

March 20, 1992

Mr W E Stanley, President
Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy and Petroleum
1210 - 3400 de Maisonneuve Boulevard West
Montreal, Quebec H3Z 3B8

Subject: Professional Development Program 1992

Dear Sir:

Enclosed please find copies of letters and papers that you should perhaps peruse. My paper on "Sampling in Exploration: Theory and Practice" was reviewed by CIM Bulletin and Mathematical Geology but rejected for reasons that would be amusing if it were not so bad for our industry. I have no choice but to submit my allegation to non-reviewed magazines and journals. My views, which are generating a great deal of interest, are not compiled for authoritative journals but carefully crafted to challenge the geologists and mining engineers to critically assess the alleged benefits of kriging and kriged variances.

I request that the Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy and Petroleum investigate my allegation. I do not want my Institute to sponsor a course that teaches mathematically flawed concepts. I submit that kriged variances are invalid because each kriged data point is a function of the measured data set, and thus violates the requirement of statistical independence. I stake my reputation as a metrologist on the veracity of this statement. Even though CIM's geostatistical reviewers show contempt for such fundamental concepts as dependencies and degrees of freedom, most CIM Members are perfectly capable of understanding that a kriged data point is the dependent variable of a function, and that the kriged variance for a set of fabricated and measured data is an invalid and meaningless statistical parameter.

Yours truly,

J W Merks
President

Enclosures : miscellaneous papers
miscellaneous letters

D05/113