EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

The second meeting of the 1974 Executive Committee was held in San Antonio on April 1, 1974. A budget comparison for the first quarter of 1974 was presented and discussed. It was noted on the comparison that income for the first quarter had been about $180 greater than anticipated. It was noted that the reason for the reduction in expenditures was primarily due to the Proceedings Volume being considerably smaller than the Proceedings Volume for 1973.

The Executive Committee discussed in detail a draft Memorandum of Understanding prepared by the AGI Committee on Planning a Unified Professional Organization. The draft memorandum was approved in principal with a reservation that the proposed Professional Affairs Division of AGI have a voting representative on the AGI Governing Board, and that acceptance to membership in the Professional Affairs Division without formal application and screening be limited to two years.

The Executive Committee approved four recommendations made by the Advisory Board: (1) the standing committees of the Institute be consolidated under four main committees: External Affairs, Internal Affairs, Professional Affairs, Governmental Relations, and that the four representatives from the Advisory Board to the Executive Committee be appointed the executive Liaison with the four committees; (2) a review be made of procedures in the headquarters office; (3) the Membership Committee be reactivated and charged to prepare a profile of the membership and to develop methods for increasing the numerical size of the Institute; (4) a Goals and Strategy Review Board be established.

The Executive Committee approved the merger of the Illinois Section with the Indiana Section, with the combined Section to be called the Illinois-Indiana Section.

The Executive Committee approved a petition from the Institute members in North and South Dakota for the formation of the Dakota Section of the Institute.

The Executive Committee approved the appointment of an ad hoc committee to prepare a list of standard specialties for use in the membership directory. It was decided that both the home telephone number and the office telephone number of all members will be listed in the membership directory.

It was noted that copies of the Cooperative Evaluation brochure are available and have been distributed to the State Sections. It was decided that copies of the brochure should be sent to all members of the National Council on Accreditation.

The Executive Committee approved the efforts made by the Regulatory and Legislative Committee to cooperate with AISLE (An Inter-Society Liaison Committee on the Environment), and approved the listing of AIPG as one of the AISLE affiliated societies.

It was reported that four Professional Guides and one Suggested Practice were in the process of being printed. It was decided that purchase of the guides and practices would be open to all geologists, particularly in view of the fact that the Institute was asking other societies to cooperate in the preparation of the guides and practices.

NEW YORK LICENSING BILL

In mid-March, George Banino reported that a law to license the practice of geology in the State of New York had been submitted to the state legislature (SB 7866). The experience requirements of the proposed law were drafted in such a manner as to encourage future reciprocity with California and Idaho. (A careful review of California's general experience requirements showed their applicability to New York, so they were adopted in essence by the New York State bill-drafting committee.)

The bill was introduced into both the New York State Senate and the Assembly, and in March was under review by several committees.

Banino reported that the New York State geological community—especially the AIPG, AEG, and "the main academic groups"—support the registration activity. He noted that knowledgeable legislative advisors say that licensing bills seldom pass the first year, but New York geologists are hoping that theirs will be the exception.
EDITOR'S COMMENTS

Hazard to Geologists. Hamilton L. Tingey, consulting geologist in Long Beach, California, relates the following hazardous story, complete with moral.

“Our company performs considerable R&D work for a variety of clients including the military. In 1972, one of our geologists and one of our geophysicists were working on a runway at an Air Force Base in conjunction with an airfield pavement evaluation study.

This particular operation consisted of making Binkleyman Beam measurements of pavement deflections. An F-111 fighter-bomber towed by a tractor was being used as the reactive force. Security was fairly tight and proper clearances had been obtained. Somehow or other the Air Police didn’t get the word in regard to this operation. Someone in the control tower noticed the F-111 on the runway where it normally did not belong and notified the AP. On Op 5 alert (attempt to steal an aircraft) was called and our two intrepid earth scientists found themselves confronted by several Air Policemen on the business end of loaded submachine guns. Our geologist didn’t have his identification with him and when he gave his name, the AP turned to our helpful geophysicist and asked him to verify the guy’s name. He was so flustered with the gun pointed in his face that he answered, “I don’t know.” Anyway, the Colonel in charge showed up and straightened things out.

“MORAL: Don’t attempt to take off in an Air Force F-111 especially with a tractor hooked to it and insist that your partner know your name.”

Reciprocity. As pointed out in the report of the New York Section on the Albany Chapter under the title “Chapters within a Section”, reciprocity between states of licensing or registration laws is an important element. Ian Campbell’s letter to the editor in the February issue of Geotimes told of the meeting a few months ago of the Idaho and California Boards of Registration for Geologists. Note particularly that “the conferrees determined that each could accord ‘mutual recognition’ to registrants of the other state without the need for enacting a formal reciprocity agreement”. They expressed the hope, Ian said, that similar arrangements could be developed with Delaware and Maine, as well as with other states that may later enact similar laws.

Urban Geologists. AIPG Member Aligirdas B. Garlauskas, geologist with the City of Cleveland, presented a paper at the GSA North-Central Section meeting in Kent, Ohio, May 8-11, 1974. His abstract told of the wide degree of input needed from professional geologists in the solution of many problems of the city. He stressed that the professional geologist who works on urban geologic problems must interact with several other professions, and therefore such a geologist requires broad training. He noted that the understanding of complex political-legal factors is a particularly important element of the work of the urban geologist employed by a city, if he is to be successful. Although what he says has been said before and may be familiar to many AIPG members, it has been our experience that at least until recently most U.S. geologists seem to have been almost totally unaware of the political-legal basis whereby decisions are made about implementation of geologic programs that can solve societal problems. Publication last year of Robert Legget’s Cities and Geology has provided an excellent basis for documenting for the nongeologist the huge role played by geology both in creating and in providing solutions to urban problems.

Environmental Guidelines for State Agencies. The State Liaison Officer’s News Bulletin of the U.S. Bureau of Mines for March 1974 reports that the Maryland Secretary of Natural Resources has issued guidelines to aid state agencies in assessing environmental effects of all proposed construction projects, effective July 1, 1974. The guidelines set forth a checklist of environmental considerations including hydrology, geology, physiography/geomorphology, ecology, and socioeconomic considerations. The guidelines were adopted after a public hearing.

DEATHS

Gordon Oaksheott sent the following notice of the death of

Orville L. Bandy (1917-1973)*

Orville L. Bandy, Professor of Geological Sciences at the University of Southern California since 1948, died of leukemia at his home in Inglewood, California, on August 2, 1973. Orville was an unflagging, dedicated research micropaleontologist who made himself a world authority on the environmental adaptations of foraminifers. He excelled in teaching, research, administration, and also in professional services to many organizations, among them the Society of Economic Paleontologists and Mineralogists (Past President) and AIPG. In his short career, he produced a large number of major papers and he left a living memorial of hundreds of students to carry on his work.

STATE SECTION NEWS

CALIFORNIA

The March 11, 1974 Newsletter of the California Section reported on the January 25 meeting of the California Geological Coordinating Council, attended by representatives of nine societies and associations. State legislation discussed included six Senate bills, three House bills, and a Senate concurrent resolution. A very useful list of the 80 State assemblymen and 40 state senators, together with their addresses and party affiliations, was included. In addition, S. 2850, the Federal Outer Continental Shelf bill, was summarized. The Section meeting, scheduled for April 12, was to discuss these bills and the status of the council.

COLORADO

The March Colorado Communicator announced the March 11 monthly meeting; described the activity on H.B. 1169 (Geological Hazards Bill); noted the brief short course on groundwater hydrology and water well technology scheduled for March 22-23, and the seminar on May 3 on "Geological Practices affected by Recent Land Use Laws".

The April Colorado Communicator announced the April 8 monthly luncheon meeting, at which Richard D. Holt was scheduled to speak on Colorado coal resources. It reported with glowing pride on the March 22-23 short course on Groundwater and Wells, sponsored by the AEG and AIPG - three AIPG members were on the program: Lloyd Hershey, Willard Owens, and Richard Pearl. A third item reported on was the status of legislation; as of March 27, neither a major land-use bill nor an energy bill had been passed. A leaflet describing the upcoming seminar on May 3, dealing with the geologist and land-use laws, showed how well it is organized - the 13 speakers on the four general topics included consulting geologists, a State Representative, a regional governmental official, a city government geologist, the president of a paving company, county planners, an attorney, a soils engineer, a USGS person, and the State Geologist; five are AIPG members - John Ivey, Larry O'Brien, Ray Robeck, John Rold and Ed Simpson.

The May Colorado Communicator told of the rescheduling of Richard Holt’s coal talk until May, because the Section was able to change its April meeting to a joint one with the Denver Coal Club to hear the new U.S. Bureau of Mines’ Director Thomas Falkie. Additional employment news was presented together with a final legislative report for 1974 – the latter noted that four land-use bills were passed during the last week of the session, but the geological hazards bill was not passed.

The Colorado Section obviously is making good use of continuing education as a weapon for broadening the visage of both geologists and nongeologists in the areas of their mutual concern and interaction.

LOUISIANA

The April Newsletter carried an announcement of the April 20 meeting of the State Section in Baton Rouge, together with news clippings on the oil industry and notices of the monthly meetings of the New Orleans and Lafayette chapters.

MICHIGAN

Jeffrey C. Sutherland is chairman of the Committee for State Registration of Geologists, which was formed recently under the auspices of the Michigan Basin Geological Society. Although the number of AIPG members in the state is small, Sutherland hopes that they will support the effort.

MONTANA

The State Section was to meet on April 16 in Billings, to hear a report on the April 1 meeting of the national AIPG Advisory Board.

OHIO

A February 7 letter from the State Section Vice President Bob Bates told of the Section Dinner Meeting on February 28 in Columbus, with two speakers on the “Effect of the Earth Resources Crunch on the Profession of Geology” – Joseph L. Mancuso and Guy F. Sitler. The spring meeting of the State Section was planned for April 22. The Columbus area AIPG luncheons were slated for February 12 and March 13.

The February 15 issue of the Newsletter, the first one for the Ohio Section, gave President W. E. Shafer the opportunity to make an excellent and wide-ranging statement. Two of his goals for the year are: (1) to establish a working contact with key members of the State Legislature, and (2) to draft a model state registration law for geologists in Ohio. Geologic Hazards Committee chairman Fred Klaer submitted a preliminary report on eleven types of geologic hazards in the state. A very useful supplement to the Newsletter was a listing of bills introduced into the State legislature which may affect the geologist, with a request for comment from members of the Section.

OKLAHOMA

The Section met on January 15 in Oklahoma City, to hear an attorney discuss “The Expert Witness”. (This notice was not received in time to catch the March TPG before it was put to bed.)
MAINTAINING PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

Introduction

The March, 1974 issue of TPG contained an introductory statement regarding methods of maintaining professional competence and a request for comments or summaries of discussions at Section meetings. We did not need additional office help to open the mail relating to this subject! Fourteen letters, several oral comments, reactions of two local meetings (Denver and Oklahoma City), and discussions of continuing education in the California Section newsletter (March and April, 1972) constitute the input thus far. We greatly appreciate the thoughtful comments of the letter writers. These comments and opinions probably constitute a representative sample.

Remarks range from the suggestion that AIPG immediately establish a requirement for proof of continuing competence to the threat of resignation if such a requirement was established! Most letters express qualified approval of a periodic formal statement from Members indicating how they are maintaining "high standards of competence."

Summary of Comments

The Membership should be reminded and encouraged to make a positive effort to maintain professional competence, but it is "difficult to establish any generally applicable criteria," especially in view of the varied careers of the Members. Attendance at courses, meetings, and field trips indicates interest in maintaining competence, but it does not necessarily indicate comprehension by the attendee. There is no way to confirm the reading time or home-study time claimed. There should be a distinction between competence (achievement) and simply "activity."

Evaluations of the quality of courses, especially company-sponsored courses, are difficult and there is no way to measure the knowledge gained. One attendance at a national or regional convention and one attendance at a short course (or seminar) should be mandatory, but attendance at scientific or technical meetings may be for business or pleasure rather than scientific enlightenment. Management courses are of dubious value in improving geologic ability. Travel and irregular hours make attendance at university courses difficult or impossible. Grades in graduate courses "depend as much on personality as on ability."* Costs of "overseas" courses are excessive, if available. None of these activities would constitute "proof" of competence.

Unpublished reports are important indicators of competence, but they cannot be evaluated by other Members. Papers published and presented at scientific meetings are of low average quality. There are limitations on time and opportunity (of company geologists) to publish or to prepare papers for oral presentation.

*My students apparently haven't discovered this!

The informed judgement of one's peers (not fellow workers?) might be a more reliable measure. An evaluation of mental faculties (loss of memory, mental disorders, etc.) should be made. Company leaves for additional study should be more common.

A Membership questionnaire should determine what members are doing to maintain competence — the items should be evaluated in terms of priority or relevance. AIPG should combine efforts with AAPG (and other societies) in a continuing education effort. The Professional Competence Committee should be the same as the Continuing Education Committee.

Discussion

Everyone is in favor of maintaining professional competence! After all, we agreed to this proposition when we became Members of the AIPG. Despite all the comments (indicating the complexity of the problem), the fact remains that most professions require periodic evidence of maintenance of competence.

The lack of time and the proprietary nature of work are, in some cases, invalid excuses used to justify a lack of contribution to the literature. Many company employees do publish; others contribute to the advancement of knowledge by service as editors, reviewers, field-trip leaders, etc. even though they do not actually publish papers. Most "field" and "case history" papers could not possibly be considered proprietary — they are written after work hours or on weekends, are legitimate contributions, and aid in maintaining professional competence.

The first requirement in becoming a geological scientist is to attend college. A secondary, and also important, consideration is quality of education. It was in this context that I posed the question of maintaining competence — we should be concerned first with what is being done and second with quality. It is probably true that no successful method of measuring quality is available, but it is a fact that if nothing is being done then the question of quality is moot.

Inasmuch as membership in AIPG is not required by law, it may not be practical to require annual evidence of Member activities relating to professional competence. But shouldn't this be an element in state registration laws? Most of us who must make an annual report of such activities do not consider it to be an onerous chore; in fact, it serves as a biographical reminder of just where we are going in our professional careers.

Perhaps the results of a questionnaire would be informative. It certainly would not be disruptive, from time to time, to remind AIPG members of their commitment to maintenance of competence.

John D. Haun, Vice President
REGULATORY AND LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
Activities as of May 1974
C. F. Withington, Chairman

In February, the Regulatory and Legislative Committee held its first full meeting. The result was the development of a policy statement which the Committee and its Legislative Counsel could use as a basis of operation. A copy of the policy statement, as approved by the Executive Committee on April 1, follows.

During the period since February, the Legislative Counsel, James U. Hamersley, concentrated on those bills in which he felt geologists could play a part. These include: oversight hearing on metals; a proposal to create a new materials information agency and reporting center; strip mining; and various energy, land use and solid waste disposal bills. The purpose of his efforts is to ensure that the bills meet the guidelines set up by the Executive Committee. Testimony by the AIPG was scheduled for the end of May before the U.S. House of Representatives' Interior Subcommittee, which is considering legislation on minerals policy, and the AIPG hopes to influence this committee with its expertise. Complete testimony will be reported on in the next issue of TPG.

The committee received encouragement from the Executive Committee to represent the AIPG on AISLE (An Inter-Society Liaison Committee on the Environment), and to offer the services of AIPG members where appropriate. The purpose of AISLE is to try to show the state legislatures of the fifty states that they can gain a lot by applying to professionals like professional geologists in determining what legislation should be enacted. The idea was spawned in New York where the AISLE committee consisting, besides AIPG (which became involved through William E. Cutcliffe), of seventeen other professional groups. The focus in New York State was energy. AISLE has been asked to contribute volunteer professional help for the legislature of Massachusetts, and AIPG members in the Boston area have been alerted. Other areas of possible contribution are Utah, Oregon or Washington, and Kentucky. Any members who feel that their state would benefit from such exposure should get in touch with the Regulatory and Legislative Committee for help.

Finally, for those members in the Santa Barbara, California area, it was announced at the last AISLE meeting that an interdisciplinary type of study of the American Society of Landscape Architects has been funded by the National Science Foundation to design, for Santa Barbara, a new process for considering regional issues and opinions, with applicability to other regions in the nation. The Principal Investigator is Mr. William Ewald, Jr., a Development Consultant located in Washington, D.C. Although there is not much money in the project, it is an excellent opportunity to get some geologic input into an important project.

Finally, the Utah Section, AIPG, sent a memorandum from the Utah State Geologist’s office concerning the Soil Conservation Service and the alleged activities of their soil scientists in making geologic decisions on slope stability and other land use elements. A meeting was held on May 2 with the Associate Administrator of the SCS and his key staff members at which A. U. Honkala, J. U. Hamersley, and C. F. Withington advised the SCS of these charges and stated the AIPG position regarding the dissemination of geologic information by non-geologists. The meeting appeared fruitful and further results will be reported in the next TPG.

POLICY STATEMENT

The American Institute of Professional Geologists has endorsed a natural resource policy as outlined below. AIPG has taken this stand based on a sense of professional responsibility. The Nation faces ever increasing resource problems which will greatly affect our welfare. Geologists clearly foresee an urgent need to manage our resources wisely and wish to sound an alarm accompanied with an action plan.

The Executive Committee endorses the following suggested policies and recommendations of the National Commission on Materials Policy. The purpose of this congressionally authorized commission was to develop a national materials policy embracing all natural resources — materials, energy, and the natural environment.

The Commission stated that it should be the policy of the United States to:

1. provide adequate energy and materials supplies to satisfy not only the basic needs of nutrition, shelter, and health, but a dynamic economy, without indulgence in waste;
2. rely on market forces as a prime determinant of the mix of imports and domestic production in the field of materials, but at the same time decrease and prevent wherever necessary a dangerous or costly dependence on imports;
3. accomplish the foregoing objectives while protecting or enhancing the environment in which we live;
4. conserve our natural resources and environment by treating waste materials as resources and returning them either to use or, in a harmless condition to the ecosystem; and
5. institute coordinated resource policy planning which recognizes the interrelationships among materials, energy, and the environment.”

The American Institute of Professional Geologists also endorses the following principal recommendation of the Commission, and urges Congress and the Administration to take prompt action.

“...to achieve coordinated and integrated materials energy, and environment policy planning and execution, the Federal Government must be organized to cope effectively with the changing interactions of the materials system. A single agency, ... overseen by a single Joint Congressional Committee, will facilitate such policy formulation.”

The Executive Committee takes this action to alert our Nation’s President, the Congress, and our citizens to the importance of these concepts. Without major governmental reorganization as suggested above, geologists foresee numerous conflicts encroaching upon us at an ever increasing rate.
“The value of the informal structure of the Chapter has been to draw a divergent group of geologists together to discuss matters of mutual interest. Depending on the subject matter of a meeting, one group of geologists, such as from academia, may be better represented than another, such as from government. Ideas flow freely with no constraints by organizational bylaws, points of view, biases, etc.

“The Albany Chapter has become a hub of activity in New York and in the Northeast. Among its many accomplishments, some of the major ones supported by the State Section or the National are:

1. Initiation of the concept and development of the Professional Practices and Guides;
2. A study of state registration and certification for geologists resulting in two position papers;
3. Two years of hard work on licensing which culminated in January, 1974, in submission of a bill to the New York Legislature to license the practice of geology;
4. Spearheading of a successful fund drive which netted over $2,000, enabling retention of the services of a New York Legislative Counsel to monitor legislative activity and guide submission of the licensing bill;
5. Initiation of participation by geologists in a joint New York State Assembly-AAAS meeting on legislation in relation to energy and the environment. This activity has led to several additional benefits:
   a. Directly resulting from geologists input, the creation of a New York State bill to form an Office of Energy and Resources to concern itself with the management of the State’s resources;
   b. Participation by AIPG in the formalization and development of an intersociety group known as AISLE;
   c. Participation by AIPG members in the organization of a meeting with the Massachusetts legislature similar to that held in New York.

“Numerous other activities have been undertaken by the Chapter. Backing by the State Section has been essential. Working with both AIPG members and non-member geologists has been valuable and stimulating. No geologists in the Albany area have been heard to ask ‘What does AIPG do?’”

Texas. Ross Shipman, Section President, reports on the embryo state of their organization, through the following squib that is being published in the Section Newsletter:

“The Professional Geologists in Corpus Christi and Midland have found it desirable to organize themselves loosely and informally into local groups. This arrangement can be very effective politically when dealing with local governments and when the members need to communicate collectively with their representatives in the state legislature. These local groups also expedite membership screening, local public relation efforts, and have proved effective in increasing membership.

“We have decided to encourage the organization of local chapters on a slightly more formal basis this year. With a local chairman and periodic local meetings, we hope to be able to communicate quickly the data necessary to enable our
members to be more politically active when unity and strength are needed.

"We need help to accomplish this organizational goal this year. By looking through the new AIPG Membership Directory, it becomes obvious that many areas of Texas have enough members to form a chapter, and the Houston members could form several chapters, if they desire. The optimum plan would be for a group of members to get together on their own, choose a chairman, and tell the Section Executive Committee that you have the chapter organized. If help is needed, call on the Section President or another member of the Section Executive Committee.

"The next regular session of the Texas Legislature begins in January of 1975. We need the local chapters functioning well by then."

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Jim Dunn sent the following thought-provoking letter regarding management of our mineral resources, and what AIPG can do to help alleviate the increasingly desperate situation.

"April 5, 1974

"Dr. Frank B. Conselman

"Dear Frank:

"I am writing this letter to add to the dialogue started by Walter E. Heinrichs, Jr. in the last TPG and to express my growing concern about the mismanagement of our mineral resources. It is shocking to me to see needless shortages in the United States of so many mineral commodities, with energy only the top of an iceberg.

Current or looming shortages are in:

1. Energy. Yet some of the world's major energy resources lie underdeveloped within our borders.
2. Copper. Yet huge copper deposits lie fallow.
3. Zinc. Yet major areas with zinc potential are relatively untested.
4. Nickel. Yet major known deposits in the United States are not developed.
5. Portland cement. Yet our limestone deposits are probably adequate for thousands of years.
6. Fertilizer. Yet huge deposits of phosphate and potash are known.
7. Fine aggregates. Yet some of the greatest shortages exist in market areas underlain by fine aggregate.
8. Aluminum. Yet the average cubic mile of earth's crust contains over 10,000% of the current world's annual consumption.

I could go on with the depressing list, but these illustrate the point.

The economic and sociologic costs to the people of the United States are enormous. Economic costs are relatively easy to measure and run into the billions of dollars annually. But perhaps history will measure a greater cost; a loss of national confidence and buoyancy. We are no longer the supremely confident people . . . .

And now, reinforcing the national gloom, we have the sophistry of the Club of Rome. They fed status data about mineral resources into a dynamic system which is approaching a logarithmic expansion rate. Naturally, the computer concluded that we are going to run out of everything. Yet minerals are what we walk upon. We take them so much for granted that we hardly even know they are there. As geologists, we know that we don't run out of minerals, we just mine lower grades. And as geologists, we know that resources are culturally and economically defined. Had the Club of Rome's computer been available 20,000 years ago it might have concluded that the human race could not survive beyond the next 50 years. The reasons would have been perfectly obvious: "The known resources of flint for arrowheads are limited; hence we will starve to death. Besides, even if we survive that, the evil spirits will kill us. Why? Because it is obvious that the other deposits we mine to paint our bodies so we can keep evil spirits away are limited."

I see no reason for gloom about resources. I do wonder, however, about our ability to manage, to take care of the most obvious and predictable problems about mineral resources.

I see no real attempt to manage our mineral resources in a context of total resource management. I see too few governmental or private groups even asking the right questions, much less getting answers or taking action. What are some of the questions?

1. How do engineering and general commodity specifications influence reserves of mineral materials? . . . . Can we stretch our known currently economic resources by specification changes?

2. What are the short- and long-range socio-economic costs of developing domestic mineral resources versus not developing them?

3. How can our legitimate concern for a good environment be integrated with our need for minerals?

4. Can we use tax or other financial inducements to both develop resources in the broadest public interest while still maintaining a healthy environment? . . . .

5. Philosophically, does anyone have the right to prevent the development of a resource which is needed by the nation as a whole? "Anyone" includes all entities less than the whole nation -- whether they be oil or mining companies, lumber companies, towns, counties, and states, conservation clubs, or individual land owners. . . . .

6. Can we develop a positive philosophy of resource management in public interest terms which enables us to make intelligent national interest decisions? A long-range philosophy is, I think, essential and of utmost importance. To see the Goliaths of industry without a satisfactory philosophical base repeatedly defeated by preservationist Davids who do, might be laughable but for the fact that the results of the conflicts can destroy our system.

7. And really, what is the national interest? Surely our man-induced period of gloom is not in the national interest. Who is defining the costs of alternatives in an expository (non-
advocate) manner? Who is informing the public of the socio-economic costs of alternatives? . . . . Does the public know that mineral commodities coming out of relatively small areas have enormous positive national impact?

What does all of this have to do with AIPG? Currently, I see no other geologic society which is actively making recommendations for mineral resource management. Conversely, I see many people in the mineral industry and many geologists expressing concern. And many good but short steps toward evaluating aspects of the problem have been made by individual geologists and various government agencies. But very little action results.

Recommendations made by industry are suspected as being self-serving, so they cannot really be effective. Recommendations made by one government agency are likely to be suspected by other government agencies. So the two most knowledgeable groups have trouble being effective.

Can we, as a knowledgeable group of professionals, have impact where others fail? I think maybe we can. How?

Specifically, we could: (1) set up a committee to collect data; (2) write a Guide distilling the concepts of mineral resource conservation in the broadest environmental and socio-economic context; (3) further strengthen the AIPG position favoring better resource management, and (4) talk to legislators and try to get legislation: (a) to study the problems; (b) to devise methods of handling resources; (c) to inform the public of socio-economic costs of alternatives; and, most important (d) to develop and implement positive programs.

We are pleased that under your leadership AIPG has taken a position nationally in favor of mineral resource management in the context of total resource management. We are currently working toward getting this read into the Congressional Record. New legislation in Colorado is geologically sophisticated and very far-sighted. In New York State, we have been able to help conceptualize a new bill to establish a new Office of Energy and Resources. The bill is being sponsored by the speaker of the assembly, Perry B. Duryea, Jr. So we can do much; we can be effective; but I feel that we must do more.

I think that it is our professional responsibility to do no less than help our founding nation see the light at the end of the tunnel. There has never been a time in our history when the voice of the scientific community has been more urgently needed.

James R. Dunn

PROFESSIONAL PARAGRAPHS

After the March TPG was put to bed, we received a press release of January 13, 1974 from the California Department of Conservation, announcing that James E. Slossen had been named State Geologist and Chief of the Division of Mines and Geology. Slossen, who joined the Division in 1973, holds master and doctorate degrees from U.S.C. A consulting geologist before joining the DMG, he taught at Los Angeles Valley College. Registered in the States of California, Idaho, and Arizona, Slossen is currently president of the California Section, AIPG.

John A. Taylor, petroleum geologist of Oklahoma City, has completed his first year on the Oklahoma Energy Council. He prepared a report on the economics of Oklahoma's oil and gas exploration and production.

Peter T. Flawn, president of The University of Texas at San Antonio, has been elected to the National Academy of Engineering.

Activities of other AIPG members are cited under "State Section News".