

November 27, 1967

Professor Curt Teichert  
c/o Geology Department  
University of Kansas  
Lawrence, Kansas

Dear Curt:

Over breakfast in New Orleans we discussed the prevalence of plagiarism and kindred ethical malpractices. So you can judge for yourself what I was talking about, I am listing below two articles which you can read at your leisure and judge for yourself.

You might want to answer for yourself the following questions: What data, facts, or observations does the second article contain that were not in the first article and are new and the result of hard work? What new conclusion or interpretation is found in the second article that was not already stated in the text or not indicated on the figures of the first article? Is the first sentence of the second article a correct appraisal?

- 1) Stenzel, H. B., Turner, F. E., and Hesse, C. J., 1944, Brackish and non-marine Miocene in southeastern Texas: Am. Assoc. Petroleum Geologists Bull., v. 28, no. 7, p. 977-1011, illustr.
- 2) Floyd, D. N., Miller, T. H., and Berry, W. B. N., 1958, Miocene Paleocology in the Burkeville area, Newton County, Texas: Gulf Coast Assoc. Geol. Soc., Trans. v. 8, p. 157-161, 1 fig.

The authors of the second paper were two students and one professor (Berry) at the University of Houston. This is the same Berry who works on graptolites. The first paper happens to be the first consciously paleoecological paper in the Gulf Tertiary, and one of the first in all of North America.

Yours for better ethics in geology.

Sincerely,

COPY  
H. B. Stenzel  
Visiting Professor