSIONALISM

By Sherman A. Wengerd, President

The American Association of Petroleum Geologists

"The great end of life is not knowledge, but action."

...Thomas Huxley

We must assume that the geologists that join A.I.P.G., A.A.P.G. Professional Division, and/or S.I.P.E.S., and the geophysicists who wish SEG to develop a certifying arm for their geoscientists, A.E.G. for theirs, and A.I.M.E. the same, are scientists first and professionals second. These scientists are charged with searching for the truth about the earth in a business like way, and at a profit. I believe that exploration scientists are the most courageous of all scientists because they have convictions that are continually being tested, not only for "rightness" of their theories, but also for the profitability of their endeavors. Yet W. E. Wickenden, former President of Case Institute, once said in The Second Mile,

"Every calling has its mile of compulsion, its daily round of tasks and duties, its standard of honest craftsmanship, its code of man-to-man relations, which one must cover if he is to survive. Beyond that lies the mile of voluntary effort, where men strive for excellence, give unrequired service to the common good, and seek to invest their work with a wide and enduring significance. It is only in this second mile that a calling may attain to the dignity and the distinction of a profession."

Our work must thus be concerned with the good we can do for humanity - an urge that springs from the spiritual depths of fewer geoscientists than we may hope.

Tarred with the brush of industrialism, we have been shrinking violets in ivory towers (to mix two trite phrases); fearful of the I.R.S., THE O.P.E.C., THE N.E.A., THE F.P.C., THE F.T.C., and every other acronym emanating from governments. Industry has risen to fight. So have many geologists, but not enough. A concern unfollowed by conviction and unfortified by courage is a hollow concern. The scientific professional is hampered by lack of numbers and inadequate financing because so many will not join in the fray ("The dues are too high."

"I don't have time."

"My wife says we can't afford it."

"Why should I do anything for the profession? Look what it's done to me, or what has it done for me?")

The apathy of the scientist is legion, but what about the professional? To be concerned is an acquired social trait; to be overly concerned without the scientific facts is dangerous. Witness the number of ridiculous statements by preservationists who wish to correct social wrongs by one bold unscientific factual stroke. I place in exactly the same category the geoscientist who says, "I've got mine, buster, too bad about you. Why should I join A.I.P.G.?" The answer is not just education, but the courage to evince our convictions and then pursue rigorous action via cooperative effort.

Sir Francis Bacon once said, "I hold every man a debtor to his profession; from which as men of course do seek to receive countenance and profit, so ought they of duty to endeavor themselves by way of amends to be a help and ornament thereunto."

Sure it's unpopular to be a nonconformist when so many geoscientists are conformists holding jobs rather than pursuing goals. We must seek not only the solution to difficult scientific riddles but also the betterment of mankind. Would that we could all see the greatness and goodness of the profession of exploration for natural resources and their wise conservation through diligent action. I challenge every one of you to stand up and be counted - now!

"The only way to achieve true success is to express yourself completely in service to society."

...Aristotle

POLITICAL INFLUENCE

Through the efforts of the Minnesota-Wisconsin Section, a geologist has been selected to administer the recently enacted "Water Well Contractors Licensing Act" in Minnesota. This is the type of influence A.I.P.G. Sections can and should exert more often.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (continued from page 1)

The problems of having two certifying organizations was again discussed in detail. This brought up the question of possible A.I.P.G. action should the AAPG accept and implement the recommendations of the Joint Liaison Committee (Sloss Chairman) that A.I.P.G. be the sole certifying body. The Executive Committee unanimously approved the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT, if the majority recommendation of the Joint Liaison Committee under the Chairmanship of L. L. Sloss is approved and implemented by AAPG, the Executive Committee of A.I.P.G. agrees to accept all certified petroleum geologists, members of the AAPG Professional Affairs Division, as full members of A.I.P.G.

It was noted that the next meeting of the Executive Committee would be July 14 and 15 and this meeting was adjourned.
ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
APRIL 16, 1972

A meeting of the Advisory Board of the American Institute of Professional Geologists was held at the Downtowner Motor Inn, Denver, Colorado, April 16, 1972, pursuant to notice given by Chairman Robert R. Berg.

Chairman Berg called the meeting to order at 8:30 A.M. and requested a call of the roll of Delegates and Official Alternates. The following Delegates or Official Alternates were present:

California
    Gary E. Melickian
    Henry H. Neel
    Bennie W. Troxel
Colorado
    Willard G. Owens
    William A. Newton
    Raymond C. Robeck
    Raymond G. Marvin
Florida
    F. Michael Wahl
    Neilson Rudd
Illinois
    John J. Amoruso
    Paul M. Strunk
Kansas
    Frank A. Exum
    John J. Pedry
Louisiana
    Henry L. Cullins, Jr.

It was noted that there was not a quorum of the Advisory Board present. It was decided, however, to continue with the business of the meeting since the actions of the Advisory Board are not binding as official business of the Institute.

It was moved and seconded that the Advisory Board recommend to the Executive Committee of the Institute that 20% of the eligible Delegates or Official Alternates be set as a quorum for any meeting of the Advisory Board. The motion carried.

Chairman Berg reviewed the history of discussions between AIPG and AAPG regarding the problem of having two certifying organizations. These discussions led to a report by the Joint Liaison Committee under the chairmanship of L. L. Sloss, which recommended that AIPG be the sole certifying body. The Delegates reported that their Sections were overwhelmingly in favor of a single professional and certifying organization, and most had taken steps to inform AAPG House Delegates from their areas of this desire.

In answer to a question from Cullins, it was reported that the present Liaison Committee, James Wheeler, Chairman, was proceeding with the preparation of a Constitution and Bylaws for a new single society should such a society be necessary. Robeck asked about specialty certification within AIPG should AAPG approve the Sloss report with that stipulation. It was the consensus of the Delegates that the majority of AIPG members would accept such a program if necessary for the elimination of the confusion of overlapping certifications.

Chairman Berg opened the discussion of Institute dues structure with a review of the financial status of the Institute.

The State Sections had been asked to discuss a graduated dues system, a sustaining member dues, and a general increase in dues. Most members present reported their Sections opposed to a graduated dues system, with some Sections in favor of a sustaining member dues. Hershey reported that the Tennessee Section recommends a $5 increase in dues for 1973, and a concerted effort to increase the membership by 30%. If the 30% increase in membership is not met, the recommendation is for an additional $5 increase in dues for 1974. Marvin reported that the Colorado Section recommends that no action be taken regarding Institute dues until the single society matter is settled with AAPG. It is entirely possible that a large increase in membership from the AAPG Professional Division would obviate the necessity of an increase. It was the consensus of the Delegates that no action be taken regarding Institute dues at this time.

Upp opened the discussion on registration with a review of the history of the proposed Oklahoma Licensing Bill. Robeck and Marvin reported on the status of the proposed Colorado Bill, stating that the Bill was being prepared by a committee composed of members representing all scientific societies in Colorado. Strunk reported that the engineering geologists are pushing for a registration law in Texas. The Texas Section is conducting a survey to obtain the opinions of all Texas geologists. Hershey reported on the results of the questionnaire printed in the March issue of The Professional Geologist. The results indicate a 3 to 1 response in favor of registration. Pedry and Owens expressed the opinion for their respective Sections that the Institute must guide all state bills so that a maximum uniformity can be obtained.

The question of accepting proxy votes at Advisory Board meetings was again discussed. Exum expressed the opposition of the Wyoming Section to acceptance of proxy votes for the reason that the original questions presented to Sections for a given action are generally revised in discussion at the meeting to the point that final action does not agree with action acceptable to the Section. Kilgore expressed the New Mexico opposition to proxy votes. Hershey stated that Tennessee supports the acceptance of proxy votes, but wants the acceptance limited to questions discussed by State Sections, and on which the Delegates have been instructed. Upp expressed the support of the Oklahoma Section for this limited acceptance.

It was moved and seconded that proxy votes be accepted only on those agenda items previously discussed and voted on by State Sections, and upon which Section Delegates have been instructed. The motion was defeated by a vote of 17 to 3.

Rose of Oklahoma brought up the problem of the conflict between the Advisory Board meeting and the meeting of the AAPG House of Delegates. He suggested that future Board meetings at AAPG conventions be held a day earlier. It was noted that this had been tried before, but few Delegates wanted to come to the convention a day earlier. It was also noted that this was the first year that the AAPG House of Delegates had met on Sunday instead of the usual Monday.

Pedry again suggested that AIPG nationally coordinate all state registration laws. Robeck suggested that the model
registration law available at Institute headquarters be rewritten to conform with existing laws and laws being considered.

Chairman Berg announced that the question of clarification and reduction of the Institute's experience requirements would be an item on the agenda for the October Advisory Board meeting.

Cullins suggested that all applicants for membership be given a brief training in the history, purposes and programs of the Institute. All applicants should be made aware of the professional and ethical aspects of their membership, and the problems encountered by the Institute in its activities. President Rudd stated that the Officers would give the suggestion careful consideration.

The Advisory Board meeting was adjourned at 11:00 A.M.

RESULTS OF THE EDITOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE

A total of 301 questionnaires were returned. The views on registration are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Employed</th>
<th>Government Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Registration</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>For Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Registration</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Against Registration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academically Employed</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Registration</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Registration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answers to a choice of goals for AIPG are as follows in order of the number of votes in each category.

GOAL NO. I
1. Promotion of one professional society (this includes a few votes for AIPG and AAPG to merge)*
2. Attaining professional recognition
3. Promoting registration
4. Upgrading the profession
5. Strengthening the profession
6. Expand publicity
7. Expand the membership
8. Establish and evaluate the professional qualifications of geologists
9. Lobbying
10. Involvement in environmental problems
11. Many other suggestions were made by individuals some of which are worthy of projects for AIPG and some of the remarks were at least interesting. Your editor suggests that most members take a course in penmanship.

*Many of those voting for one professional society indicated that AIPG Certification should be accepted as indicative of competence to practice nationwide.

GOAL NO. II
1. Actively work for registration
2. Establish standards to protect the public
3. Publicity and public relations
4. Strengthen the profession
5. Enhance the image of the geologist
6. Promotion of one professional society
7. Upgrade the profession
8. Increased political activity
9. Increase our membership
10. (a) Involvement in environmental problems
    (b) Involvement with governmental agencies in regard to mineral policy.

GOAL NO. III
1. Publicity and public relations
2. Strengthen the profession
3. Upgrade the profession
4. Promote one professional society
5. Increased involvement in environmental problems
6. Protection of the public from unethical practices
7. Advisory service to governmental agencies on environmental problems
8. Maintain and promote ethical practices
9. Involvement in politics
10. Increase membership and finances

GOAL NO. IV
1. Lobbying
2. Evaluation of the professional qualifications of geologists
3. Establish standards to protect the public
4. Protection of the public from charlatans
5. Promote one professional society
6. Publicity and public relations
7. Advisory service to government officials for the public welfare
8. Political watchdog but not lobby
9. Create public awareness of geologic hazards
10. Upgrading geological education

GOAL NO. V
1. Promote one professional society
2. Proceed toward academic accreditation
3. Political involvement
4. Increase our membership and finances
5. Others

MEMBERS WHO HAVE RECENTLY RESIGNED

BARKDULL, J. E. LUTZEN, E. E.
BUDDENHAGEN, H. J. MALLOY, R. E.
DAHLGREN, E. G. MOODY, G. B.
GREENWOOD, R. WAGNER, J. K.
QUESTIONNAIRE NO. 2

The questions of other classes of membership in AIPG and different experience requirements have been discussed at several Executive Committee and Advisory Board Meetings with strong feelings for and against other classes of membership or changing the qualifications. The membership at large has never voted on these proposals but many members, in answering the previous questionnaire, expressed the need for action on changing membership qualifications. This questionnaire is a straw vote on several recommendations that were made.

1. Junior Membership (Masters Degree but less than present experience requirements)
   □ For
   □ Against

2. Change experience requirement from 8 years to 5 years past the Bachelors Degree
   □ For
   □ Against

3. Provide for a student membership
   □ For
   □ Against

4. Provide for corporate membership*
   □ For
   □ Against

5. Sustaining membership*
   □ For
   □ Against

6. Keep the membership status quo
   □ For
   □ Against

*These were proposed to increase dues.

Please return this to:

Bob Hershey, Editor
G-5 State Office Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219
CORRECTION

Your editor regrets the fact that Dr. A. S. Furcron was listed in the last issue of T.P.G. on the suspended member list. Dr. Furcron died in 1971 but we did not know of his death. He was Director and State Geologist of the Georgia Department of Mines, Mining and Geology for many years.

PROGRESS REPORT - 1972 ANNUAL MEETING

Hugh Montgomery is preparing a dynamic program for the Friday afternoon meeting with the theme: "The Professional Geologist, His Community Impact and Concern."

The program will consist of a panel of professionals including a geologist, all of which have interacted with the natural resources field in their careers. A brief biographical sketch on four of the six panelists follows.

Dr. Gordon Everett is a geologist with the Environmental Protection Agency and is responsible for policy enforcement. His topic will be "Geology, An Interdisciplinary Mode for Solving Conflicts Between Man and His Natural Environment."

Mr. Vincent Fuma is Pennsylvania Commissioner of Professional and Occupational Affairs and will discuss "The Basic Philosophy and Theory of Statutory or Other Restraints on Professional Practice."

Mr. Vernon Frye is an expert in water resources management within the larger activity of local economic development. His remarks will reveal how the pace of local development demands increasing complex disciplinary approaches to solving problems of resource availability and environmental restraints in local growth.

Attorney Herbert Fishbone is a private counselor to the cement industry who specializes in corporate defense against citations under air, land, and water quality control legislation. His remarks will reveal the unfolding statutory scene, its meaning to the world of the natural resources profession and business, as well as that of the public prosecutor. Special insight will be noted on how business can guard against illegal events and professionals can best provide the service the legal expert needs.

I will keep you informed in regard to other speakers to be publicized in the "Communicator" as our Friday afternoon program slots are filled.

Derek B. Tatlock, Publicity Chairman

ETHICS COMMITTEE TO STUDY HYPOTHETICAL CASES

No code of ethics, no matter how well written, can possibly foresee all the complexities of professional practice. It's one thing to state a general principle and another to interpret that principle relative to specific circumstances. For this reason, most professions have found that their published code becomes only a set of general principles and that the detailed operational guides to professional performance develop much as does our civil law, by the precedent established in the review and decision of individual cases.

Until the last decade there have been very few instances where a geological organization was called upon to render a decision on professional ethics. Most cases of disciplinary action by various geological societies followed action in the civil or criminal courts. As we have developed a higher degree of professional awareness and consciousness of our responsibilities to the public, the whole question of professional ethics has taken on a much greater degree of importance. While we hope that it will rarely be necessary, the power of certification carries with it both the authority and the obligation of ethical discipline.

Clearly the best time to consider professional ethics is before a specific case arises. It takes the personal factor out of investigations of professional impropriety. If a situation involving professional ethics has been publicly discussed within the profession and if a consensus has been reached and publicized, there are two obvious benefits. First, the decision will be more broadly based and more carefully reasoned than one made under the pressure of an actual investigation involving specific personalities. Secondly, public discussion of these issues within the profession should largely eliminate the plea of ignorance from the one accused.

Happily our Committee on Ethics has not been excessively busy with actual cases in past years. When I took office, I suggested to Fred Stead that it might be well for them to consider hypothetical cases and issue tentative opinions which could be presented in the TPG and discussed by the membership through the "Letters" columns. To get the ball rolling, I have drawn two or three hypothetical questions from comments which the members have made to me. The first is reported on in a following article. I feel quite confident that various members will suggest other hypothetical questions which the Committee on Ethics can study in the future.

Neilson Rudd, President

HYPOTHETICAL ETHICS PROBLEM

"An independent petroleum geologist develops a prospect which he 'sells' to an independent operator or promoter for an override. In earning his override, he is required to write a geological report which will be used in promoting the drilling venture and will be retained to provide geological supervision of the drilling operation. While this is a very common circumstance in many parts of the country, there is obviously a conflict of interest. The geologist's opportunity to recapture his time and research expenditures rests upon the promoter's success in raising the necessary money, and this in tum depends, at least in part, upon the 'salability' of the geological report. Further, assuming some marginal 'shows' in the well, it is to the advantage of owners of royalty interest (including the geologist) that pipe be set and completion attempted, even though the risk may be great to the owners of the working interest. Is it good ethical practice for a geologist to be in such a conflict of interest position? Should he make full disclosure of his interest to all other parties in the deal and in what fashion? Even with full disclosure, what standards of objectivity (discussion of the negative aspects as well as the positive aspects of the
prospect) should be expected in the geological report? Should a geologist who routinely becomes involved in ventures of this nature style himself as a 'consultant,' recognizing that investors (particularly those inexperienced in oil exploration) often take this as implying impartiality and a concern for their interest as clients, a condition which might not be the case?"

ANSWER: This situation need not present a conflict of interest, assuming the geologist is honest and adheres to either the AIPG or AAPG Code of Ethics. Geologists who "consult" should technically have no economic interest in the project, property, or prospect being evaluated. This is customarily stated in the "disclaimer statement" which should accompany each consultant's written report. If the geologist prepares a report in which he has an economic interest, this should also be clearly stated and understood by the client. At this point, the prudent geologist should recommend that the client engage the services of a qualified third party to further evaluate the prospect. If a geologist routinely becomes involved in drilling ventures, retaining an economic interest, he does not qualify as a true consultant, but becomes a geological promoter. Unfortunately, the difference between these two is poorly understood within the profession, as well as by the public.

"WHAT IT TAKES TO BE AN EXPERT WITNESS"

When our genial editor's request for a guest editorial reached me, my first inclination was the obvious one of telling about the beginnings of AIPG. But my mind was changed by a field trip to Kettleman North Dome oil field, conducted by the Pacific Section of AAPG and its affiliates. Thirty-five years ago, I served as an expert witness on a very important lawsuit pertaining to that field. My client was the Board of Directors of Kettleman North Dome Association, the defendant in the case.

A handful of old-timers on the field trip remembered the lawsuit. Two, in particular, urged me to write, for publication, what it takes to be an expert witness. In recalling our editor's request, I decided this was a suitable subject for an editorial in a publication devoted to professionalism.

From the cases on which I have served, some significant points were impressed upon my mind. I hope they will prove useful to others, particularly beginners. Practically everything I am going to say is well known but may be forgotten under stress.

1. It goes without saying that one of the fundamentals is to learn the case so thoroughly that, when you are on the stand, with no one to fall back on, you will have control of the situation. This requires not only knowing the points in your favor but those that favor your opponents as well.

2. Don't quibble. Hammer home your strong points without cluttering the case with trivia.

3. "One picture is worth a thousand words." Illustrate your points as clearly as possible with maps, charts, graphs, and other appropriate exhibits, so the judge or jury will understand them. Once more, don't cloud the picture with inconsequential things.

4. "Honesty is the best policy." Some witnesses try to deceive the court. If their falsehood becomes apparent, their effectiveness is destroyed. Some basically honest witnesses become so obsessed with the desire to win that they bend their consciences and are evasive if not untruthful. Don't try to defend an indefensible position. (An honest witness is sometimes dismayed to find that another witness is not honest. However, most witnesses are honest and helpful.)

5. Nearly every case has something favorable to each side. If the weight of evidence is against your side, advise your clients to save expense and frustration by making a settlement. If you have a strong case, readily concede the points that favor your opponent, if you are asked. This will make a strong impression on the judge or jury, and they will believe the points you make in favor of your side. It is very important that you appear honest as well as be honest.

6. If you are naturally fluent and have the ability to use the right word at the right time, you have a great deal going for you. Some witnesses are honest but unable to express their thoughts effectively. Some witnesses talk too much and, thereby, open up points for their opponents to attack. Others try to look important by using high-flown language. A witness is constantly being evaluated by those who observe him, particularly the judge. A forthright presentation is the most effective.

7. Lawyers come in all varieties. In nearly every case, an expert witness knows more about his subject than the examining lawyer, and need not fear his questioning. It is only when the witness himself is inadequately prepared that he needs to worry. Some lawyers come into court miserably unprepared. I remember one case in which a lawyer was so busy with politics that he didn't know what he was talking about in court, and kept using inappropriate words.

8. Some clients withhold vital information from their experts and even their lawyers. In one flagrant case, a pair of sisters were being sued by a man they hired to act as their agent in dealing with a lessee. He was paid a percentage of the income. After several years they tired of this and stopped paying. Naturally he sued for what they owed him. My recollection is that it was $35,000. The dominant sister pretended she was just a poor, dumb woman, who didn't understand the oil business. The plaintiff countered by producing a sheaf of letters she had written him, urging him to keep the heat on the company to drill more wells. Her lawyer was unaware of the existence of these letters. The plaintiff won.

9. Judges often give little intimation of what they think of the testimony during the trial, sometimes to the dismay of the litigants. The witness may think he is not getting his point across when he actually is.

10. Some companies expect their experts to make a satisfactory presentation, while barring access to vital information. This confronts the expert with an intolerable situation from which he had better withdraw, when it becomes apparent to him.

11. Some clients try to dictate an expert's testimony. I can recall three cases where I was not permitted to testify when I insisted upon presenting my own views. Independent conclusions are vital to expert opinions. A concomitant requirement is that the expert must have an open mind.
12. Do not underestimate your opponent. Assume he is, at least, as smart as you are.

Much more could be said but this is not the place for going into more detail.

Martin Van Couvering

OBITUARIES

CAREY CRONEIS, AIPG 656, once Chancellor and acting President of Rice University, died in January after a month of ill health following surgery. Dr. Croneis was one of the nation's leading geologists, had been active in state and civic affairs, and had taken a concerned part in Rice teaching and administration until his retirement last August. Upon retirement he was made Chancellor Emeritus. The Rice community honored him with a memorial service.

Dr. Croneis was graduated (1922) from Denison University with junior-year Phi Beta Kappa honors. He took his doctorate at Harvard in 1928 and immediately joined the faculty of the University of Chicago. He was also Head of the Hall of Science at the Chicago World’s Fair (1934), as well as a member of the First National Science Foundation Committee on Mathematics, Physical and Engineering Sciences.

Dr. Croneis was a past president of the American Geological Institute, the National Association of Geology Teachers, and the Society of Economic Paleontologists and Mineralogists. He was the author or co-author of several books and numerous scientific articles and reviews.

RICHARD (DICK) L. PIERCE, AIPG 358, Geologist (Paleontologist) for the U.S.G.S. Branch of Paleontology and Stratigraphy for the past six years, died on January 24, 1972 in the Stanford Medical Center following two heart transplants and subsequent complications.

Dick was employed in 1952 in Long Beach as a paleontologist by Richfield Oil Corporation. In 1957 he was transferred to Bakersfield as the District Paleontologist. He was employed in this capacity until 1966 when he elected to accept employment with the U.S.G.S., where he served until his death.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dear Sir,

Some time ago you sent a questionnaire to which the membership was polled for their opinions on the primary reasons for the existence of AIPG. I have given this much thought and, although late, would like to express my views on the subject. I believe that the essence of its reason for being is to properly inform and protect the public and to advance the profession of geology. To this end I believe the AIPG should work toward establishing the concept that certification with AIPG is tantamount to state registration and should be so accepted when a state is considering the need for legislation concerning registration. This would be of obvious advantage to AIPG, but more so to the given states inasmuch as the financial requirements for establishing the state board of registration would be greatly lessened. Furthermore, and probably of greater importance, the public would be assured not only of competent scientists but ethical ones also, inasmuch as AIPG screens on an ethical basis.

The second most important function of AIPG should be simply to "lobby" for the profession. This would take the form of looking after interests of the profession in the Congress and in various state legislatures. Of equal importance, it would include the exertion of pressure on users of members of the profession to adopt socially responsible personnel policies. Most specifically this would apply to corporations exploiting natural resources (e.g., oil companies, mining companies, etc.) where cyclical employment is compounded by wholesale severance of exploration staffs.

In short, our raison d'être is to promote a profession worthy of respect by society, and which is, in turn, respected by those it serves.

F. L. Doyle

PROFESSIONAL PARAGRAPHS

JOSEPH JENSEN, AIPG 2082, chairman of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, was honored today by the American Association of Petroleum Geologists for "outstanding achievement" in the conservation of petroleum and water resources in California. Jensen, 85, accepted the award from Sherman A. Wengel, president of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, at a luncheon meeting of the Los Angeles Basin Geological Society.

KIRTLEY F. MATHER, CPG 1472, formerly of Harvard University and currently enjoying retirement in Albuquerque, is now a member of the New Mexico State Section.

HOWARD ROTHROCK, CPG 9, has been named to head the Environmental Improvement Agency (ELA) for New Mexico.

STATE SECTION NEWS

FLORIDA

R. O. VERNON, AIPG, was on November 16, 1971 appointed Director of the Division of Interior Resources, Florida Department of Natural Resources. In this capacity he will have the Bureau of Geology, Bureau of Water Resources and Bureau of Waterways under his supervision. Replacing Dr. Vernon as Chief of the Bureau of Geology and as State Geologist of Florida is CHARLES W. HENDRY, JR., AIPG.

KANSAS

Several AIPG members participated in a symposium cosponsored by the American Institute of Planners and the American Institute of Professional Geologists in Wichita, Kansas. The following AIPG members spoke at the symposium: W. R. CREATH, AIPG, Co-Chairman (Introductory Remarks); RAYMOND STRoud (Mineral Resource Development, Metropolitan Areas); PAUL HILPMAN (Environmental Impact Studies: Boon or Burden); DAVID RICHARDS (Application of Hydrogeologic Data to Urban Planning); WILLIAM V. KNIGHT (Terrain Analysis and Environmental Mapping).

MISSISSIPPI

The Mississippi Section of the AIPG played an active part recently in securing an amendment to Mississippi State Oil and Gas Board Statewide Rule 24 requiring that logs be released to open files in that state after a reasonable period of time. This was for a period not to exceed one year from the date on which it was filed.
### APPROVED BUDGET 1972

#### ESTIMATED INCOME:

1. **Dues from 2115 Active Members**
   - $42,300.00
   - Less delinquent accounts: 1,000.00
   - **$41,300.00**

2. **Transfer from reserve dues account**
   - 80 applications pending 1-1-72: 50 approved before 1-1-72 ... $1,000.00
   - 30 approved 7-1-72 to 9-30-72 ... 360.00
   - **1,360.00**

New applications received in 1972 (dues to reserve account):
- 140 @ $20 ... ($2,800.00)
- 50 approved in 1972 ... 1,000.00
- 90 in suspense to 1973 ... (1,800.00)

3. **Processing Fees**
   - 140 @ $5 ... 700.00

4. **Interest**
   - 900.00

5. **Sale of insignia material**
   - 100.00

**Total Estimated Income**

$45,360.00

#### ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES (see Page 2):

A. **Administrative**
   - $23,489.00

B. **GHQ Operations**
   - 13,616.00

C. **Membership Services**
   - 8,255.00

**Total Estimated Expenses**

$45,360.00

---

(continued next column)

#### B. Operations GHQ:

1. **Rent**
   - $3,000.00

2. **Office Supplies**
   - 1,236.00

3. **Microfilming**
   - 100.00

4. **Addressograph**
   - 120.00

5. **Printing**
   - Applicant lists ... $540.00
   - Forms ... 500.00
   - Certificates ... 350.00
   - Xerox ... 1,100.00
   - **2,490.00**

6. **Postal Costs**
   - General ... $1,900.00
   - Applicant list ... 1,000.00
   - Ballots, dues notices ... 200.00
   - Directory ... 225.00
   - **3,325.00**

7. **Telephone**
   - 900.00

8. **Depreciation**
   - 310.00

9. **Services by Others**
   - Audit ... $1,750.00
   - Legal reserve ... 300.00
   - AAPG card ... 85.00
   - **2,135.00**

**Total Operations GHQ Expenditures**

$13,616.00

#### C. Membership Services:

1. **Publications**
   - The Professional Geologist ... $2,000.00
   - 1972 Directory ... 2,350.00
   - Procedures Manual ... 500.00
   - Newsletter (Communicator) ... 1,120.00
   - **$6,155.00**

2. **AGI Dues**
   - 2,100.00

**Total Membership Services Expenditures**

$8,255.00

**TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES**

$45,360.00