

## EDITORIAL

This is second issue of NEOGENE NEWSLETTERS prepared by the Subcommission in order to gather and disseminate information on its activities, and to document the progress in the definition of stages and chronostratigraphic units of higher rank.

The preparation of such a document is a demanding enterprise and could not have been achieved without the participation of various contributors, and without the strenuous work of dr. Cesare Ravazzi, that is gratefully acknowledged for this.

I am sad to announce that Graham Jenkins, chairman of the Paleogene Subcommission and a very active and supportive SNS member, died suddenly on August 6, this year. It is a great loss for us, since we shared many positions and worked in close contact.

The distribution of this issue in late September is motivated by the necessity to include results of the INQUA and RCMNS Congresses. With a Bureau meeting held in Vienna on April 26, a business meeting of the Subcommission held in Bucarest on September 6, and a very active correspondence with ICS, we had a very busy year, and the results are visible.

Elections of the new Bureau, partial renovation of membership, several responses to the Guidelines for the definition of Global Stratotypes. The scientific achievements are also visible: one has just to compare the frontispiece of Neogene Newsletter n. 1 and n. 2.

This brings to a difficult point: the upper boundary of the Neogene is questioned and all the old and new controversies related to this topic, and to the role of the Cenozoic, are once again on stage. The INQUA Commission on Stratigraphy, that acts as Subcommission for the Quaternary of ICS, wants to move the base of the Quaternary to 2.5 Ma, entirely ignoring even the existence of the Neogene Subcommission.

There is a saying in my country that says: IF THEY DO NOT WANT ME, THEY DO NOT DESERVE ME. This is my reaction. In other words, we go our own way, and try to subdivide the Neogene in the best possible way, following the rules dictated or suggested by ICS, using stage names and defining their GSSPs. We started from top down, because it is easier than the other way, due to the existence of a wealth of new proxy data coming not only from deep sea drilling, but also from multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary researches on land-based sections, as shown by the exemple on the back of this issue.

This is the way we are going. The future will say if we were successful or not in achieving a well defined and well understood subdivision of the geologic time.

Milano, September 15, 1995

Maria Bianca Cita