

Aug 23, 1957
Wilfred Roux

Dear Dr. Stenzel

Just a note to let you know my whereabouts. I've moved on to Linder, Ala & am staying at the Linder Motel. I intend to work as much of Marengo County as is possible in a week. I'll leave here the 1st of Sept. & retrace my work back to Winston Co., Miss. Seems there are quite a few things I've learned since I've started and wish to recheck. Also, I've little or nothing done on the Betheden. From what I have seen, however, including the type locality, I doubt if any thing can be done with it.

In your last letter, you mentioned bauxitic sand; I haven't had any of this since I left the northern half of Kemper Co. So I want to go back and try to answer the questions you raised concerning the relationship of the marine & non-marine units.

I might as well prepare you for what may be a shock. I've seen many a foot of this "sometimes damned - sometimes beautiful stuff" since the first part of June and having no professor to coach me - have gotten some ideas of my own. I am pretty sure of a few things. (1) Miller's basal Ackerman and the basal Nanafalia are one & the same, just marine & non marine facies. This is what

MacNeil calls the Fearns Springs but is not. Thus his work = correlation of the "basal Wilcox" is correct, he just got carried away with the rather coarse sand at the Fearns Springs type locality. (2) The Matthews Landing belongs in the Nabeola; there is a good Stenzelian marine transgressive disconformity at the base of Nabeola Landing and everywhere else that a good exposure can be found. The fun comes when you go up dip, i.e. into Winston Co = north. Have you the answer for me?

(3) I'm still not sure, but it looks as if Mellen's might about the F. S. and Coal Bluff being facies of one another. This is really the hardest to answer. But I am sure the F. S. is above the Porter's Creek and below the Ackerman-Naufoalia and thus is in the same stratigraphic position as the Nabeola and like the Nabeola, it is bounded above and below by disconformities.

Now here's the golt — it appears to me that a Midway-Wilcox boundary is a mighty thin line and one that is most closely connected with tectonic uplift = a renewal of sedimentation. And from seeing these sediments and from trying to tell them apart, I've come to the conclusion that the real break is at the base of the Matthew's Landing. This I think makes your correlation (in Miss. Geol. Soc. field trip) much more in line with the other units. The M. L. is the real marine disconformity, not the basal Naufoalia-Ackerman (the Fearns Springs of you and

MacNeil.) There are still many problems staring me in the face. I wish you were here to see this, I'm sure I could point it out much better than trying to write about it.

I received a letter from La Moreaux saying he would write when he & Dr. Soulmier headed for the field. I have never heard from him again, so I concluded they canceled the trip. I suppose its just as well.

I don't know yet, but I imagine school starts about the 17th. I'm planning on staying out here until the 10th, then go to N.O. & then on to Austin before the 17th. Will I be able to see you in Houston on the way? Please let me know one way or the other.

So long for now and I hope I haven't become carried away on this work. Give the girls my love.

Yours very truly,
Pete