

Goldwater

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 12

MAY 14, 1970, TO MAY 22, 1970

(PAGES 15505 TO 16850)

SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER,  
"TIME OF CRISIS FOR THE NATIONAL  
AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM"  
MAY 19, 1970

those of us who share our students' concerns also lay aside our personal interests and join with them actively in this task. In response to the request of the students, we will immediately nominate faculty to join students in a committee to develop a plan of academic options to permit the students the freedom of action they need. In concert with the resolution of the students of May 6, 1970 we oppose violence, and pledge to work with the students to help them implement their course of action in striving for justice and peace.

Vote:  
Yes ..... 250  
No ..... 51

2. Resolved: We, as individuals of the faculty of the Yale University School of Medicine, support the following aims:

1. That attempts to suppress legitimate dissent in our country end; that we find repulsive the deliberate use of dehumanizing stereotypes by our government to discredit its critics.

2. That oppression of Black Americans and all other minority group members cease.

3. That the United States government stop its escalation of the Vietnam War into Cambodia and Laos; that it unilaterally and immediately withdraw all forces from Southeast Asia.

4. That the involvement of universities with war research end immediately.

The tragic killings at Kent State University this week speak of the perilous division of the nation by these issues. We join with our own students in calling upon Americans of every persuasion to oppose violence of any kind in their words and acts.

Vote:  
Yes ..... 195  
No ..... 51

#### TUSDM STATEMENT

We, the undersigned, members of the Tufts University School of Dental Medicine Community have made the serious decision to support the Student Mobilization National Strike. We feel that as responsible members of the American Dental Association and health profession, it is our moral obligation to oppose policies which perpetrate the destruction of human lives and endanger the future of the Democratic process of our society.

As students, our ability to affect change in Foreign and Domestic policy is severely limited. As a concerned body of future professional health care, we implore the American Dental Association to join actively in opposition to present national and international policy and to utilize all resources available toward this critical effort.

Stuart Wisotsky, Robert M. Black, Sheldon Mauley, John P. Ficarella, Joseph A. Woods, Ronald W. Randazzo, Harvey Weller, Bruce S. Wyman, Robert Gaber, Stuart G. Merle, David G. Angus, Sam Eisenstein, Robert Roy, Billy Rover, Richard E. Brown.

David S. Fox, William H. Myers, Michael Joshua Shiro, Jeffrey Stevens, Jeffrey Jacoboff, Max Zanderer, Mark C. Beal, Lawrence G. Golden, Ronald P. Burok, Kenneth D. Morris, Brian E. Fitzgerald, Paul David Gaston, Marc Rosenberg, Andrew M. Alpert, Harvey J. Cohen, Mark Levy, and Leonard S. Ostriff.

Gary Ries, Robert L. Billagg, M. Dark, Richard Smith, Todd J. Wrenis, Gary W. Stern, Mark F. Feldman, Morris E. Cohen, Steve Skapse, David Klaman, Robert N. Harellich, Richard Varnerin, Steven Joel Lunech, Leonard P. Rodin, Peter Hart, and Barry Matz.

Gregory M. Shipak, Allan S. Deutsch, Walter Dobleski, Louis Robert Wolf, Michael Stein, Allyn E. Segelman,

Mark J. Burbach, Irving Horowitz, Jan Friedman, Peter Pence, Jeffrey W. Schlotman, Robert M. Arnold, Calvin W. Wollington, Jr., Edward C. Lortin, Robert A. Werner, Stephen L. Jones, Richard A. Greene, and Peter Dell Colb.

Stuart Bayes, Howard Sepowitz, Ira L. Eisenstein, Thomas Frankel, Leonard E. Schiffman, Joseph D. Gleecher, John Johansson Dow, Paul Fitzgerald, Michael Awnoff, Elliot Packman, Marc E. Lemohn, Stuart Ross, Stephen J. Davidson, Richard N. Norris, Bettina Laidley, and Jeny Cohen.

Colin Michael Sparks, Richard Holsten, Kenneth Goldberg, James A. Cottone, Jeffrey S. Foyer, Helen Bumanoff, H. L. Schare, Cornelia P. Anderson, Dale Styman, Andrew M. Horn, Harold Shapin, Matthew Wenbray, Richard M. Bloom, Kenneth J. Backman, Steven R. Lazar, David H. Piza, Robert A. Coleman, Leonard C. Smith, Michael S. Wolfman, Arnold K. Kaplan, Fred W. Salvatorello, and Steven H. Schurtz. Stephen Finn, Paul Cavaby, Elliott Donhoff, D. E. Prundiullo, D. S. Bronell, Bruce Berkouk, Robert Farber, Herbert Feubey, Peter A. Figgoff, Bruce Feld, Henry Talbert, David Moloff, Lewis F. Colella, Dennis R. Scharer, and Frederick A. Curro.

Nan S. Grease, Harold Nulff, George R. Kessler, William Pfaffmann, William Pollach, Howard Adams, Harold P. Sherman, David Baskin, Steven Elman, Ralph R. Trinquet, Richard A. Doff, Mitchell Winston, William Lobel, Michael Koffer, Robert E. Zayre, Lawrence Lipston, Wayne Johnston, and Daniel G. Davidson.

Steven Salmon, Stean Albin, David Belitz, Jerome Donnelly, S. J. Foster, Michael Weissman, Frederick A. Mele, Peter H. Ruguskin, Robert J. Urbon, Elliot Green, Alan R. Levy, B. J. Bowen, W. Lei, Andrew R. Rusmin, and Judy Thistle.

James Allcore, Martin H. Zase, Charles Adams, Miss Parley, Donald H. Sandol, Peter D. Cream, Joseph J. Creun, Michael J. Glick, R. Craig Carrol, Lawrence B. Cutler, Robert J. Duoff, John B. Bush, Evelyn Geller, Donald P. Johnson.

Lesbe Muldorf, Peter G. Ridger, Robert A. Muranda, Lawrence Rubin, Theodos Gummer, Barry M. Zide, Barry Soyoloff, Bruce Castick, James H. Chalmers, Jr., Morton Cohen, and Leonard Brown.

#### TUFTS NEW ENGLAND MEDICAL CENTER COMMUNITY

We, the undersigned members of the Tufts-New England Medical Center Community, have voted in support of the National University Strike. We have chosen not to carry on business as usual, but rather to redirect our energy to constructive political action in order to bring about the following goals:

1. The immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Southeast Asia.
2. The immediate and unconditional cessation of the use of troops to suppress political dissent.
3. The redirection of military funds to improve the ailing condition of American life.

We join millions of students and working people across the nation in a concerted effort to end the war in Southeast Asia and to halt the unprecedented and unconstitutional repression of political dissent at home.

There will be no interruption in patient care!

(There were 482 signers—signatures illegible.)

#### TIME OF CRISIS FOR THE NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it has been reported that the Smithsonian Board of Regents will be holding a semi-annual policy meeting tomorrow. The last one took place in January, I believe.

Since these sessions are so important in setting the goals and boundaries for the Institution's activities, I would express my hope that the regents will be able to address a part of their attention to a long delayed but urgently needed Smithsonian project.

Mr. President, I am referring to the construction of a permanent building for the National Air and Space Museum, which without question is, or should be, one of the major components of the world-famous Smithsonian complex of museums and galleries. The concept for this building can truly be said to date back nearly 25 years, to August of 1946, when Congress first established the National Air Museum as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution.

As a part of the 1946 law, Congress expressly included provisions for selecting a site for an air museum building to be located here in the Nation's Capital.

Subsequently, in 1958, Congress authorized a Mall site for the museum and allowed funds to be spent on detailed plans for the proposed building. During fiscal years 1964 and 1965, a little under \$2 million was appropriated so that the architectural design and layout of the museum could be completed.

Finally, in 1966 Congress concluded this series of authorizations by giving the Smithsonian a firm statutory basis for proceeding with the construction of the museum building. Part I of this legislation also changed the name of the "National Air Museum" to the "National Air and Space Museum."

So the concept for the projected building has a history starting in 1944. The architectural work is finished and the construction plans are in hand. The site has been designated by Congress and approved by the necessary planning and art commissions. And Congress has approved the actual construction of the building.

Yet, as of today, not 1 dollar has been funded for construction of the museum. The proposed building is at an absolute standstill. In fact, according to S. Paul Johnston, former Director of the Air and Space Museum, the project "may never get off the ground."

Why is this so? What is the true status of the building project? What is the real justification and need for the establishment of a national museum devoted to aeronautical and astronautical developments?

These are the kinds of questions that I have been reviewing since resuming my service in the Senate. And I hope that they represent the type of analysis which the Smithsonian regents and top brass might be willing to make concerning this important facility.

Mr. President, if the Board of Regents and the administrators of the Smithsonian wish to undertake an examination of the difficulties which the Air and Space Museum is encountering, they would do

well to start by reading the challenging address given before the Washington Aero Club on April 22 of last year by S. Paul Johnston, who was then still director of the Air and Space Museum.

Mr. Johnston had some very interesting remarks to make on that occasion. For example, after noting the original aura of excitement which he had held when he first looked over the prospect of creating a new museum facility, he summed up his feelings prior to his impending retirement by saying:

Now, five years later, I make my valedictory address in an atmosphere of frustration and personal disappointment. The bright outlook of 1965 has receded farther upstream each year. At the moment, the prospects for a new facility are at least as far in the future as they were then.

This is a shocking statement of concern. But the reasons Mr. Johnston gave for his conclusion are even more disturbing.

While he noted that the museum's enabling legislation of 1966 carries with it a commitment to postpone requests for construction money pending a reduction in the Vietnam conflict, he made clear his recognition that "some day such restrictions will disappear."

Mr. President, I am of the hope that this consideration will disappear even sooner than Mr. Johnston thought possible, and I would like to develop this point more fully later in my statement.

But, for now I want to focus on what Mr. Johnston calls the real problems confronting the museum. In his words, these "real problems relate not to things, but to people—that is, attitudes with respect to the Air and Space Museum, both in government—and, more specifically, in the Smithsonian itself."

Mr. Johnston followed this remark by reminding his audience—a public audience mind you—that he had come on board 5 years ago full of enthusiasm and "under an impression that the expansion of the Air and Space Museum activities was high on the Smithsonian's list of 'Things to be Done.'"

Then he added:

It was not until we were well into FY-67 that I began to suspect that we were not as high up on the Smithsonian Totem Pole as I had hopefully imagined.

Here it comes. Mr. Johnston is ready to put the finger on what he feels is the real source of the museum's problems.

His speech continues:

It comes down to a question of priorities—and when (as at present) money and man-power are being rationed, the question is—where do money and man-power go first?

Answer:—Not to the Air and Space Museum.

Now, I am still quoting:

Unfortunately, from our point of view, the current art and "ology"—oriented management of the Smithsonian appears to favor sculpture gardens, folk art (both performing and static), and elaborate housing for the scholarly, over the more practical, hardware-oriented technologies of flight.

At this point, Mr. Johnston sought to document his charge. He said:

At present, several millions of dollars are being spent to re-furbish the original Smith-

sonian Building in the pre-Civil War manner of the First Secretary, Joseph Henry—simply to provide a properly elegant atmosphere for Visiting Scholars. At the same time, essential operating dollars for the Air and Space Museum have almost dried up completely. Out of the more than \$30 million Federally appropriated Smithsonian budget, the Air and Space Museum's share is approximately 2 percent. We are in almost the same class with respect to personnel, about 2 percent of the total Smithsonian complement.

To make matters even bleaker, Mr. Johnston revealed that the museum was "threatened with expulsion from the Mall—to take up quarters and to try to operate a museum activity in the ancient and dilapidated Pension Building on downtown Court House Square."

Incidentally, I might note at this juncture, that the museum was able to fend off being separated from the main complex on the Mall, which some old maps describe accurately as the "Smithsonian Park." However, if this move was ever seriously considered within the Smithsonian structure, I must register my sympathy with Mr. Johnston over what would be an affront to a major museum.

Unfortunately, some other units of the Smithsonian did get shunted over there where I understand they are experiencing some crime and security problems.

But let me return to Mr. Johnston's remarks. For he is not through yet.

On top of everything else, the former Air and Space director noted that under the organization pattern then in effect, the Air and Space Museum reported to the Assistant Secretary for History and Art. The incumbent, according to Mr. Johnston, "take some pride in the fact that he has never come within miles of the Pentagon—physically or spiritually. He has little personal interest in aerospace matters, and yet he is representing us in the Upper Councils of the Smithsonian on our programs and priorities."

Well, this is pretty strong stuff and should have been thoroughly explored last year when it was first aired in public. The Evening Star reported the criticism under a three-column head so it was certainly open for the world to see.

Without commenting on the personality angle here, I would like to express my amazement at the fact that the aeronautical and astronautical sciences were in fact placed under the same section of the Smithsonian that is devoted to the humanities and arts.

Aeronautics and space exploration derive from, and indeed incorporate, many of the sciences, including mathematics, physics, fuel chemistry, metallurgy, physiology, psychology, biology, astronomy, astrophysics, geology, and geophysics. How in creation flight ever got mixed up with the "arts" at the Institution is beyond me.

This fact alone would raise doubts in my mind about the degree of interest and attention which the Smithsonian was devoting to its flight museum. I am happy to report that after great pressures were exerted, the Air and Space Museum was shifted last fall to the section for science, where it undoubtedly belongs.

Mr. President, in order that many interested persons may be able to examine for themselves the point of view given by a recent Director of the Air and Space Museum itself, I will ask at the conclusion of my remarks that the text of Mr. Johnston's speech be printed in the RECORD.

Having raised these complaints, I should not leave them lying open on the table, as it were, without seeking to explore the question of whether or not there is, in fact, a sound foundation for them.

In this connection, Mr. President, I will merely attempt to open the record so far as it is accessible to me and let the chips fall where they may. I will not attempt to make any determinations as to the attitudes or proclivities of the Smithsonian administration.

They can review the record for themselves. The Board of Regents can study the facts and make their own conclusions. And the appropriate committees of Congress having legislative jurisdiction over Smithsonian matters will, I hope, be ready to delve more fully into the subject in the event my remarks leave any important questions unanswered insofar as their interests are involved.

In fact, if nothing else comes of this speech except a drawing of attention to and interest in the true needs and role of the Air and Space Museum, I will consider my effort as having been worthwhile.

Let us examine one of the issues presented by Mr. Johnston. Does the Air and Space Museum get a miniscule portion of the Smithsonian budget as compared with its actual importance?

To answer this, I believe one should consider exactly what the overall objectives and functions of the museum really are. Here we can turn to the presentation material offered to Congress by the Smithsonian in justification of its annual budget requests.

At page 819 of the House hearings on the Institution's appropriation requests for fiscal 1971, Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian offers the following explanation:

The National Air and Space Museum is the nation's center for exhibition, education, and research in the history and principles of air and space flight. It maintains the world's greatest collection of objects related to flight and is a unique resource for research in aviation and aerospace history, in flight science and technology, in the impact of man-flight on the cultural life and economy of America, and in the pioneering efforts of early aviators and astronauts. This growing collection now consists of more than 200 technically and historically important aircraft, more than 300 engines, 1,000 air and spacecraft models, and a vast array of related equipment. Supplementing the physical specimens are extensive holdings of records resulting from air and space research, development and operations, films, art work, and memorabilia that available to students, historians, biographers, technicians, and engineers. Drawing upon these resources, the Museum produces exhibits portraying the past, present, and future of aeronautics in America.

In other words, the Smithsonian's leadership is saying that the Air and Space Museum should be the center in the

United States for the exhibition of the historical mainstream of flight—flight both in the atmosphere and into space.

Not only that, but the museum is also expected to be the Nation's center for public education or awareness of the significance and scope of aeronautical and astronautical developments. By visiting the museum, the public should become aware of the significant events which have taken place in the development of flight.

Even more, the museum is supposed to provide reference services for technical historians, patent researchers, airplane building hobbyists, and other specialists who need access to the original sources, including both research materials and actual artifacts.

With this bit of sketchy, but revealing, background, we can take a look at the budget and personnel figures and find out whether or not the museum's share is equal to its needs.

When Mr. Johnston took over the reins at the Air and Space Museum in 1965, there were 34 authorized permanent positions for that museum. This is the number that was allowed under the 1966 fiscal year appropriations.

Yet today there are not even that many hands on board. The actual number of personnel at the National Air and Space Museum of the United States is 30 people, counting the administrative side, support crew, and secretaries. This number also includes the 14 employees working at the preservation and restoration division at Silver Hill.

Several years ago the technical support team had 15 positions, now it is down to 14.

The curator's professional staff has decreased 50 percent in the Aero Section—from 4 to 2.

The Historical Research Center, which supports the museum in documenting the significance of acquisitions, answers 6,000 public inquiries annually, and runs a reference library, has the grand total of three employees.

The museum itself has no Director. Even though the former head gave 1 year's advance notice of his resignation, the position has not been filled 19 months later.

In terms of the overall Smithsonian picture, the Air and Space Museum has 1.6 percent of the actual total employment. At the April hearings, Assistant Secretary Bradley stated that the actual employment was 1,889 positions, so I am comparing 30 against 1,889.

The result is similar if I take the full number of authorized positions for fiscal 1970, which is 2,077, and compare it with the 41 positions which the Air and Space Museum is entitled to on paper, but does not, in fact, enjoy. On the basis of this comparison, the museum still has less than 2 percent of the overall slots.

In fairness, I will add that the Smithsonian has filed a request for an increase in the number of authorized positions reserved for the Air and Space Museum.

But, I must pose the question of what good this will do them if the positions are not released? There has been a rise in the number of positions authorized, but it has been purely on paper.

The story is the same when we delve into the budget figures. It is true that there has been an increase in funds appropriated for the Air and Space Museum since the 1966 fiscal year. However, when we examine the money appropriated to the museum—\$564,000—in light of the total money appropriated for Smithsonian salaries and expenses—\$29,565,000—in the current fiscal year, we come up with almost the same low percentage as resulted in the case of employment.

The Air and Space share of the budget is 1.7 percent and its share of personnel is 1.6 percent.

Some people may wish to contrast these figures with the demonstrated capacity of the Air and Space Museum to draw visitors to the Smithsonian complex. Out of a total number of 12,438,909 visitors to the Smithsonian Park in calendar year 1969, more than 4 million visitors went through air and space exhibits.

This is more people than went to see the Lincoln Memorial in 1969, which is the country's most popular historical shrine. It also represents nearly one-third of the overall Smithsonian audience and I think this fact deserves greater attention by those people who are setting policies for the museum—and I am addressing myself both to individuals at the Institution and in Congress.

For instance, I noted that Secretary Ripley referred to 2 million persons in his testimony to the House Appropriations Subcommittee. This is at page 894 of the hearings.

But in truth, there were more than 4 million visitors to the air and space displays during the last calendar year. Approximately 2.3 million of these persons came to see the impressive air and space objects located in the exhibit halls of the Arts and Industries building.

The original Wright Brothers flyer is on display here as well as the Spirit of St. Louis, and Mercury spacecraft Friendship-7. Also, the lunar rock sample is exhibited in this building, and as a result the current rate of visitors has risen to an average of 2.5 million on an annual basis.

There are nearly another 2 million persons who looked through the fascinating exhibits at the tin shed, the World War I hangar that houses many other Air and Space Museum displays. This structure is an entirely separate building from the Arts and Industries building. One popular item here is a command module simulator which a family can actually pilot.

It is pertinent to remember, when looking at the combined figure of 4.1 million visitors, that the exhibit areas were closed in both of these buildings every Monday in January, February, and March of 1969. Furthermore, they were closed at 4:30 p.m. all through the year, unlike the history and technology exhibits which stayed open until 9 p.m. for 5 months in the year.

Nor are the flight exhibit halls air conditioned in the Arts and Industries building. So all in all, I think the Air and Space Museum has placed a remarkable role in drawing visitors to the Smithsonian complex.

To me, this is a significant indication of its unique capacity to be a source of public understanding about the world of flight and an inspiration to youth.

It certainly gives a clear picture of the view held by millions of taxpayers who come to Washington to see their dollars at work. To approximately one-third of the individual Americans who comprise the Smithsonian's audience, the air and space exhibits are a live, vital part of the Institution. If they were to be told that the stature of the National Air and Space Museum within the Smithsonian organization is only 1.6 or 1.7 percent in terms of actual employees and money provided for its operations, I imagine there would be many raised eyebrows and much downright astonishment.

Another allegation opened up by Mr. Johnston's speech is that there is an art- and elegance-oriented direction to the Smithsonian's activities.

Again, I must turn to the documented record and allow the facts to speak for themselves.

One item Mr. Johnston may have had in mind when he was speaking of elaborate housing is the Belmont Conference Center. If memory serves me correctly, this structure was about to be released from the Smithsonian organization when I was completing my prior term in the Senate. Upon returning to this body after my 4-year sabbatical, I discover that it has been remodeled and now serves as a little-used conference center which is nearer to Baltimore than to Washington.

Or perhaps Mr. Johnston was thinking about the Renwick Gallery of Art on Pennsylvania Avenue. Since the 1967 fiscal year \$2,070,000 has been appropriated by Congress for restoration and renovation of this building, which is to be used for decorative arts. The Smithsonian management is asking for another \$300,000 to try to complete this program.

In somewhat the same category is another new component of the Smithsonian, the Cooper-Hewitt Museum of Decorative Arts and Design. One difference is that this building happens to be situated in New York City. Formerly it was known as the Carnegie Mansion.

The Smithsonian's presentation materials to Congress do not mention this building, so I could not determine what commitments have been made to revamp and refurbish it. Perhaps the funds for this project are carried in the private side of the Smithsonian's support structure. In any event, the acquisition of one more arts component might indicate a proclivity in that area.

One facility about which Mr. Johnston could not have known is the acquisition of the Archives of American Art. This happened just recently. What the full meaning will be of placing the Archives under the Smithsonian umbrella has yet to be explained, but I notice that its branch offices in Detroit and New York will be maintained.

Nor could he have foreseen the ambitious embarking by the Smithsonian management on a lavish national magazine. The periodical, which is called Smithsonian, actually contains articles about many non-Smithsonian activities and may or may not be able to compete with other scholarly reviews on such a

basis. Again, the venture is merely one more item to be noted and taken into account when considering where priorities for the Smithsonian's energies and interests are being aimed.

There is no question that Mr. Johnston, as well as the entire American public, had heard about the next Smithsonian project which I will mention. The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden has gained its share of notoriety.

The latest bit of news about this project is that it has cost overruns of about \$1 million above the \$15 million that Congress authorized for it. Almost \$9 million is being sought in the 1971 budget for construction work on this structure and its associated garden.

Similarly, Mr. Johnston was undoubtedly aware of the creation of the Division of Performing Arts inside the Smithsonian organization. This unit puts on an annual Folklife Festival on the Mall and spends in the neighborhood of \$200,000 annually.

Next, Mr. Johnston was likely aware that almost \$7 million was appropriated by Congress for repairs and restoration work to turn the former Patent Office in Washington into a center for the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery. Congress allowed \$5,465,000 for this project in 1964, which is when the present Secretary came to the Smithsonian. Another \$400,000 was provided prior to that for planning, and \$1 million was appropriated afterward to complete the work.

One more example which Mr. Johnston zeroed in on is the refurbishing of the original SI building in a pre-Civil War manner. By December of 1970, the whole building is to be revamped with curtains, rugs, furnishings, and gas light fixtures in keeping with the way it looked in 1855. Apparently the \$2.6 million appropriated for this work will provide comfortable offices for the Smithsonian secretary and his assistant secretaries, as well as a VIP dining room for the Smithsonian management.

There is a followup project to this one which would likely have aroused Mr. Johnston's interest if he were still at the Smithsonian. An appropriation of \$500,000 is currently being sought for the renovation of the 90-year-old Arts and Industries building. The Smithsonian management is seeking to construct several second floor decks in the building to obtain added space for administrative and public service purposes.

And, while we are in the area of construction, it seems appropriate to refer to two new requests which the Smithsonian management has laid before Congress. One of these is in the form of legislation seeking authority to spend \$6 million for the construction of two bicentennial pavilions.

The theme of these pavilions seems to have a heavy sociological bent, with emphasis being put on ways to describe "the whole panorama of our cultures." In the words of Secretary Ripley:

Young people representing Negroes, Indians, Spanish, Chinese, Japanese and other subcultures are not given the evidence that they are part of the stream of history of the United States.

Now, it may be proper for the Institution to play this kind of role in the Nation's bicentennial, but once more I must pose the question of where its priorities should be given. With the gigantic public interest in air and space, and with the tremendous pioneering role and contributions of the United States in the mainstream of aviation, rocketry, and space history, I believe it is fair to ask why the Smithsonian and the Congress should not be planning to unveil the permanent National Air and Space Museum in time for the national celebrations in 1976, instead of brainstorming major new sociocultural exhibits?

Another bill which was introduced recently at the request of the Smithsonian is one to reserve a site for the creation of a National Museum of Man. Although anthropology and studies in the science of man have traditionally been included within the Museum of Natural History, the Smithsonian administrators want to lay the foundation for an entirely separate, major new museum as a Smithsonian component.

Do these requests fit in with the pattern of activities which might fall under the heading of what Mr. Johnston has referred to as "art and 'ology'"—oriented attitudes?

We are dealing with subjective elements here. We must always keep in front of us the realization that the Smithsonian is a many-faceted institution. Any organization devoted to the "increase and diffusion of knowledge among men" has to display many sides and promote varied interests.

So it is not so much a question of whether or not the Smithsonian should expand its art activities, or develop elegant structures, or foster showy projects, as it is to ask where the limit of its resources is and which programs among the lot deserve priority attention and interest out of the money and manpower available.

This is why I have studied the Smithsonian organization across the board to see whether any obvious patterns might develop. This way the interested observer might be able to trace where the priorities have been given and where a decline or lack of strong support is visible.

Consequently, in addition to the projects which I have described above—all of which relate to the validity or error in the observations which Mr. Johnston has made—I would like to discuss a few other matters which may be useful in rounding out the picture.

Looked at over the period of the last 7 or 8 fiscal years, there appears to be a definite ballooning of positions and appropriations for certain units of the Smithsonian. On the other hand, the possible decline in attention to the National Air and Space Museum is seen not to be an isolated situation.

The overall number of permanent employees at the Institution is a case in point. In calendar year 1964 the total number of permanent positions authorized by Congress for the Smithsonian was 1,348. In addition, there was a full-time equivalent of 18 other employees represented by temporary workers.

By calendar year 1970 the number of authorized permanent employees had jumped to 2,077, with a request in for 2,448 for fiscal 1971. While the number of full-time equivalent employees is no longer shown in the presentation materials before Congress, the last time I saw it revealed it had shot up to 100 or more. Also, I believe there are in excess of 1,100 other employees who are paid from private funds.

Where are all these people located? Which bureaus and offices of the Smithsonian enjoy the added support of part-time helpers and privately paid employees?

While I cannot provide the complete answer, I can say one thing for sure. They are not at the Air and Space Museum, which, as I have said, has only 30 employees in all.

Where has the jump in employment occurred? Well, one place to look is right at the top. In early 1964, the Smithsonian management listed 23 positions. In 1970, the comparable figure has risen to 62.

Now, I know the presentation sheets do not show this. The Institution's table claims 29 slots for Office of Secretary and 33 positions for Management Support. I would remind my colleagues, however, that at the 1968 fiscal year hearings the Secretary disclosed that he had split up the Office of Secretary.

At page 981 of the House hearings, Mrs. HANSEN is reported to have asked:

Was management support set up so the Office of the Secretary would not look so expensive?

Upon this inquiry, Dr. Ripley answered:

We have divided functions previously budgeted under the Office of the Secretary that have been separately described in our 1968 justifications as management support.

Thus, if we are to find an accurate basis for viewing the growth of the Office of Secretary, we should take management support into account. It is on this basis that I say management has jumped from 23 to 62 positions.

Going to appropriations, it is interesting to note that the budget for management has increased 63 percent from fiscal year 1966 to 1969. The funds appropriated were \$561,000 in fiscal 1966 and \$916,000 in fiscal 1969. Again, this is calculated by combining the figures for Office of the Secretary and Management Support.

During the same period appropriations for the National Air and Space Museum increased by 31 percent—less than half of the management increase.

General or central administration has seen a similar sizable increase over the past few years. From 165 permanent positions in fiscal 1966, it has gone to 243 positions in fiscal 1970. Using the same border years, administrative appropriations have gone up from \$2,450,000 to \$4,103,000.

Another office which has enjoyed a healthy expansion is Academic Programs. This unit was founded in fiscal 1967 with 10 positions and \$200,000. By the 1969 fiscal year this unit was receiving more funds than the entire National Air and Space Museum. Aca-

ademic Programs now has 18 employees and over a half million dollar budget.

Perhaps one reason for its remarkable progress is the Secretary's open interest in education. According to Frank Waldrop, writing in the May issue of the *Washingtonian*, Dr. Ripley right off "wanted to know why the Capital of the United States did not have a university up there with Yale, Princeton, Oxford, Cambridge, or even Harvard. Congress would put up the money, his friends at the old schools would lend the professors, and the Smithsonian would do the housekeeping."

Elsewhere in this article, entitled "The Elegant Birdman of the Smithsonian"—Dr. Ripley is an ornithologist—his idea is described as one of using "the museum as the living heart of culture and education."

Such a view is consistent with the statement which Dr. Ripley made in his first budget appearance before Congress. On March 4, 1964, he said:

The Smithsonian can and should be a tremendous force for education in the world today.

At the 1967 fiscal year hearings, Dr. Ripley referred to the scientists and curators of the Institution as "a faculty as indeed I call them, of 300 qualified scholars working in the Smithsonian."

The Office of Academic Programs is a logical outgrowth of this philosophy since it offers several fellowship appointments and stipends, accompanied by formal educational activities.

The establishment of an educational radio service, "Radio Smithsonian," is further evidence of the direction in which the Institution is headed. Even the *Smithsonian* magazine is being heralded as one of the educational channels from the Smithsonian to people in their homes.

Once again I must clarify my purpose. It is not to criticize the development of new Smithsonian activities. It is not to say that the Institution should not broaden its interests in the fields of arts, humanities, and public awareness. As one who has sponsored two measures to extend the life of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and as the author of two amendments to strengthen that organization, I believe my credentials are in order in that field.

Rather my aim is to identify those areas where the greatest attention has been given, to illustrate the kind of major advances which are possible within the Smithsonian organization when the top brass is solidly in back of a project, to refresh my friends in Congress as to how we have been willing to fund many imposing new programs, and to ask whether the same current of enthusiasm, attention, and importance should not be given to the basic and practical sciences—which most certainly includes the National Air and Space Museum.

A little earlier I set forth my discovery that the flight museum had company in the apparent suspension of priority treatment. On the basis of having reviewed several recent Smithsonian budget statements I cannot help but feel that the Museum of Natural History is in the same boat with the Air and Space Museum.

In the tables for the 1966 fiscal year

the Museum of Natural History is shown to have 258 authorized positions. Yet in the 1970 fiscal year their base is down to 253. So, the past 5 fiscal years have not shown much progress for this important Smithsonian component.

True, the appropriations for natural history have risen a little, from \$3,002,000 in the 1966 fiscal year to \$3,674,000 in the 1970 fiscal year. But, put in the context of raises in other categories of the Smithsonian, such as general administration, this rise is minor.

The 1966 figure for general administration was \$2,450,000 or over a half million dollars below the Natural History Museum. The outlook for general administration in 1970 is a total appropriation of \$4,103,000. The budget for these units is now larger than natural history by \$429,000, nearly the reverse of the situation which existed in 1966.

Occasionally there is some notice taken of the special needs of the research scientists working at the museum, but I cannot say that there has been sufficient followthrough on them.

For example, at the hearings on funds for the 1967 fiscal year, Secretary Ripley alerted Congress to the fact that:

We have about 111 scientists working in natural history. We have about 90 technicians. All the surveys made by scientific organizations throughout the Government and in the Nation say at the very minimum two technical aids should be assigned to each scientist.

Well, if this is so, what has been done about it? Very little, I must conclude, if my current head count is right. For I believe the number of bench scientists has dropped to 103 and the number of technicians has fallen to 87.

Mr. President, this is the wrong kind of progress. If we do not watch out, in a very short while there will be two scientists for every laboratory technician instead of the other way around.

It is true that some recognition has again been given to the unfortunate developments at the museum. On page 757 of the April hearings on the House side, the Smithsonian statement includes the following admission:

[S]cientific research and curatorial activities in some museums may not be faring as well now as they were in 1968. A good example would be the National Museum of Natural History.

This is fine, but it is a little reminiscent of the 1967 hearings. The real question is what remedy is being pushed to change things.

While we are examining the situation at natural history, I should mention one more dimension of the problem which certain important visitors to the museum have brought to my attention. These persons, who know what they are talking about when it comes to judging significant animal specimens, tell me that the condition of exhibit animals on display in the Hall of Mammals is downright deplorable.

We should remember that a great many of these animals were donated to the Smithsonian. Often money was provided to the Institution for the actual mounting of the specimens. Also, I would remind my colleagues that several of

these animals were derived from Teddy Roosevelt's famed African safari.

With this important historical tie, and with the thought that the exhibit halls represent such an important role as the visible side of the Smithsonian in the eyes of taxpayers, I feel this matter is also worthy of being explored deeply by the proper authorities. Again, I suppose, the answer lies in a shortage of personnel. There simply is not anybody, or any unit, given to the museum who can do the job of maintaining these public specimens in good order. If the Museum of Natural History is not on the list of priorities at the Institution, then the deterioration of exhibit animals at that museum would seem to follow.

There once was a taxidermic unit under natural history that could handle this kind of preservation work, as well as serve a useful technical support role, but it was first moved out of the museum and then abolished. So this problem is logically connected with the broader need for adequate technical help at the museum.

Mr. President, this review of the Smithsonian scene should be enough to assist anyone interested in these matters to get off the ground. Hopefully, my comments will stir up some fresh thinking and activity by those persons who have responsibilities for the progress of all aspects of the Smithsonian.

In the event that there is some truth to the complaint about proclivities and attitudes within the Smithsonian organization, whether unintentional or not, I would wish that by airing the idea we will alert responsible, fair, and intelligent people to the difficulties caused by such moods.

In short, all I am seeking is a balance. If any redressing is in order, then let it be done by putting things in their proper perspective. I am asking for no special favors for the Air and Space endeavor. An equal standing for it within the priorities of the Smithsonian program is as far as my plea goes.

For once it is clear that the flight project has a priority status inside the Smithsonian structure, and once it is demonstrated that the National Air and Space Museum has achieved a stature in that organization commensurate with its true national stature, I am confident Congress can be persuaded to press forward with funding for the permanent building.

There are no restrictions in the 1966 enabling law. Nothing of this kind is spelled out in the law itself. No conditions were proposed by the House committee or on the floor of the House.

The reason for deferring the project is found on page 4 of the report by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. The language reads as follows:

The Committee expressly recommends . . . that appropriations should not be requested pursuant to H.R. 6125 unless and until there is a substantial reduction in our military expenditures in Vietnam.

So there it is. This is the only legislative holdup on the program. It was recommended in June of 1966, before the first manned lunar landing had taken place.

Now that this landmark in the history

of mankind has occurred and public excitement about space achievements has catapulted, I believe the time has arrived when the American people want to have a decent home for the national center where the world's greatest collection of aircraft and space objects can be shown.

Americans want to have a center where they can enjoy the incomparable inspirational feeling which their heritage in flight and space can offer. In these troubled times, the people want to have some resource where they can gain a feeling of pride in human accomplishment.

This is what the National Air and Space Museum is all about. It will tell the story of progress during the past, but it will guide visitors' thoughts to the challenges, hopes, and opportunities of the future as well.

In closing, I will say that I do not know of any better investment for the Nation's celebration of its 200th anniversary than the establishment of a permanent building for the National Air and Space Museum. Aviation and astronautics are America's triumph. Let us recognize it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address by Mr. S. Paul Johnston and other materials relative to my remarks about the Smithsonian be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From A.A.H.S. Journal, Summer 1969]

ADDRESS TO THE WASHINGTON AERO CLUB, BY S. PAUL JOHNSTON, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

I greatly appreciate this opportunity to come before this oldest of our local aerospace associations to discuss briefly the current outlook for the establishment of a proper museum facility to bring before the American public some concept of where we have been, why we are here—and where we are going in this business in which we are all engaged.

Incidentally, at this point in time, I have come full-cycle in my short career as a "museologist." My first public appearance after taking on this job about five years ago was before this club. Now—this will probably be my last appearance on behalf of the National Air and Space Museum. I shall retire from the Federal Service on the First of September of this year.

At the time of my matriculation speech—which must have been sometime in the winter of 1964-65—I was really "bright-eyed and bushy-tailed" over the prospect of creating here in Washington a great new facility on behalf of the government, and the aerospace industry. This seemed a fantastically interesting and worthwhile thing to do. It seemed then, just around the corner.

Now, five years later, I make my valedictory address in an atmosphere of frustration and personal disappointment. The bright outlook of 1965 has receded farther upstream each year. At the moment, the prospects for a new facility are at least as far in the future as they were then. We can't yet see around that corner.

Disappointing as all this may be, we are all aware of the underlying reasons. This country's dollar commitments at home and abroad for urgent domestic and military programs are currently the overriding considerations. This is not exactly the time to go to the Congress for some \$50 million for a museum building in Washington. In fact, during the hearings on our enabling legisla-

tion (H.R. 6125 passed and signed by President Johnson in July of 1966), the Smithsonian was specifically enjoined from coming to the Congress for construction funding until after the settlement of the Vietnamese War.

Someday such restrictions will disappear. No one knows when this may be. But it is not too early to give the matter some serious thought. In every post-war period there are urgent needs for large public works projects to take up the economic slack, to help tide over the period of adjustment when the swing is away from war-time production back to neglected domestic needs.

In the projected Air and Space Museum we have an ideal project of this kind—on the shelf and ready to go. Consider the following:

(a) The project has been approved and construction authorized by Congress;

(b) The site has been approved by the several National Capitol Planning and Art Commissions, and dedicated for the purpose by the Congress.

(c) Congress has appropriated (1963-64) over \$2 million for planning and design of a building. The architectural work is completed and the construction drawings are in hand.

All that remains is Congressional appropriation for construction.

But there are other problems—and I want to touch on a few of them—particularly to point out where you, as the Aero Club of Washington can lend a much needed hand.

You have already indicated your interest in doing something for us. Your immediate reaction to a recent article in an aviation publication alleging a "dreadful" state of affairs at Silver Hill was most gratifying. I do not intend to discuss that bit of doubtful journalism here. Gene Norris and his committee have looked into the situation in detail and I am perfectly willing to leave the case in their hands.

Also, a few weeks ago, in the course of inspecting progress on the NC-4 (which is now down on the Mall), the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Air, VADM Thomas Connolly, looked over the entire facility at Silver Hill and made the following comment (in part):

"As a member of your Advisory Board, I was glad of the opportunity to inspect the Silver Hill facility, apart from the NC-4 project and I was much impressed by what I saw. Your shops are in excellent shape, even by Navy standards. The fact that so much progress has been made in the last few years in getting new warehouse buildings for the protection of our country's historically important aircraft, engines, and spacecraft is most laudable. Your inventory records were most impressive and these are important. Soon we must drive hard for the permanent Museum. America badly needs it now in my opinion."

The magazine article had other effects, both bad and good. It is no news to any of you Washington hands that letters from Congressmen create consternation—if not downright panic—in any government bureau. Everything else comes to a grinding halt until some sort of reply is dispatched—usually by carrier pigeon. I can't even guess how many man-hours have been absorbed around my office lately in fending off "crank" letters to Congressmen generated by that article.

On the other hand, we have had many positive results. You might be surprised at the number of young people who have offered to volunteer their services to help in any way. For example, I had a telephone call from a pair of 16-17 year old high school seniors from Long Island, Bob Oddo and Ralph Muscente—they offered to come to Washington during their Easter holiday to see what they might do for us during the summer. I thought this was great. We had them come

down, put them up overnight and gave them the run of the museum, including Silver Hill and our model shops at 24th Street. They really had a ball—and I think that they went home with quite a different impression of a museum and its problems than the one they brought with them. We hope they will be back.

Now, as to what your organization can do.

First, you must isolate the real problems confronting the museum. I think that Gene Norris and his committee recognized (and hopefully reported to your Board) that the basic problem does not lie in the area of assisting the museum to salvage a lot of old aircraft which are allegedly rotting away on a Maryland hill-top. Actually, of the 200-odd airframes and 300-400 engines, etc., at Silver Hill—only a relatively small fraction are of sufficient historical value to even be considered for public display. Our physical problems have long since been recognized, and are being dealt with as rapidly as our capabilities (money and manpower) allow.

Our real problems relate not to things, but to people—i.e., attitudes with respect to the Air and Space Museum, both in government—and, more specifically, in the Smithsonian itself. The latter controls the former. It is in such areas that your organization can be of the greatest help.

As I said earlier—I came here five years ago "full of beans" and enthusiasm—under an impression that the expansion of the Air and Space Museum activities was high on the Smithsonian's list of "Things to be Done." In spite of the slowing down of our legislative programs and the progressive imposition of dollar and manpower restrictions, I failed to read the obvious signs correctly. Perhaps this resulted from lack of proper communication with the "front office." It was not until we were well into FY-67 that I began to suspect that we were not as high up on the Smithsonian Totem Pole as I had hopefully imagined.

Most of us who have been in this aviation business for many years develop a certain amount of self delusion. In our enthusiasm for our own activities, we think that everybody is impressed by—and vitally interested in our mechanical birds and their accomplishments. It is sometimes a shock to find that this "just ain't necessarily so." Especially around a place like the Smithsonian, there are any number of "ologies" and sociologically-oriented disciplines whose practitioners consider aircraft only as a means of getting out to the remote boondocks to study baboon behavior, or to look into the private life of the green spotted frog of the upper Amazon—and spacecraft are important only as vehicles to carry biological or astrophysical experiments.

Now these things are all well worth doing—but it comes down to a question of priorities—and when (as at present) money and man-power are being rationed, the question is—where do money and man-power go first?

Answer:—Not to the Air and Space Museum.

Unfortunately, from our point of view, the current art and "ology"—oriented management of the Smithsonian appears to favor sculpture gardens, folk art (both performing and static), and elaborate housing for the scholarly, over the more practical, hardware-oriented technologies of flight.

At present, several millions of dollars are being spent to re-furbish the original Smithsonian Building in the pre-Civil War manner of the First Secretary, Joseph Henry—simply to provide a properly elegant atmosphere for Visiting Scholars. At the same time, essential operating dollars for the Air and Space Museum have almost dried up completely. Out of the more than \$1 billion Federally appropriated Smithsonian budget, the Air and Space Museum's share is approximately 2 percent. We are in almost

the same class with respect to personnel, about 2 percent of the total Smithsonian complement. And yet—statistically, more people come in to see air and space exhibits than visit any other S.I. component—except possibly the Zoo!

Furthermore, we are now threatened with expulsion from the Mall—to take up quarters and to try to operate a museum activity in the ancient and dilapidated Pension Building on downtown Court House Square. This we are strenuously resisting, for there may be reason to believe that once we are separated from the main complex on the Mall—we may never get back.

But, there is nothing really astonishing in all this if one considers the pedigrees and proclivities of the Smithsonian Secretariat—the top-side group which determines the Institution's policies and priorities. Most of them hail from the Groves of Academe—holders of advanced degrees in philosophy, biology, sociology, history and art.

Under the present organization pattern, the Air and Space Museum reports to the Assistant Secretary for History and Art. The incumbent is a nice guy, a PhD—a specialist in the political history of England in the 18th Century. He takes some pride in the fact that he has never come within miles of the Pentagon—physically or spiritually. He has little personal interest in the aerospace matters, and yet he is representing us in the Upper Council of the Smithsonian on our programs and priorities.

I protested this arrangement when it was first announced about a year ago on the grounds that we were substantially more akin to science and technology than to history and art—but to no avail.

Now here is where I think that you can help us most.

The Secretary of the Smithsonian is a highly intelligent man of great scholarly attainments. He is a biologist by trade, an ornithologist by profession and a humanitarian by instinct. His personal interests are naturally in such areas. But, as head of an institution which derives the greater part of its support (both directly and indirectly) from the Federal Government, he must be reasonably responsive to Congressional wishes.

He must also be responsible to the Board of Regents, the governing body of the Institution. By law, the 14 Regents include (1) the Chief Justice of the United States as Chancellor; (2) the Vice President of the United States as Vice Chancellor; (3) Six Congressional members, three from the House; and six "citizen" members. The names of the individuals are, of course, a matter of public record. Unfortunately, at present only one "Citizen Regent" has any direct interest in air and space activities—William A. M. Burden of New York. Bill has been most helpful, but his is only one voice. In past years, Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker was a Regent, and had a great deal to do with keeping the air and space interests alive, but Jerry had to drop many of his former activities and resigned last year. As far as I know, no replacement has been announced for his chair.

By law, the Air and Space Museum has its own Advisory Board, charged with advising the Secretary on matters relating to the Museum. Its membership consists of Chiefs of Staff (or their designees) of the several Armed Services, and the Heads (or designees) of two civilian agencies, NASA, FAA, plus three citizen members. At present the latter three positions are vacant, awaiting Presidential appointments under the new administration. This board meets at the will of the Secretary. It has been convened only three times in the past two years.

I am not about to suggest how you go about it. That is up to you. But it does seem possible that through your many business and professional associations you do have channels of communication with the Hill—the Bureau of the Budget, and even into the

Smithsonian administration. Any way that can be found to call attention to the situation of the Air and Space Museum and to create some favorable reactions when museum dollars and personnel allotments are under consideration will be all to the good.

You may also wish to undertake to make it clear to the Congress and to the Smithsonian Secretariat that the industries and the professional societies you represent take a dim view of anything that tends to diminish the status and stature of aerospace science and technology in the Smithsonian scheme of things.

The National Air and Space Museum is an invaluable asset for the education of the American people as to the past achievements, the current importance and the future potentials of the great industries we represent. But, there is presently a real danger that, unless you people in the industry and in the scientific and technical societies take a real interest in its future and take positive action to insure that future, it may never get off the ground.

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 23, 1969]

#### AIR MUSEUM NEGLECT CLAIMED

The Smithsonian Institution has been criticized by the director of its National Air and Space Museum for neglecting that program while spending millions on projects he considers less vital to the public interest.

S. Paul Johnston, 69, who is retiring from federal service in September, told the Aero Club of Washington yesterday he is giving his "valedictory address in an atmosphere of frustration and personal disappointment."

Johnston expressed concern whether a new \$50 million museum, for which Congress appropriated \$2 million planning money five years ago, would ever "get off the ground" under the present set of circumstances.

While it was understood the building must wait until after the Vietnam war, there is now doubt whether it will ever be built unless a real interest is taken by "you people in the industry and in the scientific and technical societies," Johnston said.

Blaming lack of interest and apathy at the Smithsonian itself, Johnston said the air and space museum receives about 2 percent of a \$50 million budget, although more people visit the air-oriented exhibits than any other Smithsonian component except the Zoo.

"There is really nothing astonishing about all this if one considers the pedigrees and proclivities of the Smithsonian secretariat—the top-side group which determines the institution's policies and priorities," Johnston said.

"Almost to a man they hail from the Groves of Academe—holders of advanced degrees in philosophy, biology, sociology, history and art.

"Under the present organizational pattern, the Air and Space Museum reports to the Assistant Secretary for History and Art. The incumbent is a Ph.D., a nice guy—a specialist in the political history of England in the 18th Century.

"He takes some pride in the fact that he has never come within miles of the Pentagon—physically or spiritually. He has little personal interest in aerospace matters, and yet he is representing us in the Upper Council of the Smithsonian on our programs and priorities," Johnston said.

The secretary for history and art is Charles Blitzer.

Johnston said the "art and 'ology" oriented Smithsonian management appeared to favor sculpture gardens, folk art and elaborate housing for the scholarly "over the more practical, hardware-oriented technologies of flight."

He said several millions of dollars were being spent to restore the original Smithsonian building to its pre-Civil War styling "to provide a properly elegant atmosphere for visiting scholars."

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 6, 1969]

#### SMITHSONIAN SEEKS CASH FOR PAVILIONS

The Smithsonian Institution has asked Congress for permission to undertake its first major expansion in almost six years.

It is seeking \$6 million to construct two 25,000-square foot pavilions adjacent to its National Museum of History and Technology on Constitution Avenue between 12th and 14th Streets NW.

They would be called Bicentennial Pavilions and would be in operation by 1976 as a major part of the institution's observance of the 200th anniversary of the American Declaration of Independence.

The institution's second request is that Congress set aside federally owned land on the Mall bounded by Third Street, Maryland Avenue, Fourth Street and Jefferson Drive, for the institution's use at a later date.

It is hoped in the future to construct there a 350,000-square-foot museum to be called the National Museum of Man.

Sen. J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.), on behalf of the institution's board of regents, of which he is a member, has introduced two bills in the Senate that would authorize this expansion.

Smithsonian spokesmen have said that increasing numbers of visitors—over 6 million last year—and diminishing space available for exhibits make the expansion necessary.

The pavilions would be named "A Nation from the Nations" and "A Nation to the Nations." They would serve as a showplace, respectively, for the contributions made to the nation by the various peoples who settled it, and the influence of America on the world.

The Museum of Man would permit removal of the sciences of man from the Museum of Natural History.

It would consolidate the Smithsonian's office of anthropology there and the center for the study of man.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 28, 1970]

#### POOL SMITHSONIAN FUNDS?

The regents of the Smithsonian Institution met today to consider a proposal by Secretary S. Dillon Ripley that the several separate endowments of the institution be pooled, handled as one large fund in their investment and management.

The secretary has correctly pointed out that this is the custom at Harvard and Yale as well as the Museum of Modern Art in New York. The idea makes a certain amount of immediate sense to anyone who reflects that big money has an investment advantage over small money.

The situation, however, is more complicated than that. Despite the present secretary's efforts, the Smithsonian is not a university. It is the nation's original "multiversity." And in nothing more so than in the numerous endowments, especially the \$13 million endowment of the Freer Gallery of Art, seemingly the principal target of the pooling proposal.

Like many donors of the Smithsonian funds, Charles Freer did not leave his superb collection of Oriental art, the money to erect a handsome building to house it and the \$13 million to the Smithsonian Institution. Rather, he gave his most generous gift to the United States of America. This political entity turned the bequest, as it had many others, over to the Smithsonian for administrative purposes.

There is no question but that Freer's intent was to have his bequest support his interest in Oriental art and not to have it support the diverse interests of any Smithsonian secretary of the future. The proposal to pool the \$13 million is basically the action of a housekeeper seeking to take over the function of the master of the house.

In the name of the nation's agreement with Freer, honorably entered into, the proposal must be resisted by the regents.



**HIRSHHORN MUSEUM BID EYED**  
(By David Vienna)

The federal government is investigating an attempt by a construction company to increase by \$759,279 a low bid it submitted to build a new museum for the Smithsonian Institution.

The company—Piracci Construction Co. of Baltimore—tried to change the bid the day after its original bid was found to be the lowest of three submitted, the General Services Administration said.

The founder and former president of Piracci Construction is Dominic Piracci Sr., who was convicted last year of paying off a labor official to insure labor peace on a construction project.

The Piracci firm, whose former chief is also the father-in-law of Baltimore Mayor Thomas J. D'Alesandro III, originally submitted a bid of \$12,204,763 to build the Smithsonian's Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Gardens.

**BID WAS LOWEST**

When the bids were opened at the General Services Administration on Dec. 18, 1969, Piracci's bid was \$2,558,514.40 lower than Norair Engineering Co.'s offer of \$14,763,277.40.

Another company, Blake Construction Co., Inc., bid \$14,817,811 on the project.

"The day after the bids were opened, Piracci advised the (GSA) contracting officer that it had made a mistake in its bid," according to a GSA memorandum on the matter.

"Piracci alleged that it erroneously omitted from its bid the amount of \$754,375 for architectural concrete and the amount of \$4,904.43 for a consequent increase in the costs of performance and payment bonds," the GSA document said. "Piracci requested correction of its bid by . . . \$759,279.43," the memo said.

If the corrected bid is allowed, the Piracci bid would come to \$12,964,042.43—still less than the Norair offer.

Early this month, Norair "protested to the comptroller general of the United States any award to Piracci Construction Co. in the amount other than the amount of Piracci's original bid," the GSA memo said.

**OTHER ERRORS**

GSA must report to the comptroller general on the matter and will be bound by the comptroller's decision. The comptroller general is in charge of the investigation.

A spokesman for Piracci declined to comment yesterday on the investigation. He said it would be "improper for us to discuss the matter at this time."

GSA officials said sometimes errors are made in bids and bidders were allowed to amend their offers.

GSA said that roughly 3 per cent of the bids submitted to the agency on construction projects contain bidder's errors.

Norair itself made a mistake in a previous round of bidding on the same project. Last spring the museum and garden project, which will be situated in the Mall area between 7th and 9th Streets was opened to bids.

Norair was the low bidder then with an offer of \$15,198,000, but withdrew its bid, claiming that an arithmetical error made its bid \$1 million too low, a GSA official said. Piracci submitted a bid of \$16.3 million in the spring.

All the bids submitted in the spring were higher than the \$13 million allotted for the project by Congress. GSA subsequently reduced the size of the project and solicited another round of bids late last year.

Dominic Piracci Sr. resigned as president and relinquished all his interest in the construction company that bears his name in June, 1969, a company lawyer here said yesterday.

In June Piracci began serving a six-month sentence for paying a union official \$10,000 to guarantee "labor peace" during the con-

struction by the Piracci firm of the national Social Security Administration headquarters in Baltimore, Piracci was also fined \$5,000.

Guido Iozzi Jr., president of the Baltimore Construction Trades Council (AFL-CIO) was convicted of receiving the Piracci payoff. Iozzi was given a 15-year prison sentence in February, 1969, for extortion.

The Piracci firm also built the \$3.2 million post office in Riverdale, Prince George's County, the newest and largest post office in the suburbs.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 30, 1970]  
**RIPLEY PROJECTS BACKED BY SMITHSONIAN REGENTS**

(By Herman Schaden)

Smithsonian Secretary S. Dillon Ripley has been given a full vote of confidence by the Board of Regents in his program to broaden the scope of the institution's activities.

In a statement released today the regents, the organization's policy-making group:

1. Approved the Smithsonian Magazine, a national monthly scheduled to begin publication in April.

2. Endorsed a study of the secretary's recommendation to pool various private endowment funds for investment purposes, while maintaining the individual character of each fund.

3. Expressed satisfaction with plans for improved operating procedures and for internal auditing of financial affairs.

With Chief Justice Warren E. Burger presiding for the first time as chancellor, the regents' actions were regarded by institution spokesmen as a clear-cut repudiation of recent sniping at Ripley by sources outside the Smithsonian.

Although the semiannual regents' meeting was held Wednesday, their carefully drafted statement was not issued until Burger and others approved it word by word.

A staff under the direction of Edward K. Thompson, former editor of Life, has been preparing for the magazine publication for more than a year. Subscriptions and advertising have been solicited nationally.

A suggestion by one source that some regents opposed the magazine was not borne out at the meeting. Two regents were said to have favored the magazine, but expressed uncertainty because of unfamiliarity with publication plans.

**SUBSCRIBERS BECOME MEMBERS**

The regents said the magazine "will be supported by a basic subscription of \$10 a year, advertising revenue, and other private sources outside presently existing Smithsonian funds . . . Subscribers will automatically become members of the Smithsonian Associates and will become eligible for other benefits."

After hearing a detailed explanation of the fund-pooling proposal the regents "accepted the secretary's recommendation to study the advisability of establishing a unified investment program for the institution's private endowments designed to achieve higher investment rates and lower administration costs without affecting the integrity of the individual funds such as the Walcott Fund, Sprague Fund, the Freer Fund, the Ramsey Fund and many others.

"This program, if ultimately adopted, would not involve any transfer of collections, capital funds or income from any one of the existing endowment funds to any other.

**REQUEST TERMS UNCHANGED**

"None of these steps would depart from the terms of the original bequests, including the Freer gift and bequest of his unique collection of Oriental and American works of art."

Proponents of the plan have said the Smithsonian has fallen behind the times in

not having adopted it sooner. They have insisted that the procedure would in no way jeopardize separate maintenance of Freer and other funds earmarked by donors for specific uses.

The regents said they also discussed a preliminary draft report in which the General Accounting Office took exception with the way building construction funds for the Natural History Museum had been utilized for the purchase of furnishings. Smithsonian officials maintain the expenditures were justified by intent of Congress, and they will so argue in a rebuttal to GAO.

"No action was taken by the board with respect to the GAO report in view of its preliminary nature," the regents said.

"The board expressed satisfaction with the institution's plans for improvement of various operating procedures and of the internal auditing of the financial affairs of the institution."

The Smithsonian's fiscal department is in the process of being modernized under the direction of its treasurer, T. Amos Wheeler.

The meeting was held at Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post's estate, Hillwood, which will be maintained as a Smithsonian Institution after her death.

Attending were Sens. Clinton P. Anderson and J. William Fulbright, Reps. George H. Mahon and Frank T. Bow, and citizen members John Nicholas Brown, William A. M. Burden, Crawford H. Greenewalt, Caryl P. Haskins and, a new regent, Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman of the International Business Machines Corp.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1970]

**HIRSHHORN MUSEUM COST RISES AGAIN—**

**BY \$1 MILLION**

(By David Vienna)

Smithsonian Institution officials anticipate the cost of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden will exceed by about \$1 million the \$15 million congressional authorization for the project.

House Appropriations Committee sources said they were advised of this late in January by Smithsonian officials.

This is the second time since December that cost estimates have been increased for the museum, on which construction will begin Monday.

The Piracci Construction Co. of Baltimore increased its low bid of \$12,204,763 to build the structure by almost \$760,000 the day after Piracci was awarded the contract.

Piracci claimed it had made an error in its original bid. The revised bid was allowed, following an investigation by the General Accounting Office.

The bulk of the \$1 million overrun is attributable to "inflationary increases" in the construction industry, congressional sources said they were told by Smithsonian officials.

The construction costs now are expected to rise to \$13.8 million, \$800,000 higher than Piracci's previously revised bid, sources say.

The \$13.8 million cost of construction is just one of several expenditures necessary to complete the \$16 million project. Other items include planning, design, contingencies and other costs.

Asked how the Smithsonian was going to come up with the additional \$1 million, a congressional source said, "it was understood that there would be a contribution from Hirshhorn." Hirshhorn and his representatives were not available for comment yesterday.

Details on the contribution are being worked out, the source said. Part or all of the money may come from Hirshhorn's previous pledge of \$1 million to the Smithsonian to purchase art works.

The museum, which will be built in the Mall area between 7th and 9th Streets, will house Hirshhorn's art collection, valued at some \$40-million, which he is giving to the government.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 11, 1970]

**MALL MEMORIAL TO HIRSHHORN PROBED**  
(By Jack Anderson)

Both Congress and the White House are quietly investigating how the Hirshhorn Museum, a doughnut-shaped edifice intended to immortalize a stock manipulator and convicted money smuggler, happened to be accorded an honored spot on Washington's historic mall.

Now under construction, the Hirshhorn Doughnut will soon take its place beside the Washington Monument and Lincoln Memorial.

Rep. Frank Thompson (D-N.J.), chairman of the House Library and Memorials subcommittee, is checking into the curious background of Joseph E. Hirshhorn, now 70, who demanded and got a memorial to himself in the same neighborhood as those honoring George Washington and Abraham Lincoln.

At the same time, presidential troubleshooter Clark Mollenhoff is conducting a separate investigation into the tax aspects of Hirshhorn's \$25 million art collection, which is supposed to be deposited in the Hirshhorn Doughnut.

The bantamweight, Latvian-born Hirshhorn immigrated to Brooklyn's turn-of-the-century ghetto and launched into a shady financial career before he was whiskered.

**SLEAZY DEALING**

He made several fortunes on the curb market before the Securities and Exchange Commission hampered this sort of dealing. Then he branched into stock juggling across the Canadian border.

In Canada, he got in trouble with Canadian Securities Commissioner J. M. Godfrey who charged in a written report that Hirshhorn had pulled off a million-dollar "manipulation." No criminal charges could be brought because it was a "loner" deal not a conspiracy.

Instead, the fast-talking young American was ordered deported—an order he fought and won. Later, in 1945, he was fined \$8,500 in an illegal securities sale case and for trying to smuggle \$15,000 out of Canada.

In 1951, Hirshhorn's stock finagling came under fire in the Saskatchewan legislature where Liberal Alex Cameron called him a "racketeer." But Hirshhorn staged a fantastic uranium coup and amassed millions.

**DANGEROUS CURIOSITY**

He also bought truckloads of contemporary paintings which, by 1955, were valued at \$1.5 million. How the "value" figure reached more than \$25 million is a question that has aroused Mollenhoff's curiosity.

There is a letter in the Smithsonian Institution's confidential files, for instance, from Hirshhorn's curator, Abram Lerner, insisting that the artists' own dealers should assess the value of the paintings. This is like asking a producer to evaluate his own movie and it was questioned by the Smithsonian officials.

A memo between the officials cautions: "Before the Smithsonian accepts the proposal, we must be absolutely sure that the valuation will be satisfactory to the Internal Revenue Service." Insiders concede that the collection cost far less than the \$25 million evaluation.

Other Smithsonian documents, marked "Administratively Confidential," show that the institution had to do some jockeying to get the collection. One tells how the vain Hirshhorn "would like some renewed attention from Mrs. (Lyndon) Johnson—a phone call or some such."

As it happened, Lady Bird and Lynda Bird quietly dropped in on the Hirshhorn collection in Greenwich, Conn., to "Oh" and "Ah."

This column has a copy of another crucial letter, which Hirshhorn wrote President

Johnson on May 17, 1965. It instructs LBJ: "I would, of course, want binding assurances that the museum would bear my name in perpetuity."

**ADVICE AND DISSENT**

Some advisers were apprehensive about the conditions. Sherman Lee, director of Cleveland's Museum of Art, urged Mrs. Johnson to forego Hirshhorn's name lest it discourage other donors to the museum. He also warned Lady Bird of the "quixotic nature" of the collection.

The Chicago Art Institute's renowned Charles Cunningham at a meeting of art museum directors, according to the confidential minutes, snorted: "The United States government is being asked to furnish \$10 to \$12 million in appropriated funds to establish a memorial to Joseph Hirshhorn."

But LBJ was egged on by Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas, a friend of Hirshhorn's. The President finally agreed that the taxpayers would build and maintain the Hirshhorn gallery and a huge ditch crossing the mall that would contain a pool and sculpture garden.

By contrast, Andrew Mellon donated the National Gallery of Art, paid for the building and endowed its upkeep. He also modestly ordered his name left off.

But LBJ let himself be hornswoggled into immortalizing Hirshhorn on the same mall with Washington and Lincoln. At the groundbreaking, Mr. Johnson solemnly intoned: "The flight of Apollo 8 and the birth of the Hirshhorn Museum tells us something about this country and its people."

And upon the same occasion, curator Lerner added: "Mr. Hirshhorn has the spirit shown by mountain climbers, explorers and burglars."

[From the Washington Post, April 1970]

**SMITHSONIAN PROBE ASKED**

(By Maxine Cheshire)

Rep. Frank Thompson, chairman of the House Library and Memorials subcommittee, has asked the Rules Committee to subpoena power to launch an investigation into the Smithsonian Institution's financial affairs.

John d'Amecourt, chief counsel for the subcommittee, said yesterday afternoon that Thompson intends to "conduct hearings into the entire Smithsonian—from basement to attic."

There has been no such review, he said, since the museum was founded.

"It's time," he added, "in view of all the criticism recently, to air the whole thing and get everything out in the open . . . there have been so many allegations made that must be proven or disproven once and for all."

D'Amecourt said the subcommittee will ask to see financial records, "individual records, expense accounts and a complete auditing of both private and federal funds."

Without a subpoena, Congress does not ordinarily have a right to delve into the Smithsonian's private endowments if officials choose to resist pressure to open the books.

The General Accounting Office, after a preliminary study of the Smithsonian's financial management activities, recommended in January that Congress instigate "increased auditing attention" of federal appropriations.

In a formal statement, after the GAO recommendation, the Board of Regents expressed "satisfaction with the Institution's plans for improvement of various operating procedures and of the internal auditing of the financial affairs of the Institution."

D'Amecourt's investigation is already under way. The subpoena resolution before the Rules Committee is expected to be acted upon "pro forma" within a few days.

A date for hearings to begin has not been set.

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 26, 1970]

**REVIEW OF SMITHSONIAN SET**

(By Herman Schaden)

A congressional investigation of Smithsonian Institution operations, first in the sprawling complex's 124-year-history, will be undertaken soon by a House Administration subcommittee.

As outlined by Chairman Frank Thompson, D-N.J., it will be an open-minded review intended to clear the air of nagging rumors and allegations which recently have come to the attention of the Library and Memorials subcommittee.

Thompson is a trustee of the Kennedy Center, a Smithsonian subsidiary, and has a record of sponsorship of cultural projects perhaps unrivaled in Congress.

"The Smithsonian as everyone knows is a fine organization with a long record of notable achievements as a museum and in advancing knowledge in the arts and sciences," Thompson said. "The purpose of a hearing is to get to the bottom of recent allegations, and not to make headlines."

**REVIEW PLANNED EARLY**

John d'Amecourt, subcommittee staff director, said a review of Smithsonian affairs was planned before a series of events critical of the institution began last winter.

"The subcommittee and other members of Congress have heard allegations of mismanagement, the expeditious use of funds and that the Smithsonian perhaps was overextending itself on some projects," d'Amecourt said.

The subcommittee has asked the Rules Committee for subpoena power which will assure access to any and all Smithsonian financial records applying to both the private and public sources of revenue and disbursement. It also will give the investigators power to call any witness it wants to hear.

A combination of news stories and complaints by private citizens prompted the Thompson subcommittee to broaden its original plans so that the review may now reach into many facets of the Smithsonian's far-flung operations.

The hearing is expected to inquire into the usage of the \$29 million in endowments in addition to the \$31.3-million federal appropriation.

**CONSOLIDATION OF FUNDS**

Some sources are known to be concerned lest private funds and endowments, earmarked for specific purposes, are transferred to other uses. The most frequently mentioned funds is the \$18 million endowment for the Freer Art Gallery. Smithsonian officials have denied the fund has been tapped for uses other than the Freer.

Last winter the Smithsonian administration asked its Board of Regents to approve a plan whereby all funds, including the Freer, could be consolidated for investment purposes. The proponents said the Freer, as well as other bequests, would retain their individual character.

About the same time the General Accounting Office sent a preliminary draft report to the Smithsonian criticizing use of construction funds at the Museum of Natural History for the purchase of supplies. The Smithsonian claims it always has had congressional authorization for such procedures, and says it can prove it.

Still another bone of contention is the new Smithsonian Magazine. Some say the publication was begun altogether with private funds, others hint that money was borrowed from other Smithsonian sources with the expectation that eventually the magazine would be self-supporting.

Recently other charges have been heard, some of a petty nature. One complainant, employed for a time on a contractual basis at the Smithsonian, has practically spent full time sniping at the institution.

All this apparently has raised doubts in minds of legislators, so much so that not long ago a resolution to increase the regents' membership by two barely got a two-thirds majority needed under suspension of the House rules. It still has not passed the Senate.

The Thompson subcommittee handles bills for new Smithsonian projects.

Such items as \$2 million planning money for a giant radio-radar telescope, a \$10 million, 10-year program for improving the Suitland-Silver Hill storage facility, and a Bi-centennial Park at Ft. Foote and Jones Point, may not receive much encouragement until the hearing has paved the way.

[From the Washington Post, May 1970]

#### ARCHIVES FOR ART

(By Paul Richard)

The Smithsonian Institution announced last night that it has acquired the Archives of American Art, a vast collection of historical material that will help transform the Smithsonian—and the city of Washington—into a major center for the scholarly study of the history of American art.

The archives include some five million frames of microfilm (culled, with permission, from the files of the nation's finest libraries and museums) and an additional three million items of "primary source material."

These include sketchbooks, catalogues, auction records, photographs, the private papers of such artists as Franz Kline and David Smith, and thousands of hours of "oral history"—tape-recorded conversations with Ben Shahn, Claes Oldenburg, Edward Hopper, Barnett Newman and others who have helped to shape the history of American art.

The acquisition of the Archives collection brings Washington another research facility to add to its scholarly resources in the art fields.

The National Gallery of Art is organizing an institute for advanced study in the visual arts. The Smithsonian has put scholars specializing in American art in charge of the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery. With these developments, with the construction of the new Joseph H. Hirshhorn museum, and now with the acquisition of the Archives, it is widely believed that the arrival of droves of scholars can not be far behind.

The scholarly study of American art is a relatively young field. Until recently art historians—and American artists—focused their studies on the art history of Europe. When the Abstract Expressionists demonstrated that this country was more than a provincial colony of Europe, our scholars began to realize that the history of indigenous American art was almost entirely unexplored.

A decade ago the number of scholars getting doctorates in the history of American art could be counted on the fingers of one hand.

In Detroit in 1954, with interest in American painting and prices skyrocketing, E. P. Richardson, the art historian, began to organize the Archives of American Art. A branch office was later opened in New York, and the Archives administrative headquarters were transferred to that city.

Though the Archives is now beneath the Smithsonian's umbrella, its Detroit and New York offices, its board of trustees and its administration will be maintained.

[From Business Week, Feb. 21, 1970]

#### A SKIRMISH AT THE SMITHSONIAN

When a number of powerful members of Smithsonian Institution's board of regents took aim at ornithologist S. Dillon Ripley last month, he seemed headed the way of the passenger pigeon or some other species of

vanishing wildlife. But after a boardroom struggle in the finest traditions of the U.S. establishment, Ripley, the institution's secretary, appears to have emerged a winner, at least temporarily.

The General Accounting Office opened fire at Ripley, 56, with a report finding fault with the way he had spent \$380,000 in construction funds.

Then the regents challenged his project for a lavish monthly magazine, the *Smithsonian*, and countermanded his plans for moving endowment funds from bonds and blue chips into a pool of growth stock investments.

A decisive board meeting was called at the end of January by Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, whose Supreme Court post makes him chancellor of the Smithsonian. The regents include Senators Clinton P. Anderson (D-N. M.), and J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.) Representatives George Mahon (D-Tex.) and Frank T. Bow (R-Ohio), financiers John Nicholas Brown and William A. M. Burden, Dr. Caryl P. Haskins, head of the Carnegie Institution, Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman of International Business Machines Corp., and Crawford H. Greenewalt, former Du Pont president and chairman.

After the meeting, Burger imposed a ban on any disclosure of the subjects discussed. "It was money, that's all it was—money," mutters one of the regents. The board appears to have reached an agreement about money matters. But most observers believe that Ripley's troubles are rooted in more than money. Indeed, the life-style of the Smithsonian may be at stake.

#### HISTORY

When Congress set up the Smithsonian in 1846, as a result of a \$500,000 bequest from Englishman James Smithson, its purpose was fairly simple. It was to collect and display every kind of scientific, cultural, and historical achievement. And it did that job superbly. It grew into a conglomerate of information centers without parallel anywhere. Then, as the decades rolled by, it began to creak with age.

When Ripley took charge in 1964, he set out to breathe new life and a sense of participation into an institution that, with its collection of more than 59-million objects, had come to be known derisively as the "nation's attic." Encouraging the Smithsonian's scientists to become more than mere custodians, Ripley urged them into new fields of research and exploration. A full four years before "the environment" became a political password, Ripley began moving the Smithsonian into broad-scale studies of human and animal ecology. He brought in more than 50 scientists to do degree work at Smithsonian installations.

Festivals, kite contests, society balls, and a ghetto museum-branch were launched to bring the Smithsonian into the main stream of Washington's daily life. The institution's July 4 folk festival has drawn crowds of more than 100,000. Within Ripley's tenure, two new museums have been added to the stable of institution art galleries and museums, which are mostly in Washington and already are visited by 20-million people a year. And two more museums are scheduled to be added this year and next. So far, Ripley has doubled the Smithsonian's building space. And since he took charge, the number of permanent employees has jumped from 1,300 to 2,100.

#### PRO AND CON

In general, the average visitor to the Smithsonian is pleased by the changes. So are many scientists. But there has been alarm and dismay in some quarters. Some traditionalists feel that the Smithsonian is renouncing its very special place in American culture. And there are those who are frankly worried by the cost of all the innovations. In his six-year fight to bring the Smithsonian and its five museums, two art galleries, and

175-acre zoo into closer contact with the popular and scientific communities, Ripley was clearly running short of money.

So far, he has managed to operate the Smithsonian on a budget of less than \$50-million. Nearly 60% of that came from Congressional appropriations. But though the operating costs continue to rise, Congress is getting steadily more reluctant to increase its contribution. The institution also receives grants and contracts for work thrown its way by government agencies, but income from this source is decreasing, too. It fell to only \$12-million last year.

Most of the rest of operating revenue is income from the Smithsonian's \$26.5-million in private endowment. About half this income comes from a single source: the Freer Fund, established by Charles Freer, a Detroit industrialist who died in 1919.

#### SOURCE

Freer, with the help of artist James McNeill Whistler, became a collector of Oriental art at a time when most Americans totally ignored Asian culture. He shared his enthusiasm with Mrs. Agnes Meyer, wife of the Washington financier-publisher Eugene Meyer. At Freer's death, she was named as one of the few people authorized to contribute to the Freer Collection. Today, eightyish, a widow, Mrs. Meyer lives in Washington where her daughter Mrs. Katharine Graham is president of the Washington Post Co.

With regard to Ripley's present course of action, Mrs. Meyer and her powerful Washington friends feel the deepest concern. They particularly fear dissipation of the Freer Fund through the type of stock-pooling arrangements that Ripley has proposed. And, as the Smithsonian's interests have moved into new areas, away from American and Oriental art, they have noted unhappily that funds for additions to the Freer Collection were becoming harder to get. They believe that, to alleviate this, the Smithsonian and the government could contribute more to the Freer's maintenance and personnel expenses, so that more of the endowment income would be available for acquisitions.

#### THE BOARD

Whatever the grievances against Ripley, the forces supporting him seem to have held firm when the board of regents met under Justice Burger at "Hillwood," an urban Washington estate that will someday belong to the Smithsonian. At present, it is the residence of Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post, socialite and cereal heiress.

Crawford Greenewalt, whose frozen-action photographs of hummingbirds have made his name well-known to ornithologists, backed Ripley's proposal for a magazine for "Smithsonian Associates." Not all the regents felt as warmly about the idea but, eventually, approved the proposal. The first issue of the *Smithsonian*, now due in April, will be a professional job put together by a staff of editorial veterans who have worked for *Time*, *Life*, *National Geographic*, and *Horizon*.

The board also went on record as disagreeing with the GAO's criticism of Ripley's handling of federal funds. It expressed "satisfaction with the institution's plans for improvement of various operating procedures and of the internal auditing of the financial affairs of the institution." And it agreed to study Ripley's plan for pooling Smithsonian trust funds, though it insisted that he assure past and potential donors that the integrity of the funds will be maintained.

Once agreement on these points had been reached, Burger clamped down his ban on any further discussion. Ripley withdrew to Georgia to recover from a bout of flu. And his supporters apparently felt that they had won on all fronts. But his critics are already looking forward to the next board meeting, set for May 28. In Tucson, at the Arizona Inn where she is spending the month of February, Mrs. Meyer has not disarmed. "We will continue to protect the Freer," she says.