THE DILEMMA OF THE GROWTH OF PROFESSIONAL GEOLOGY

Ten years ago AIPG was formed out of the ashes of the Professional Standards Committee of AGI to serve the profession of geology. That it has grown and served a need is evidenced by the 2,267 members enrolled and the countless numbers of activities with which the Institute has been involved.

Despite our growth there have been geologists who have stayed away sometimes because of their fears of guildism, their intense personal feelings about the independence of geologists, or just because they were poorly informed about the objectives of AIPG. Then, too, there has been in the background a resistance on the society level of becoming involved with professionalism when tax status was involved, i.e., whether to be 501-C-3 or 501-C-6. There has been one exception — the growth of the DPA of AAPG to about 1,400 members. However, its recognition of professional activity has brought little effective action.

The past ten years have brought marked changes in the nature of geologic employment away from an under-employed profession, and a generally passive one, to the present where fuller employment exists, and geology is in a more active advocate position. Such significant events as the moon shot, the environmental awakening of the 60’s, and the energy crisis have placed the geologist in the public limelight. Because of these activities there has indeed been professional growth with the beginning of regulative controls on geologists, and geologists, with registration occurring in California, Idaho, Delaware and legal certification in Maine.

For geologists as professionals there are new horizons of the likes we have not seen before. The possibilities seem unlimited. Yet there is still the lingering matter of the need of a single voice in professionalism. To date AIPG has been the strongest and only one. However, despite our growth in members and personal understanding of professional matters, there are those outside of AIPG who want to be a part of the general movement but are not in agreement entirely with our objectives - or have failed to understand them. They are seeking to have AGI reenter the realm of professional matters again. Is it to be that this is a ten-year cycle, AGI and AIPG?

What course do we as AIPG members have in light of the events of this past year? The Sloss Report was defeated by the narrowest margin leaving AIPG and the DPA of AAPG apart once again. Our approaches to SEXG and AEG have been marked with only partial success. However, from these efforts there does seem to be a greater desire for accommodation both within AIPG, as evidenced by the passage of the By-Law changes regarding specialty certification and the Constitutional Pre-amble change to make our objectives more diverse, and within AGI by proposed activities of a newly formed planning committee to work on recommendations concerning the matter of a single professional society.

AIPG is now well equipped to accommodate other specialties into the Institute on the basis of certification. We have also taken a stand squarely in support of registration as an activity of professional growth. Our advocate position is aided by retention of a legal counsel in Washington. We have carried out our programs and remain financially sound within the limits of those programs.

Is this enough? Should we seek to make further accommodations by listening more closely to the desires of the fledgling AGI planning committee on the single professional or umbrella society concept? This committee is headed by our President for 1974, Frank Conselman. Though only recently formed on November 18 from an ad hoc committee on Certification and Registration of AGI, its objectives will be to seek an accommodation between the four societies previously involved - AIPG, AAPG, SEXG and AEG with some observer societies. How far should AIPG go in its cooperation? That will be the question for 1974.

The growth of AIPG has been steady, built on the experience of ten years. Some mistakes have been made but yet the basic structure of state sections and a strong Constitution and By-Laws makes it novel as an organization in flexibility to handle professional matters. What then should be our attitude toward any proposed change or accommodation not directly representing our views on professionalism?

The Institute policy has always been to listen and to plot a steady course. This policy, your writer agrees with, for change for change's sake is never the answer. Therefore, it would seem prudent not to weaken our resolve to be a better professional organization as AIPG, but rather to remain autonomous, to continue to strengthen our committee work, our legislative liaison, our State Sections, our registration and certification policies and naturally our efforts to increase membership while listening to proposals. The indications of interest in (continued on page 10, column 2)
FROM THE COMMITTEES

The AIPG Ethics Committee has recommended that the AIPG Code of Ethics be expanded to include a clause on the use of disclaimers. This item was discussed at the Annual Business Meeting in New Orleans, but was tabled because it was felt that the general membership was not familiar with the problem. Fred Stead, chairman of the Ethics Committee, has supplied the following statement for your consideration and comments. Send your views to Executive Director Brunton who will transmit them to Fred; do it soon so you won’t forget. (The 1974 Executive Committee meets on January 25-26.) The Ethics Committee statement follows:

DISCLAIMER, PUBLIC OFFERING, AND DISCLOSURE

Evaluations of oil and mining properties contain reserve analyses, economic projections, discounted present worth, etc. These estimates of value are critical to development and method of financing of the property. The geologist who prepares the report usually does not control its end use and therefore he can be legally vulnerable. For example, geological reports are frequently summarized and synthesized in a public-offering prospectus; thus the geologist may be quoted “out of context,” and may be later accused of misleading the prospective investor. For this reason, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission now insists that all geological, engineering, and evaluation reports be printed in full. Most states, however, do not make this requirement of local intrastate public offerings – and so the geologists run the risk of being misquoted and possibly being sued.

To avoid this risk, the geologist is advised to submit a Disclaimer with all his reports, which contains the following statements:

(a) The attached report was prepared as an independent geological evaluation for the client. All comments, observations, calculations, conclusions, and recommendations are the sole responsibility of the writer, based on all data available at this time.

(b) The writer is a professional geologist with ___ years’ experience.

(c) The writer has no economic interest or ownership in the subject property – neither does he anticipate nor expect to receive an interest therein as payment for services rendered in the preparation of this report.

(d) Signature and date.

Several states, plus all the Canadian stock exchanges, now require that a disclaimer be attached to all reports prepared by geologists for public offerings. It behooves the consulting geologist to incorporate disclaimers in all of his reports. The disclaimer preserves his integrity, regardless of the calibre of his client, and limits his personal liability. Also, if the geologist preparing the report has an interest in the property or in the company developing same, he must disclose this ownership. Full disclosure is the rule; nondisclosure is a breach of professional ethics.
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GEOLOGIC HAZARDS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

With Howard Coombs (AEG) as chairman, an Ad Hoc Committee on the Study of Geologic Hazards in the state of Washington was organized on November 7 under the parentage of the Senate Commerce Committee. The Committee includes people with the following backgrounds: engineering geology (2 AEG), geophysics, hydrology, architecture, structural engineering, environmental geology (AIPG), planning, and soils engineering. In addition, it includes a city building inspector, an insurance adjuster, a representative of the Associated General Contractors, a real estate broker with a county planning commission, and an environmental coordinator who is a lobbyist who is self-taught in geology. Gerald Thorsen, with the Washington Division of Geology and Earth Resources, is the AIPG member on the Committee.

The Committee is to study the geologic hazards to determine the degree of hazard present now and in the foreseeable future, to evaluate steps being taken to mitigate the danger to people and their property, and to propose legislation and/or policy implementation needed to mitigate reasonably the danger. Specific hazards cited are landslides, flooding, earthquakes, lahars, and volcanic activity.

A final written report is due 60 days before the regular session of the 1975 legislature convenes.

Seven of the 17 committee members are members of C.A.S.C.A.D.E. (Citizens and Scientists Concerned About Dangers to the Environment), an environmental geology lobbying organization of about 100 members, which has been in existence for about a year. Its birth and growth were affected greatly by introduction last February of a geologic hazards bill (S.B. 2659), and C.A.S.C.A.D.E.’s influence resulted in a strong geologic hazards section in the Governor’s land-use planning bill (H.B. 791). Its members include scientists, engineers, doctors, secretaries, business people, students and housewives. (If you wish additional information, write Ms. Janet M. Cullen, State Coordinator, C.A.S.C.A.D.E., 419 South Central, Olympia, WA 98501.)
ADVISORY BOARD MEETING - OCTOBER 10, 1973

A meeting of the Advisory Board of the Institute was held in New Orleans on October 10, 1973 with 29 Delegates or Alternates attending.

At the request of the Executive Committee, the Advisory Board discussed an amendment to the Bylaws that would provide for a reorganization of the Advisory Board. The proposed amendment would reduce the number of Delegates to the Advisory Board to one per State Section, with each Delegate having one or more votes based on the numerical membership of the Section. The Advisory Board recommended that the Executive Committee present the amendment to the membership at the Annual Business Meeting for vote.

The Advisory Board recommended to the Executive Committee that:

- The Institute establish a permanent system of monitoring proposed registration laws.
- The Institute assist State Sections in the preparation of registration laws.
- The Institute coordinate efforts to further the enactment of, or defeat of, proposed registration laws.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING - OCTOBER 10, 1973

The fourth and last scheduled meeting of the 1973 Executive Committee was held in New Orleans on October 11, 1973. All members of the 1974 Executive Committee were present at the invitation of President Honkala.

President Honkala reported that the Institute had formally contracted for the services of James U. Hamersley to act as the Institute’s Legislative Counsel in Washington, D.C. Jim was present at the meeting and explained the procedures by which he hopes to be of greatest service to the Institute.

The Executive Committee discussed a number of changes in the Code of Ethics as recommended by the Ethics Committee. Nine of the recommended changes were approved for presentation to the members at the Annual Business Meeting and for mail balloting by the general membership. Headquarters was instructed to mail the ballots for the proposed changes in the Code of Ethics, together with proposed amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws, to the membership on November 1, 1973.

Acting on a recommendation from the Advisory Board, the Executive Committee approved an amendment to the Bylaws providing for the reorganization of the Advisory Board. It was decided that this amendment would be voted on at the Annual Business Meeting.

Vice President Simon reported on the preparation of a "White Paper" on registration and certification. It was decided that the committee that prepared the paper be charged to draft a policy resolution on registration for consideration by the Executive Committee.

ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING - OCTOBER 13, 1973

The Annual Business Meeting of the Institute was held in New Orleans on October 13, 1973. President Honkala gave his State of the Institute report and Vito Gota father reported on the financial status of the Institute.

The members present at the Annual Business Meeting voted to approve the following amendment to the Bylaws:

ARTICLE VI. ADVISORY BOARD

Section 1. Members.

The Advisory Board shall be composed of one Delegate from each State Section of the Institute. The Delegate from each State Section shall be either the President of the Section or his delegated representative, preferably from the Executive Committee of the Section.

Each Delegate to the Advisory Board shall have one or more votes based on the membership of his Section. Each Section shall be entitled, upon organization, to one vote and additional votes for each 100 members of the Section, or major fraction thereof. The scale of representation intended is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Members</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-150</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-250</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and continued for each additional increment of 100 as required.

The members present at the Annual Business Meeting also voted to approve the following amendment to the Bylaws:

ARTICLE X. FINANCES

Section 3. Dues.

A. Institute (first sentence only):

Annual membership dues shall be $30.00 due and payable on the first day of January; except that, members who have retired from active employment shall have the option of paying full annual membership dues or one-half the annual membership dues.

The members present at the Annual Business Meeting voted to adopt the following resolutions:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT, this Assembly, representing the American Institute of Professional Geologists, officially recognize the outstanding contributions of the large number of members who have faithfully served the Institute and the profession by their voluntary work on committees during the past 10 years.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT, this Assembly, representing the American Institute of Professional Geologists, officially recognize the dedicated and faithful service of our Executive Director, Arthur F. Brunton, whose contributions to the well-being of the Institute over the past 9 years have aided greatly in the professional stature which the Institute enjoys on its 10th Anniversary.

Institute Committees presented their annual reports.

SPECIAL NEWS ITEM

AIPG Editor Allen F. Agnew has accepted the newly created post of Senior Specialist for Mining in the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress. He will report for duty on January 31, 1974. Mail should be addressed to him in care of Environmental Policy Division, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540. A more complete statement will appear in the March TPG.
STATE SECTION NEWS

How can we get the news from the State Sections for TPG? On December 7, 1972, I wrote to all 28 State Sections listed in the 1972 membership directory, attaching a form for reporting news and asking for copies of newsletters, press releases, etc.

Using the names that had been supplied to Executive Secretary Art Brunton, the Editor contacted the 22 State Sections through their presidents and secretaries. Only 15 of the 28 State Sections replied during the year (see table below) and only seven sent material more than once with only one replying three times. None sent us material for all four issues of TPG. This is understandable, we guess, but we should certainly think that more than seven would have something reportable at least twice a year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did Not Reply (13)</th>
<th>TPG (7)</th>
<th>TPGs (7)</th>
<th>TPGs (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Ore.</td>
<td>Colo. N.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind. Utah</td>
<td>Fla. N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa-Nebr. Va.</td>
<td>Miss. Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minn. Wis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do the State Sections communicate with their members? Only four have newsletters—at least that’s all which send copies to the TPG Editor (Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas). We are sure that more than four State Sections have newsletters! But why not all of the 28? After all, 10 Sections had more than 50 members on January 1, 1973, and 21 had more than 25 members. Such Sections ought to create news and their members deserve to read about it. (And the TPG Editor would like to, also.)

State Sections, ranked in order of number of AIPG members a year ago, were: (*) = newsletter received

- Texas* 351
- Colo. 286
- Calif. 241
- Okla.* 118
- Penna. 68
- La.* 66
- N.M.* 60
- Wyo. 56
- N.Y. 53
- Mont. 50
- Va. 46
- Ohio 44
- Tenn. 44
- Utah 44
- Miss. 40
- Mo. 37
- Ariz. 27
- Tenn. 27
- W.Va. 26

Let’s try it again; only this time the request goes out in the pages of TPG. State Section presidents and secretaries, please report your news to the Editor by the following 1974 dates:

- March TPG - January 11
- September TPG - July 12
- June TPG - April 12
- December TPG - October 18

And remember, State Sections, the Editor would like to get copies of your newsletters.

Now, with that off our chest, the following State Section news was received in time for this issue of TPG.

CALIFORNIA

The Annual Meeting of the Section was held on September 15 in Ventura. The program addressed professionalism and public service, as highlighted by the following talks by AIPG members:

- H. H. Neel - "The Professional Geologist Today—What Direction?"
- F. L. Stead - "The Geologist and His Obligation to Society—The Practical Aspects of Professional Ethics"
- S. A. Ogle - "Independent and Consultant Geologists: Are They in Business Practicing Undiagnosed Bankruptcy, or Involved in an Unacknowledged Hobby?"
- J. F. Curran - "State Geologist Board Report on Current Activities and Status of Continuing Education"
- Gordon B. Oakeshott - "Geologists in Public Service"

In addition, Dr. Clemens A. Nelson, Professor of Geology at UCLA, spoke on "Future Education for Professional Geologists.

(Why can’t we get him to apply for membership —Ed.)

LOUISIANA

This past summer the Louisiana Legislature enacted Act No. 125 (S.B. 108). Although modified considerably by amendments, Act No. 36 (sic) is at least recognition, for the first time by the Legislature, that the timely release of well-log data is important to the geological community of Louisiana.

The first fall meeting of the Louisiana Section occurred on September 27, when a talk on environmental impact of the offshore oil industry on the Louisiana fisheries was presented.

The Louisiana Section was host to the National AIPG Annual Meeting, October 12-13, as is reported on in the separate Proceedings volume. The Louisiana Section chose this time for its meeting, on October 11, at the headquarters hotel in New Orleans.

The New Orleans Chapter met on September 20 and on November 15 to hear talks on Earth Science teaching methods and student-interest generation, and on sulfur, respectively.

The Lafayette Chapter met on July 6 and September 27 to hear a talk by National President Ad Honkala, and one on the environmental impact of the oil industry on the Atlantic Coast.

NEW MEXICO

The August Section newsletter cited three items on which members were urged to take action: (1) proposed land-subdivision regulations by each county, (2) the present controversy concerning the New Mexico State Bureau of Mines, and (3) registration of geologists in New Mexico.

Sherm Wengard’s editorial stated the situation with regard to No. 2 clearly and forcefully. The conflict appears to have been the result of the revised chain of command decreed under pressure by the New Mexico Tech Regents on April 13, 1973, when it ordered the Director of the New Mexico State Bureau of Mines and Mineral Resources to report to the Regents only through the President of New Mexico Tech. This put a by-pass in the direct line of communication that had existed since 1927 when the Bureau was established by the Legislature, as its director was then mandated to report directly to the Board of Regents of the then New Mexico School of Mines. As a result of the April 13, 1973 action of the Legislature, Bureau Director Don H. Baker, Jr. resigned, Associate Director Dr. Frank E. Kottlowski became Acting Director, and a search committee appointed by the Tech Board of Regents began searching for a new director.
Re No. 1, all counties of New Mexico were to have had their proposed regulations on subdivisions drafted and hearings held in August and September. As of August, several counties were reportedly requiring that water-supply plans or reports be "prepared by or under the supervision of a registered professional engineer." The wording of H.B. 170 (the State Subdivision's control bill) was "water scientist." State Engineer Steve Reynolds correctly observed that the latter term is vague; however, it would permit qualified unregistered professional geologists as well as qualified registered professional engineers to certify as to water supplies. Because, says the Section, many hydrologists in New Mexico are more qualified than most registered professional engineers, and because the water-supply qualifications of neither of these two categories of professionals were spelled out, members of the New Mexico Section were urged to communicate with county commissioners and state legislators.

The great importance of No. 3 is underlined by No. 2. Representatives of the various geological societies in New Mexico (including AIPG) have formed a committee to continue the evaluation of registration of geologists and geophysicists, including the possible maintenance of an updated registration bill for submittal to the Legislature, if and when necessary. The proposed act to register geologists and geophysicists in New Mexico was defeated in the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 7, 1973, although supported by a majority of New Mexico geologists. Its defeat probably resulted from (1) strong opposition in the state government to creating new registration boards, (2) a vociferous minority opposition, and (3) the lack of a strong lobbying effort in favor. It is expected that another registration bill for geologists will probably not be considered before the 1975 session.

OHIO

The Annual Meeting of the Section was held on October 24 in Columbus. Greg Klosterman reported on the National AIPG Annual Meeting and Bob Bates spoke about some thoughts on the geologic profession. The Section had planned two quarterly meetings in Columbus during 1973 and three regional meetings—in Cincinnati, Canton, and Finlay. In addition, monthly meetings were to be held in Columbus.

At the Middletown (Cincinnati) regional meeting January 31, 1973, John Heckard talked on registration, and a committee was appointed to define geologic hazards in Ohio as a background for future registration. The Canton regional meeting in April had to be cancelled, so the next one was set for Columbus on June 20, where Bill Shafer talked on professionalism.

The idea of regional meetings bombed out. At Middletown most attendees were from Columbus. The Canton meeting had to be cancelled for lack of attendance. Too few attended the Columbus regional meeting, which was held any way. The two regional meetings did show that geologists are individualists and are not easily led but stand (sit) firm and refuse to participate, all the while complaining about those who would usurp their professional jurisdiction. If we do not soon join together it may be too late; the lawyers will have written the legislation for the engineers, architects, and planners, many of which still believe that there are underground rivers and are devotees of Henry Gross.

(The Pennsylvania Section had expressed the same complaint earlier this year and undoubtedly other State Sections are experiencing it also. Let's look alive, AIPG members who don't participate in State Section activities! --Ed.)

PENNSYLVANIA

Dick Wright, who has been working on a registration act for geologists in Pennsylvania, polled the members; of 47 returns, 46 favor some form of state registration. The south-central region held a cookout at Ron Landon's in Harrisburg this summer. The registration poll was discussed, as well as the need for a lobbyist to help in the licensing effort before introduction of the bill in the Legislature.

TEXAS

The Section Executive Committee met in San Antonio on July 28 and the Annual Meeting was held in Houston on October 26 in conjunction with the Gulf Coast Association of Geological Societies. In the September newsletter, Ross Shipman reported on legislative happenings as follows: H.B. 311, the controversial mandatory oil and gas mitigation bill, was killed by the Senate despite hard work by Lt. Gov. Bill Hobby to round up enough votes for passage. H.B. 311 included clauses that recognized AIPG certified geologists as professionals qualified to make reservoir studies.

House Concurrent Resolution 16 was the only mining legislation that passed this session. Bill Clayton's resolution set up an interim committee to study strip mining in Texas and report back in two years, with recommendations, to the 64th Legislature.

H.B. 1431 and S.B. 645 called for the inventory of land resources and planning for the development of a statewide land-resources management program. Although the legislation was received favorably (apparently) by the House Environmental Committee, it was rejected summarily (7 to 0 vote) by the Senate Natural Resources Committee.

On the subject of environment, the Appropriation Conference Committee deleted the word, "environmental," everywhere it appeared in the bill that provided funds to state agencies, to colleges, and to universities—apparently the result of disenchantment on the part of several senators with environmental efforts.

An interesting sidelight is that a spurt in applications for membership coincided with the time when the controversial mandatory oil and gas mitigation bill (H.B. 311) was pending. Interest in this bill and its near passage stimulated recognition of the need for membership in AIPG, as geologists became aware that members of the profession were working effectively to assure that geologists were recognized in the bill.

For another item on AIPG services, see "Help for the Mayors" elsewhere in this issue.

WASHINGTON

The first annual informal meeting of the Washington Section was held off the mouth of the Columbia River on June 9 on
a boat chartered by Gerald T. Sweeney, Section President. The day's fishing brought salmon to all 11 who attended, with the largest -- a 19-pounder -- being landed by Ernie Gilmour. Other activities of Washington AIG members are reported on in two other sections of this issue of TPG.

WEST VIRGINIA

The Annual Business Meeting of the Section was held in Parkersburg on September 27. In recognition of the need for definite, short-term, realistically attainable goals for the Section, three new committees were formed: (1) an ad hoc committee to compile all present and proposed state registration bills, and to prepare a composite bill for general discussion at the next meeting; (2) a committee to monitor the State Legislature, to keep aware of proposed legislation related to or affecting geologists or geology, and (3) a committee to prepare an accurate list of geologists and geophysicists residing or working in West Virginia. The latter committee's list is necessary so that any proposed registration bill may be adequately circulated for comment before being inserted into the legislative process.

Goals for the coming year are: (1) prepare a first draft of a state registration bill for geologists, with an eye on its review and revision for consideration by the 1975 Legislature; (2) more frequent Section meetings -- the next one is scheduled for midwinter in Morgantown.

The Section recently extended the term of officers from one to two years, so the Section officers remain unchanged for 1974.

AIPG AND THE NEA

The following letter from Kirk Badgley contains a lot of food for thought. We have noted our disagreement in a couple of places, but by and large we agree with him. Note particularly the segments quoted from the NEA article at the end of his letter.

October 7, 1973

Editor:

The recent issues of TPG seem quite concerned with two subjects, Registration and Professionalism. Feedback is requested, so here is my contribution . . .

Registration

First, to qualify myself, I was in on the final California arguments prior to passage, and am presently in on about the same stage of legislative endeavor with Colorado and Wyoming. I am a member of RMAG, WGA and am registered in California, No. 2212. The points missed by most geologists are:

(1) Laymen legislators will, in some degree, register us if we don't help register ourselves either at the State or National level.

(2) Legal or Court status and Security and Exchange (SEC) regulations, for all practical purposes, demand registration by some public regulatory body if the geologist's opinions and reports are to be taken seriously! He must be accountable to someone in authority. Too much money and public property is involved for us to blandly or naively think otherwise.

Professionalism

I am somewhat surprised that, after 10 years, AIPG still has fuzzy ideas as to what a professional geologist is and what his/her professional standards are. Perhaps quantification analysis is needed. (We fail to see how one can quantify a subjective area such as this -- Ed.)

There are, in TPG and elsewhere, suggestions that we emulate the Legal and Medical Professions. Perhaps this is reasonable since they were probably next in line to the world's oldest profession. However, Geology, or Earth Science, is a relatively new profession. I feel our requirements and standards are closer to the CPAs and Engineers. My memory retrieval of statistics is somewhat vague, but I think about 70% of our people are employed in industry (with 80% of those employed by the giant natural resource corporations), about 15% are in Teaching and 15% in Government. Aren't most doctors and lawyers self-employed?

If the above percentages are somewhat correct, then I feel we could use our precious time and manpower evaluating the corporations within Fortune's top 500 before we spend the effort on evaluating geology or earth science departments in higher educational institutions -- although I admit that they too need to be put under the microscope. However, the accreditation system's efforts should be recognized. Instead, we should be concentrating on those giant corporations -- their hiring, firing and retiring practices; their policies and responsibilities while operating as members of a free economic society under laws given and made by a free people and supported by taxes of a free people.

Another industry, the aero-space business, has had as many ups- and-downs as the natural resource business. (Natural resources is kinda broad; minerals and fuels don't always behave like first resources on land -- Ed.) They took the responsibility of smoothing those waves by pressuring Congress to finance retraining and relocating programs through the Department of Labor and affected State's Employment and Training Departments. This was a natural move since so much of that business is governmental.

The natural resource companies, being mostly if not entirely in the private sector, need to be made aware of their responsibilities toward their resource finders and developers by funding a similar program. After all, they smooth their own ups- and-downs by cash reserves, diversification, etc. We are largely specialists and the companies demand specialists (try finding a job as a generalist). We aren't paid enough to bridge the economic gaps or to retrain or upgrade our training and/or relocate. Such organizations as the American Petroleum Institute or the American Mining Congress need to be the clearing house or organizer of such funding. The taxpayer, through state and national legislation, shouldn't be burdened with solving private sectors problems.

It is also my firm opinion that our wonderful wives shouldn't (be forced to) sacrifice their time . . . with our children and their own way of life by having to work so that Joe Geologist can "consult," return to school, look for water in a desert of geologist employment or look for work in a new career field for which he has no training and is "overage." I don't believe these wives
or relatives should subsidize (what are) the responsibilities of the richest corporations on this wonderful earth.

I submit that there are enough retired (early and other-

wise), replaced, and laid-off geologists available to adequate-

ly evaluate those corporations as to their employment and de-

employment practices. After all, they are mostly public stock

companies and should legally be subject to scrutiny.

I believe that our free-enterprise system, with its profit

motive, is the natural, greatest and fairest way to go. I some-
times think that the big corporations are... irresponsible. They

feel free to drill, dig and do their own thing with a minimum of

interference. They too don’t seem to realize that with

freedom comes responsibility—in their case responsibility to-
ward their employees, the air, water, soil, wildlife, etc.

The first responsibility of any organization is to protect

its members: citizens (government), doctors (AMA), engineers
(NSPE), and geologists (AIPG). I loudly say “Amen” to W. J.
Hunter (TPG, 9/73, p. 12), “AIPG must offer something posi-
tive to its members—-.” I loudly say “Boo” to Prof. D. C.
Van Siclen (TPG, 9/73, p. 10), “It takes two parties to nego-
tiate and I do not care to join a union—-.” Since when does
negotiating imply joining a union. We Americans have been
negotiating since our existence. Such is the free enterprise
system! I agree with the rest of his (Van Siclen’s) letter, how-
ever.

Enclosed is a National Education Association article with

their president’s current thinking concerning Professionalism
(Helen D. Wise, Today’s Education, Sept.–Oct. 1973, p. 4–5). NEA is perhaps the largest professional organization in
existence. When reading this article, try substituting “geolo-
gist” for “teacher” and “company” for “school board.” To the
staid, self-satisfied, long-employed industrial geologist or
tenured professor or civil servant the article would sound highly
radical, but to the average geologist with three or four jobs in
ten or less years, six months or more out of work and standing
in the unemployment line with (the) impoverished and ill-
trained of our society, the words would ring with a great deal of
truth. The article then brings a sense of reality to the ge-
ology profession.

Random Thoughts About Our Profession

Termination of Geologists: How much help should the
government give a laid-off geologist in the way of an in-hand
written recommendation on the company letterhead acknowl-
edging his contributions, his areas of specialty, his length of
service, and the TRUE reason for termination. I believe the
man should not have to beg for this letter, cover or cringe, or
act as if the company were doing him a favor for his length of
service.

The responsibilities of a professional organization toward
its dues-paying members: For geologists, I submit that AIPG
was originally stimulated toward organization because of the
employment situation and the cutthroat practices of well-sitters,
etc. I believe AIPG’s original intent was to protect the geolo-
gist. AAPG certainly wasn’t doing the job, nor GSA, SEPM,
AIME, etc. The implication now seems to be that AIPG was
formed to protect the Public. I could believe that if our group
were full of charlatans, quacks (cracks?), etc., but we aren’t

and weren’t. We were and are plagued by unemployment al-
though at present the industry seems to again be reaching the
peak of its usual 11-14 year cycle of activity.

Where is a national AIPG Placement Committee, cleaning
house, or constant jobs available center? Is such a thing
“unprofessional” or does it smack of “unionism”? BAH! HUM-
BUG! The first job of any organization is to protect its mem-
bers. I am an active member and director of Forty-Plus of
Colorado. There is a professional low-cost way for members to
help themselves as that group of Administrators and Execu-
tives is doing.

New Members and Effective Action: Some sort of grand-
father clause should be used so that blanket endorsement of all
members of national geology or earth science organizations
could be accepted with a minimum of effort and time. Sure,
a few unqualified individuals would be admitted, but that isn’t
as bad as now where 90% of the geologists don’t care to join
for one reason or several! To have political clout and financial
stability, AIPG needs members!

Financial Suggestions

(1) Become recipients of geology materials (maps, books,
etc.) as willed or donated by executors/members. Hold auc-
tions and/or sell stuff.

(2) Become recipients of overriding royalties by grateful
members/public.

(3) Form a Credit Union for members.

Sincerely, Kirk Badgley

EDITORIAL

Is Teacher Advocacy Compatible With Professionalism?

By Helen D. Wise, NEA President

I am a teacher advocate. For 18 years as a junior high
teacher, I devoted my energy, time and efforts toward the
improvement of education and the teaching profession.

I worked outside the classroom representing teachers and
inside the classroom on behalf of children.

I spent long hours at the bargaining table for my local as-

sociation, I led a demonstration of thousands of teachers against
a do-nothing legislature; I participated in dozens of strike ral-

lies and all-night bargaining sessions, and I have been on many
picket lines.

In short, I am a militant. During this same period I was
involved in hundreds of workshops and in-service programs. In
the past 10 years, I completed my doctorate, developed an in-
novative program for individualized instruction using an articu-
lated team approach, and wrote a course of study with text for
slow learners. I sponsored student council activities, chaper-
oned school picnics and dances, and spent many hours coun-
selling youngsters.

In other words, I am a professional teacher. I maintain
that spending time at the bargaining table working hard to se-
cure full rights for my fellow teachers as employees does not
mean that I am less professional when I enter my classroom. By
serving as an advocate for teachers through my organization, I
do not lose or abandon my education, my experience, my abil-
ity, and my desire to communicate with children, or my com-
mitment to those youngsters.
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In fact, the reverse is true, for by applying my experience, knowledge, and support to my Association’s determination to improve education and the profession, I fulfill a truly professional commitment.

I am an activist. While it is recognized that many teachers throughout the nation are similarly dedicated, some would attempt to separate professionalism and militancy, contending that the NEA cannot be both an advocate organization and a professional society.

Today, the teachers’ concept of their role in society has changed, fortunately, and they have determined that their organization change with them. Accordingly, NEA is becoming as strong and powerful as it is large because it is responding to the needs and demands of the changed professionals it represents.

The professional classroom teacher is no longer the quiescent, compliant teacher of 30 or even 20 years ago. He is no longer automatically a professional because he is a teacher; he is a professional because he commands the respect of his peers, his students, and his community.

He has earned that respect because he is better prepared; he has more expert knowledge about the subject he teaches than does the school board member who seeks to rule him; he is determined to be involved in the policy decisions which affect his welfare as well as his teaching conditions; and, most importantly, he wants a career as a teacher, for he knows that to work in the classroom with children is to be at the heart of the educational process.

Professionalism is not synonymous with apathy, acquisitiveness and passivity. The professionalism we espouse is one of deep personal and professional commitment which will determine the educational destiny of children.

Thus it is my belief that teacher activism is more than compatible with professionalism—it is synonymous!

One of the most important aspects of our professional activism responsibility is to provide the leadership to make things happen, to become involved, to get things done, to speak for all members. This means willingness to take stands, to make changes, to be different and creative, to provide answers to problems, to speak out—to be activists.

The task is great, but the alternatives are unthinkable.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Recently Clayton H. Johnson took us to task for our remarks about sinkholes in the September TPG. He cites Webster’s 3rd New International Dictionary (Unabridged) as his authority for “groundwater”; you will recall that we poked fun at that spelling, and made our case in parallel with surface water. Our only response to Clay is that even great authorities such as Webster’s 3rd N.I.D. (U.) do not have to be correct. One need only observe the permissiveness with which the Webster’s 7th allows ungrammatical and incorrect terms to be adopted simply because they are in common use; as a favorite figure of ours (Humpty Dumpty in Through the Looking Glass) once observed (and has been forever quoted), “When I use a word ..., it means just what I choose it to mean, neither more nor less.” So, we choose to claim victory (or at least a stand-off) on our choice of spelling.

However, he nailed us on another one. We referred in the September TPG, in an item about a Rochester, Minnesota sinkhole, to “one cement-block basement wall” that began to sink. Although “cement” and “concrete” do possess the same initial letter, he reminded us that they are not synonymous. He said that we should be taken to task if that was our usage and not that of the Minneapolis Star. We quickly checked the original news item and breathed a sigh of relief upon noting that it said a “cement block wall.” However, further introspection revealed that we had omitted quote marks, so must accept our punishment of having repeated this all-too-common error.

Thanks, Clay, for keeping us on our toes.

JOIN THE WORLD

When President Ad Honkala visited the New York State Section last May, the program related to the professional geologist’s responsibility regarding environmental problems. Jim Dunn expressed his views to Ad in response to the program and, at Ad’s urging, wrote the following letter. Because it points out not only the costs but also the gains in becoming actively involved—not just in AIPG but also in scientific societies and trade organizations—we felt that the letter should be of interest to the AIPG membership. The letter follows:

May 23, 1973

Dear Ad:

Since our meeting Tuesday night, it has occurred to me that it could be of value to AIPG to review some of the reasons for the greatly increased use of geology in New York State since 1960, along with the philosophical and economic justification for the DGC participation in the religious spade work leading to much of the increase.

First, philosophy and economics. As you realize, DGC (Dunn Geoscience Corporation) is extremely active in AIPG at several levels. We are also active in other technical societies as well as trade organizations. The justification for being in trade organizations (such as aggregate producers or mining company organizations) is self-evident, although most geologists still seem reluctant to join such groups. We justify membership in certain other organizations as being a part of one’s professional and scientific development, even though there is no discernible economic return to DGC.

Our strong interest in AIPG is economically and philosophically justified with these statements: First, we are all, I believe, interested in being good professionals. Our long-term self-interest is served by strengthening the profession of geology. Good professional geologic work anywhere helps us in the long run, whether the good work is by professionals in industry, government, by teachers, or by other consultants (including direct competitors). We also feel that the converse is true. (Incidentally, I do not consider this philosophy to be unique, having heard similar expressions from members of large engineering firms.)

We do have a problem at times in that we may get carried away in our zeal and run up exorbitant costs. Nevertheless, in the long run we feel that the money is well spent, although many businessmen may not agree.
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Now, how has the use of geology increased in New York State--and, more important, why?

1. In 1960 the N.Y.S. Department of Transportation first required annual source reports for all quarries in the State that wanted State acceptance. This was pushed by a geologist (Paul Bird) in the Department of Transportation who saw such reports as a means of getting better quality control for stone products in the State. However, he was able to push it only because there were people who were ready, willing and able to do the work that was involved. Currently all sand and gravel and crushed stone operations in the State, nearly 300, must make annual reports about what they plan to produce for the year, and most such reports are prepared by geologists.

2. The Department of Environmental Conservation, the State Education Department (in which the Geological Survey is lodged), and the Department of Transportation all have substantial and expanding geologic staffs. In addition, I sense a steadily increased prestige for geologists in this state. I think that our existence, our numerous activities on behalf of our profession and of trade organizations, as well as our reputation as consultants have probably been beneficial to the status of geology in the New York State government.

Specifically, some examples of some areas where we have made contributions: (1) editing and analyzing new specifications for mineral aggregates; (2) writing specifications for mineral aggregate for the State University Construction Fund; (3) drafting and editing of the new Department of Transportation source report instructions for mineral aggregates; (4) analyzing and helping to draft the new Mined Land-Use Law, currently before the legislature (and, incidentally, helping to write the implementing documents needed for the existing Pennsylvania law).

Clearly, such work is in our self-interest, both short-term and long-term. But, the only real justification for our influence is that the activities are in the long-range public interest. Our basic belief is that greater use of geology properly done is in the public interest. And greater use by any group of competent geologists is in our own long-term interest.

Our considerable concern with the quality of professional geologic education and professional geologic practice is within this philosophical context. Good geologic work by any geologist helps us, because it is in the public interest, it advances the profession, and it leads to more work. Anything we can do to increase the prestige or the level of competence of geologic professionals helps us.

You might be interested in seeing some of our committee activities (partial list is attached). These committee activities serve the following purposes: (1) they keep us abreast of the field in addition to helping to shape latest thoughts in many areas; (2) they lead to many good contacts, and (3) they increase our "sociologic strength."

We do not feel that our approach is at all novel. Much of what we do is old hat for engineers. But it is a source of never-ending surprise to see the extent to which geologists fail to "join the world" (even though they want to), and fail to see and do the things that have been perfectly obvious to other professionals, such as engineers and architects, for over fifty years.

We do not pretend to have all of the answers. Our feeling is that as professionals we are quite good in some areas and that our firm's ranking is good. But most important and absolutely essential is the prevailing realization that we are still not good enough. We are nowhere near as good businessmen as we should be; we need to improve our budgeting of work, our public relations, and our means of constantly updating our level of technical competence. We have much to learn, particularly from engineers, about practice. Our philosophical base, however, keeps us fluid and dynamic, although we are in a semi-continuous state of future shock. But those who respond to the philosophy are never bored.

Perhaps in our approach to practice, some others might find some value. And, perhaps, other professional geologists can help us be better.

Sincerely,
James R. Dunn

REGISTRATION IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

A meeting of geologists interested in the subject of registration in the state of Washington was held at the University of Washington Department of Geological Sciences on October 30, H.B.1057, which had been introduced on March 16, 1973, but was tabled in the Committee on Commerce, was discussed first. Moving from the inadequacies of that particular bill to the larger subject of the need for registration and the obstacles to attaining it, the general discussion was most productive.

About a dozen geologists were present, including AEG "fathers" of H.B.1057, a State Representative, members of the Division of Earth and Geological Sciences (State Geologist's office, renamed), a private consultant, representatives of the two state universities and two of the state colleges and two of the community colleges, and a professional lobbyist. The discussion was open and objective, and constituted a broadening experience. (See a related item in the September TPG under "Professionalism.")

As a result, an informal committee of four or five was set up to prepare a draft of a registration bill in the next several months, which will then be reviewed by the October 30 group, after which the draft bill will be referred to clusters of geologists across the state for their review. It is believed that there are some 200 geologists in the state of Washington, and a list will be generated. (Also see West Virginia item under "State Section News.")

With regard to the specific bill, H.B.1057 on Registration and Licensing of Geologists, a hearing was held early in August before the House Commerce Committee. Testifying on the bill were six geologists, five AEG in membership or philosophy and one with a balanced view--Janet Cullen of C.A.S.C.A.D.E. (see separate item under "Geologic Hazards in the State of Washington").

Ms. Cullen's remarks boiled down to PRO: some form of registration is good because (1) it will help eliminate incompetency in the profession, (2) it will give geologists a professional standing in the law, which they do not now enjoy in the state of Washington, and (3) it would be difficult to have boards of geoscience or geologic hazards matters
without legal standing for geologists. CON: the present bill (1) is too strongly slanted toward environmental geology at the expense of other geologic specialities, and (2) its language is both so broad and so narrow that it would be unduly restrictive to nonengineering-oriented earth scientists.

The Editor's written objections to the bill in a letter of August 6 to the Senate Committee Chairman had been, unknowingly, similar, although the Editor did not learn of C.A.S.C.A.D.E. until a month later. After learning about the organization, its members, its mode of operation, its objectivity, and the capability of its coordinator, and the obvious need for such an organization and its value in its short nine-month life, he joined.

**FEDERAL LEGISLATION**

**STATUS OF BILLS**

(ENERGY)-- S.1283 - Fuel and Energy Policy (Jackson, D-Wa.). Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held mark-up sessions Oct. 31 and Nov. 2.

S.2176 - Fuel and Energy Conservation (Jackson, D-Wa.). Senate Committee on Public Works considered in executive session Oct. 11 and Nov. 2; Senate Committee on Commerce considered in executive session Nov. 9.

S.2465 - Geothermal Energy Act (Bible, D-Nev.). Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources of Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearing Nov. 7.

(PUBLIC LANDS)-- S.1081 - Alaska Pipeline (Jackson, D-Wa.). Conference met Oct. 11, 15-18 and agreed to file conference report. Report filed Nov. 7.

(SURFACE MINING)-- H.R.3 - Strip Mining Regulation Act (Hays, D-Ohio). House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held mark-up sessions Oct. 11, 16, 18, 25 and Nov. 2, 5, 6, 8, 9.

(LAND USE)-- H.R.10394 - Land Use Policy (Udall, D-Ariz.). House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held mark-up sessions Oct. 24, 31, and Nov. 7.

**BILLS INTRODUCED**

(MINING)-- S.2590 - Increase Surface Owner Rights (Goldwater, D-Ariz.). Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Would increase rights of surface owners of private lands where the U.S. retains reserved mineral interests.

**HELP FOR THE MAYORS**

The September newsletter of the Texas Section reports on an offer by that AIPG Section to provide aid to mayors of Texas cities. Section President M. O. Turner wrote the mayor of Austin, with similar letters to the mayors of Corpus Christi, Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, and San Antonio, as follows:

"Energy, geologic hazards, water, and natural resources conservation are of vital importance to the life of your city. This is to advise you that there are 26 expert geologists in Austin who are members of the American Institute of Professional Geologists and are fully qualified to assist you with developing sound scientific solutions to these most important problems. When you need technical assistance for your community needs concerning geologic matters, you can be assured that the services of a fully certified member of AIPG will be expert, professional, and entirely satisfactory. Please contact our National Headquarters in Denver, Colorado, at 345 S. Union Blvd., or me in San Antonio for a list of AIPG members in Austin."

A copy of the National AIPG's fine new folder on Earth Resources as Foundations for Environmental Planning was enclosed with each letter, says newsletter editor DeWitt C. Van Siclen.

**THE DILEMMA OF THE GROWTH** (continued from page 1) accommodation would appear to show our previous planning has been worthy of emulation. However, to have accommodation for name's sake would not be professional growth. Professional organizational growth is determined by the maturity of members, their interest in activities, their willingness to provide financial support, and their overall efforts for the profession. Growth in numbers alone without these qualities would not be worth the effort. Thus, the watchword should be caution if we are to deal constructively with the matter of professional growth. If professional growth is offered by new proposals above that which we can provide through AIPG, then AIPG should and must look carefully and act accordingly for the best interests of the profession we seek to serve.

Adolf U. Honkala, President