

October 30, 1944

Mr. M. B. Stephenson
Stanolind Oil & Gas Company
Box 3092
Houston, Texas

Dear Mr. Stephenson :

Many thanks for the information contained in your letter of October 21.

Watson Monroe gave also the same lecture in San Antonio, and I went to listen to him. When the discussion opened nobody was ready to get up, and I was called upon to open the discussion, which I did by praising the work that had been done. After I had finished, Mr. Monroe got up and said, "Now I will ask you some questions." The first question was concerning the Zilpha in Texas. I explained that I did not wish to give out too much information because I was writing up that particular problem and did not want to have too much go out before publication. However, I stated that Zilpha is extensive in Texas and that it had already received a name which has priority over Zilpha. I believe that is really sufficient to clarify the thing, and if the Mississippi geologists would want to go by priority, they would have enough data at hand to know where to get information concerning this problem. From past experience with such things, however, I do not expect to be asked at all, and I feel that it is not really justified to write to the Society and point out to them that their name should be changed. Such procedure would probably not be welcome. Incidentally, all that has been before Stearns McNeill and some other Mississippi geologists. I believe I explained that situation years ago to them. Really I do not know whether in such cases one should "holler" or just let it go by.

Have you by any chance seen the map of the Claiborne area in Mississippi which the U.S.G.S. put out recently from their petroleum investigation division? The map was made by Tourtelot. In the explanation on the margin of that map it is stated that there are glauconites in what they call the Cookfield formation and that these glauconites merge into and are probably correlative with the Osceola sand. You will notice that this is exactly what I had claimed in my paper on the Yegua problem and is diametrically opposed to what Cooke and Gardner had claimed in their papers. It would be interesting to watch whether any acknowledgment or reference to the Yegua problem will ever be made in this connection.

With many thanks,

Sincerely yours,

H. B. Stenzel, Geologist