

CHARLES IVAN ALEXANDER
3880 OLD SANTA FE TRAIL
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87501

June 15, 1969

Dear Henryk;

Your letter of June 3 came as a most happy surprise! It was most kind of you to write, and I was pleased to get brought up to date on the activities of some of my old friends.

Just a few days before your letter arrived, Bob Sheldon and his family had spent a few days visiting us in Santa Fe. Bob told me of having seen you at the recent AAPG meeting in Dallas, and reported that you had asked about me. As I told Bob at the time, I was pleased to know that you still remembered me. It was a special treat, therefore, to get your letter only a few days later.

No - I didn't attempt to return to my studies of the ostracodes. As you may recall, I did manage to publish a few papers after I went to work for Magnolia Petroleum. They were, I believe, among the more important of my publications. But as time went on, I did more and more "general geology", and finally more and more administrative work for the company, and consequently less and less micropaleontology. I was with Magnolia, and later with the parent company, Socony-Mobil, for 33 years. I did almost NO micropaleo after the first three years. By the time retirement came, I felt that I was so far behind in my knowledge of the literature that it would be virtually impossible to ever catch up, especially without access to adequate library facilities.

There were a couple of studies I had started during my last year or two at TCU that I would have liked to have completed and published, but as things worked out, I never found time to do so. One was the recognition of a series of instars of several species of Cretaceous and Tertiary ostracodes. Several of the instars had been identified as separate species!

I have, as you apparently heard, been doing some painting and pastel drawing, mainly of the "local scene", cactus flowers, etc., etc. The art work is for my own amusement, and not intended for exhibition, although a few of my miniature oils were included in one local exhibit. I don't regard myself as an artist, only as a reasonably competent draftsman. You may recall that I illustrated all my publications with my own drawings.

The main thing that I've been doing is to indulge a long-standing interest in Archaeology. We made our first vacation trip to Santa Fe and surroundings in 1938. We visited several of the more spectacular archaeological sites on that trip. We came back again and again, and the more I

saw the more I became intrigued with the Archaeology of the Southwest. The methods and the philosophy of Geology and Archaeology are so similar that it is not surprising, to me at least, that I found the latter subject of such great interest. I read all the literature I could get my hands on, and over a span of years, we visited most of the more important archaeological sites and museums from New Mexico and Arizona to Yucatan.

So, when I retired, we moved to the center of Southwestern Archaeology, and the first thing I did was supplement my previous reading by taking 3 courses in Archaeology in the Department of Anthropology at the University of New Mexico, in Albuquerque. I can't claim to have made any significant contribution to the literature in this field, but I have written a couple of items on Navaho Archaeology, and on Navaho Sandpainting. The Navaho, incidentally, have been largely neglected by Southwestern Archaeologists, in favor of the more spectacular ruins left by the Pueblo culture. Perhaps as a consequence of my interest in the Navaho, I am now serving my second year as a member of the Board of Directors of the Museum of Navaho Ceremonial Art, here in Santa Fe.

Anthropology may be a long way from Micropaleontology, but I thought it might interest you to know that, in addition to painting, I have continued active pursuit of at least some field of scientific study!

I was also happy to have news, through your letter, of Henry Howe. Please give him my greetings and best wishes.

Finally, there is no need for you to thank me for my review, in the AAPG Bulletin some years ago, of your bulletin on the Henrys Chapel Quadrangle. I felt, precisely as I stated in my review, that this was not only a masterpiece of stratigraphic study in itself, but was more importantly, a model of observation and description worthy of emulation by anyone in stratigraphic studies intended for publication.

I will always remember a field trip I made with you many years ago. We were examining an outcrop of a contact between two formations of the Claiborne Group. I asked, "Dr. Stenzel, why do you place the contact here; I would put it up here, about 10 feet higher." I recall your reply; you asked, "Do we both see the same thing - do you see the stratigraphy as I described it?" The answer was, of course, "Yes; I see exactly what you said was here. I just feel that the upper level is a better place to designate the contact." You again replied, "If you like the upper contact better, that's fine. The important thing is that we both see the same thing!" Do you remember this incident?

Cordially yours,

Ivan