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The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:10 a.m., in room 2257, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Frank Thompson, Jr., chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.  

Present: Representatives Thompson, Brademas, and Bingham.  
Also present: John d’Ameecourt, subcommittee staff director.  

Mr. Thompson. The subcommittee will be in order.  

Today is the first day of hearings on the Smithsonian Institution.  

Our first witness will be Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, who has been chief administrative officer of the Smithsonian since 1964.  

Before his testimony, I would like to reply to the question that has been most often asked with reference to these hearings; namely, why are they being held?  

The fundamental reason is the responsibility of Congress to oversee all Federal activity and spending. The Smithsonian, although relatively independent compared to other Federal organizations, is essentially a Federal responsibility. It was established by act of Congress in 1846, and over the years the bulk of its growth and its annual operating budget has come from Congress.  

What we want to begin today is a comprehensive look at the Smithsonian. I might add that this has not been done by Congress for well over 100 years.  

We hope to obtain a better understanding of how the Smithsonian operates, of its structure, of how it develops and carries out its policies, of how its activity benefits the public and, of course, we want to find out what its goals are for the future.  

Only when we have this knowledge can the subcommittee and the Congress pass confidently on legislation requested by the Smithsonian. For instance, the subcommittee now has a bill before it to authorize $2 million to plan and acquire a site for a gigantic radio-radar telescope which would be the largest in the world and which would aid the Nation’s overall scientific effort immensely.  

We have another bill which would amend the Smithsonian’s existing appropriations authorization to permit them to build sophisticated storage and retrieval systems.
We also have a bill to authorize the creation of a National Armed Forces Museum and Park, and a number of other bills, all of which would expand the scope of the Smithsonian and increase its activities.

The Congress cannot judge the relative merits of all these bills without a clear picture of what the Smithsonian is in the context of the total effort in this country in the area of art, history, the humanities, and science.

These hearings will serve another important purpose. In recent months and, indeed, throughout the history of the Institution, there has been criticism from outside the Smithsonian directed toward its management, its financial activity, and its policies. No large organization is ever free of criticism, founded or unfounded. This subcommittee cannot weigh criticism of Smithsonian activities without first knowing both sides.

Hopefully, these hearings will provide the subcommittee with a context in which criticism, whether good or bad, can be judged and action taken accordingly.

I do not know whether any new legislation will stem from these hearings, but I feel the subcommittee will come out of them better equipped to handle existing proposals more knowledgeably and efficiently.

I believe, and I am sure most people will agree, that the Smithsonian has contributed heavily to all fields of study and has, through its exhibits, done much to further its original purpose, which is, simply put: "For the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men." I believe the Smithsonian is a viable organization, and that its future growth is related to this Nation's growth in culture and science.

While the Congress should routinely oversee the activities of the Smithsonian, these hearings should not be construed as a lack of confidence in the purposes or the leadership of the Smithsonian. In the same sense, we should encourage criticism, without allowing it to obscure our goals.

With that, I would like to introduce Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, the Secretary of the Institution.

STATEMENT OF S. DILLON RIPLEY, SECRETARY, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION; ACCOMPANYED BY JAMES BRADLEY, UNDER SECRETARY, AND PETER POWERS, GENERAL COUNSEL

Dr. Ripley. Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, Congressman Brademas.

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to come before you this morning and to begin testifying about the origins and purposes of the Smithsonian Institution. We welcome this opportunity because we feel that it is entirely consonant with our purpose to be in close touch with your committee and to have an opportunity for an exchange of views, especially in regard to pending legislation, but also in regard to the purposes and programs of the Institution.

We feel we have far too few opportunities to perform this task, and it is a very hopeful and helpful sign of the continuing interest of the Congress of the United States, which has since the beginning debated and discussed and encouraged the Smithsonian mightily.
I should say that I am happy to quote the fact that, in my recent Smithsonian annual report of 1969, I said as follows:

The Smithsonian has not been invaded by angry protesters or disrupted by dissidents, but it cannot escape the need, which is becoming so general in our time, to subject its activities to the most searching review and to reappraise its objectives in the light of the more rigorous expectations of the day. No institution is too venerable or too valuable to be exempted from such scrutiny. In government jargon the phrase is, “Let us get back to the base.” An “open” university such as ours should thrive on self-examination.

In previous discussions of the scope of this set of hearings, you have suggested that I begin today with a résumé of the background, origins, and governance of the Institution, and that I should then proceed to some discussion of the present activities and my particular interest at present, and should conclude my testimony for today with a discussion about the future as we see it and, of course, the possibilities that we feel are embodied in our construct.

So I would like to proceed on this basis, if I may.

I have a statement, sir, which I would like to submit for the record, and I would like to highlight and outline that statement and then proceed with individual remarks.

Mr. Thompson. Without objection, the statement will be printed in full in the record at this point.

Dr. Ripley. Thank you, sir.

(Dr. Ripley’s prepared statement follows:)

SECRETARY S. DILLON RIPLEY’S INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT ON THE ORIGINS, HISTORY, AND LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, JULY 16, 1970

INTRODUCTION

Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Let me begin by saying that we welcome this opportunity to appear before you and that the Smithsonian has, in fact, been giving increasing thought in recent years to the need and desirability of more Congressional review of its activities. We commented on this need, especially during this time of rapid social change, in my opening statement to the recently published Smithsonian Year 1969, or our annual report to the Congress; as follows:

“The Smithsonian has not been invaded by angry protesters or disrupted by dissidents but it cannot escape the need, which is becoming so general in our time, to subject its activities to the most searching review and to reappraise its objectives in the light of the more rigorous expectations of the day. No institution is too venerable or too valuable to be exempted from such scrutiny. In government jargon the phrase is, ‘let us get back to the base.’ An ‘open’ university such as ours should thrive on self-examination.”

To do this, or “to get back to the base” in terms of these hearings, I think it would be useful to begin with a brief attempt at a definition of the Smithsonian. Indeed, it is my impression from our previous meetings, Mr. Chairman, that you would specifically welcome some basic information on what the various and seemingly diverse elements of the Institution are and what holds them all together.

Having said this, I am aware that it is not an easy task. The Smithsonian is a unique organization, and it does seem difficult at first look to find any unifying force or any common purpose in an institution whose interests range from the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum to the National Zoological Park.

I remember that a British critic writing in Punch magazine put the question this way a few years ago:

“What is the common factor linking an island in the Panama Canal, the trilithons of Stonehenge, and a Victorian Gothic building in blood red sandstone on the central axis of Washington, D.C.?”

Well, the critic agonized over this question for a page and a half and finally came to the conclusion that there was none—no common factor, really—other than the unusual last will and testament of James Smithson, the English sci-
entist or natural philosopher and the illegitimate son of the first Duke of Northumberland, whose munificence created the Smithsonian.

We don't necessarily agree with our British writer friend, but, leaving aside for a moment the subject of Smithson's will, his remarks do perhaps offer a convenient starting point for a definition of the Smithsonian and something of its history.

Mr. Chairman, you probably recognize the reference to the Gothic building in blood red sandstone as our original Smithsonian building on the south side of the Mall, or the "castle" as we call it. This was for many years the Smithsonian's only building and the first home of the National Museum, about which I will have more to say later. Today it is the administrative heart of the Institution, so to speak, providing office space for many of us here with you today.

You may not, however, recognize the reference to the trilithons of Stonehenge as an activity of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory in Cambridge, Mass. In addition to its better known tasks in radio astronomy, satellite geodesy and orbit predictions, the Observatory is also a great center for theoretical work and basic research in the broadest sense.

It happened that a few years ago one of SAO's leading astronomers, Dr. Gerald Hawkins, got extremely interested in the great stone slabs at Stonehenge, in England, previously thought to be religious monuments of some unknown people who dwelled there around 2,000 B.C. Using a computer and modern analytical techniques, Dr. Hawkins found that the positioning of the stones and the line of sight slots they made showed a distinct and remarkable correlation with the position of celestial bodies—the sun, moon, certain stars and planets—as they rose and set over a great span of years, especially during the times of equinoxes. He also discovered that the many white stone rings on the ground surrounding the dolmens could have been used for eclipse prediction. Dr. Hawkins thus confirmed what others had only vaguely suspected; namely, that Stonehenge was, in fact, a highly sophisticated astronomical center.

This is a good example of the kind of research activity, so much a part of the Smithsonian, that is difficult to put in PERT and PPB charts, or in terms of five or ten year goals, since it really depends on the individual interests of our scientists. It is true, of course, that we have many programmatic research efforts, complete with task forces and definable objectives, but we have also been and should continue to be a stronghold of basic research in the purest sense. By this I mean that the Smithsonian should continue to be a center where scholars and scientists can pursue their individual research interests in the freest possible circumstances.

We say this because such individual research efforts generally produce as many discoveries or significant contributions to knowledge as our more programmed or mission oriented efforts do. Dr. Hawkins is a case in point. His Stonehenge discoveries have helped to found a new science, generally referred to as archaeology, since a number of unusual archeological sites, such as the stone lines on the Nasca deserts of Peru, are now being restudied in the Stonehenge context, or in relation to their possible use as astronomical centers.

But to get back to the arcane references of our British critic, the island in Panama Canal is, of course, Barro Colorado island in Gatun Lake, which is the center or major study area of the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute. It was set aside as a tropical wildlife reserve in 1940, at first as an independent agency governed by various cabinet heads and later, through an executive reorganization plant in 1946, as a bureau of the Smithsonian, with the general charge that the island's "natural features be left in their natural state for scientific observation and investigation."

Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute or STRI, as we call it, illustrates another long standing principle of Smithsonian research activity: that is, to concentrate on what is relatively neglected, or to do the long term, demanding and often unglamorous basic research on which applied research, to be productive, must be firmly based.

To explain STRI, Mr. Chairman, it is necessary to bear in mind that ecologists have long concentrated on arctic, sub-arctic and temperate zones. This is because the ecology of these zones is easy to understand compared with the tropics. To be more charitable, instead of "easy," I should say that the principles of ecology—the delicate interrelationships of all living things—can be more readily discerned in the Arctic, where there are very few species, but enormous populations within the species, than in the tropics, where the number of different species, if not their populations, may be enormous.

So the tropical ecosystems are very complex and difficult. We say, nonetheless,
that they must be better studied. They comprise, after all, two-thirds of the land surface of the globe, and every day we hear of new schemes, sometimes forwarded by our own foreign aid planners, for converting supposedly lush and fertile tropical rainforests to agriculture, or for turning the Amazon basin into a vast inland sea in the name of better communications, which action, incidentally, would have a drastic effect on hemispheric and world weather conditions.

The fact is that we do not yet know enough to assume automatically that agricultural productivity will be high in tropical forest systems. Experience to date suggests the contrary. What is needed, therefore, is more basic knowledge of tropical ecosystems. We have to take complete biological inventories of these systems, determine what they are now through what is called benchmark studies and then try to measure changes and determine what may happen in the future.

This is the basic task of the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute. It has by now a reputation as the most convenient and most thoroughly studied piece of tropical rainforest in the world, and we hope that it will continue to play a major role in encouraging greater efforts in tropical biology.

With these two examples of Smithsonian research efforts in mind, let us go back quickly to the legislative basis of it all, or Smithson’s will and the action which Congress took on it.

HISTORY

(1) James Smithson’s Will

In the year 1826, James Smithson, the natural philosopher, man of science, and specialist in mineralogy, who had never set foot in the United States, nor maintained contacts with American scientists, wrote an unusual last will and testament.

Essentially, he bequeathed almost his entire fortune to a nephew, but with the stipulation that should his nephew die without leaving any children, he would then bequeath the whole of his estate:

“... to the United States of America, to found at Washington, under the name of the Smithsonian Institution, an Establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men.”

These are the exact words and the only words James Smithson employed to give direction to the institution that today bears his name.

Smithson died in Genoa, Italy, some three years later, on June 26, 1829.

Then, six years later his nephew, Henry James Hungerford, did in fact die without issue. An alert Secretary in the American Embassy in London noted this fact, and advised the United States Government that it was entitled to the Smithson bequest. Less than a year later, Richard Rush, the eminent diplomat, former Attorney General of the United States, and son of Benjamin Rush of Philadelphia, signer of the Declaration of Independence, was sent to England to prosecute the will. This he did successfully. By 1838 the British Court of Chancery had decided the suit in favor of the United States, and eleven boxes of gold sovereigns were deposited with the United States Mint in Philadelphia. These sovereigns were subsequently recoined into American money, with a resulting value of $506,519.46.

There then followed some eight years—eight extremely interesting years, if not entirely productive—in the history or, to be more accurate, the pre-history of the Smithsonian.

The phrase “increase and diffusion of knowledge among men” was succinct and it had a definitive ring. But, it must be admitted, it was also subject to a wide array of interpretations, so wide, in fact, that the Congress spent eight years of debate on the subject of its true intent.

Many proposals were forwarded. Some favored a university, the like of which neither the United States nor Europe had ever seen. Others argued for a national library, there being no Library of Congress at the time. Still others, notably Congressman Robert Dale Owen of Indiana, proposed a bill embracing a kind of national teachers college or normal school.

Through it all, John Quincy Adams, then serving as an ex-President and the Congressman from Braintree, Massachusetts, gave thoughtful advice and kept the question open, since there were many times when discouragement and weariness over the matter of the Smithson estate almost won the day.

(2) Organic Act of 1846

The debate ended and the Smithsonian was officially established by Act of Congress on August 10, 1846.

Some historians say Congress evaded any real interpretation by providing a Secretary and a Board of Regents and letting them best decide the intent of
Smithson's will. Another point of view is that Congress had the foresight to see the need for a center for basic research and public education with just such a broad charter as "the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men," witness the fact that Smithson's mandate was written into the bill, both in the preamble and in the first section on the establishment of the Institution.

The principal provisions of the organic act of 1846:
(a) Provided that the President, the Vice President, the various cabinet heads, the Commissioner of the Patent Office and the Mayor of Washington constituted an "Establishment" by the name of the Smithsonian Institution.
(b) Authorized private funding of the Institution by having the principal of Smithson's gift deposited with the Treasury, with six percent annual interest to the Smithsonian.
(c) Provided that the business of the Institution be conducted by a Secretary and a board of Regents, the general composition of which has been maintained to the present day.
(d) Provided for an Executive Committee to be formed by members of the board of Regents.
(e) Instructed the Regents to choose a site and erect a building "of plain and durable materials and structure . . . and with suitable rooms and halls for the reception and arrangement, upon a liberal scale, of objects of natural history, including a geological and mineralogical cabinet; also a chemical laboratory, a library, a gallery of art and the necessary lecture rooms."
(f) Authorized the transfer to the Institution of "all objects of art and of foreign or curious research, and all objects of natural history—belonging, or hereafter to belong, to the United States," as well as the minerals, books, manuscripts and other properties of James Smithson.
(g) Provided for the gradual establishment of a Library.
(h) Authorized the managers of the Institution to spend income of the Smithson fund "as they shall deem best suited for the promotion of the purpose of the testator."

(3) The Henry Administration

Joseph Henry of Princeton University, the most eminent physical scientist of his day and the discoverer of the principles of electro-magnetism, along with Faraday of England, was appointed by the Regents as first Secretary of the Smithsonian.

When he arrived in Washington, he had already prepared at the suggestion of the Regents a plan for the general purposes and organization of the Smithsonian.

The objectives of the Institution, he maintained, were very clear: —first, to increase, and, second, to diffuse knowledge among men. Increase meant original investigations or research in any field, inasmuch as Smithson's will did not define or restrict fields of knowledge. As Henry expressed it "Smithson was well aware that knowledge should not be viewed as existing in isolated parts, but as a whole, each portion of which throws light on all the other, and that the tendency of all is to improve the human mind, and to give it new sources of power and enjoyment."

To increase knowledge, Henry provided grants for men of talent to make original researches and, in effect, converted the original Smithsonian Building to a residential center for scholars. He himself engaged in meteorological observations, which later led to the formation of the Weather Bureau, and he encouraged studies in archeology, anthropology, and natural history.

Henry also gave equal weight to the diffusion of knowledge and therefore instituted:
(a) "Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge," with the first Smithsonian publication coming out within two years of the founding of the Institution.
(b) A Library, which was later to be transferred to the Library of Congress.
(c) The international exchange of scholarly research and publications, with the foundations of the Smithsonian’s International Exchange Service well established by 1852.
(d) "Smithsonian Lectures."

(4) Origins of Federal Appropriations

Secretary Henry did not at first give primary importance to creating a museum, since it was his view that the Smithsonian should concentrate its activities in matters of benefit to all mankind, in keeping with Smithson's will, rather than matters of local interest.

But, of course, the Museum role was ordained by the Congress in the 1846
organic act. Henry did not oppose it. By the late 1850's, the Smithsonian was housing in its new building a large amount of natural history specimens collected through government sponsored exploration of our western frontiers. By then, too, it had been proposed that the Smithsonian receive and take care of the collections of the Patent Office, which included models of inventions, a section known as the American Museum of Arts, and also some natural history collections, notably those from the expeditions of Captain Charles Wilkes to South America, Antarctica and the Pacific.

Faced with this proposal, the Board of Regents and Secretary Henry established a principle that is essential to the understanding of the Smithsonian and its subsequent growth.

They held that:
(a) Limited income from the Smithson fund should be reserved for increase and diffusion of knowledge “of a world-wide benefit” and not spent on caretaking or maintenance of museum property and collections.
(b) But if the Congress wished the Smithsonian to take on the public responsibility for a national collection and in effect, a national museum, in accord with the 1846 act, then the Smithsonian should do this for the people of the United States with appropriated funds. In this spirit, Patent Office collection was accepted in 1858 and the first federal appropriation was made to the Smithsonian, through the Department of Interior, in the amount of $4,000 annually so that, in Henry's own words, the Smithsonian could “become the curator of the national collections.”

(5) Special Purpose Appropriations

Henry was among the first men of his time to realize scientific importance of our far West and held it as a firm principle that qualified scientists should form part of land or railroad surveys and general exploration parties. Because of this, Major John Wesley Powell received a Smithsonian grant to explore the Colorado region.

Powell thereafter proposed a major expedition on the Colorado River, to go through the Grand Canyon. In 1869, Congress approved this proposal and appropriated funds through the Department of Interior, to the Smithsonian, for direction of the project.

This in turn led to many more government-sponsored surveys, some competing or overlapping. In 1879, Congress, at Powell’s suggestion, reorganized and consolidated all federal exploration, assigning geological investigation to Department of Interior, creating the U.S. Geological Survey. At the same time appropriations for anthropological investigations were made to the Smithsonian for its Bureau of Ethnology.

(6) Spencer Baird and the National Museum

The second Secretary of the Smithsonian, Spencer Baird, was a biologist, an avid collector and an enthusiastic proponent of the Smithsonian's early efforts towards museum exhibitions.

His work on the U.S. Fish Commission, further exploration parties, the work of the Bureau of Ethnology—all were adding much to the national collections.

Then came the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exposition. The Smithsonian received a federal appropriation to participate in the Exposition, and Spencer Baird was made a member of the board appointed by President Grant to plan the Government's participation.

Both Henry, who died in 1878, and Secretary Baird long had it in mind that if the Congress by its action of 1858 in providing federal funds for the national collections did indeed want the Smithsonian to serve as the National Museum, then the Smithsonian was the logical recipient of the best materials from this great Exposition.

And, considering that the Philadelphia Exposition materials were enormous and the original Smithsonian building already crowded, a new building, to be the formal home of the U.S. National Museum, seemed essential.

A request was made to this effect in 1876.
In 1879 Congress appropriated $250,000 for construction of a new building for the National Museum. It was, in effect, a reaffirmation of the museum provision in the organic act of 1846, with the following language:
“All collections of rocks, minerals, soils, fossils, and objects of natural history, archeology, and ethnology made by the Coast and Interior Survey, the Geological Survey, or by any other parties for the Government of the United States, when no longer needed for investigations in progress, shall be deposited in the National Museum.”
This legislation and the accompanying appropriation reaffirmed the unique nature of the Smithsonian as a non-governmental institution created by the Congress to which additional public responsibilities within the mandate for the increase and diffusion of knowledge have, with the consent of the Board of Regents, been legislated and supported in substantial part by appropriated funds.

SUBSEQUENT GROWTH AND LEGISLATION

(1) National Zoological Park

The National Zoological Park had its origin in the National Museum as a department of living animals, literally "in the backyards" of the Smithsonian Institution Building. The naturalist William Hornaday's concern for preserving bison and other North American big game species and educating the public about them led Secretary Langley to consider a "zoological garden" in Rock Creek Valley.

Congress authorized the National Zoological Park in 1889 and then in 1890 appropriated $200,000 for the purchase of land. This Act placed the National Zoological Park under the direction of the Regents of the Smithsonian, who were authorized to transfer to it any living specimens of animals or plants, to accept gifts, to make exchanges of species, and, generally, to improve the Park "for the advancement of science and the instruction and recreation of the people."

Initially, the maintenance and operation of the Zoo were attached to the District of Columbia appropriations bills. Beginning in 1962, however, the Smithsonian has been allotted increasing funds by the Congress for construction and finally, in the current fiscal year, for the operations and maintenance budget.

(2) Astrophysical Observatory

In 1890, Secretary Langley rekindled John Quincy Adams' idea of an observatory and sought to give the Smithsonian more balance in the physical sciences, as opposed to natural history. With contributions from James Kidder and Alexander Graham Bell, he started a modest observatory in the Smithsonian's back yard. The next year Congress appropriated $10,000 "for the maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory and the making of solar observations at high altitudes". Annual federal support has continued ever since. For many years Mr. John A. Roebling directly supported the research of Secretary Abbott in the Astrophysical Observatory.

(3) New National Museum

In 1903, the Congress authorized funds, not to exceed $3,500,000, for a new National Museum building. This structure eventually came to house the Museum of Natural History.

(4) Freer Gallery

During the winter of 1905-1906, Charles Lang Freer offered the Smithsonian his collection of Oriental art and $5,000,000 for a building to house it, in trust. The Regents accepted the offer, and in 1915 Freer waived the condition that the collection was to remain in his possession during his lifetime and offered $1,000,000 if the Smithsonian would go ahead with construction of the Freer Gallery of Art.

I should like to note at this point, Mr. Chairman, that the foregoing outline has focused almost entirely on the public responsibilities and federal financing of the Institution's development. All through this time, of course, the Smithsonian was receiving many significant gifts and building up its private endowment. The Freer Gallery is the outstanding example.

(5) National Gallery of Art

On January 24, 1865, a fire in the Smithsonian Building destroyed our original art gallery. Thereafter, the Smithsonian turned over works of art given it to either the Library of Congress or the Corcoran Gallery of Art, for safekeeping.

But the Philadelphia Centennial brought much new art material. The Corcoran and Library of Congress deposits were recalled in 1896 and the east wing of the original Smithsonian Building was made an art gallery.

This gallery's existence was officially recognized through a gift of Mrs. Harriet Lane Johnston, President Buchanan's niece. When Mrs. Johnston died in 1903, she left her valuable private collection to the Corcoran Gallery but with the stipulation that should the United States Government ever establish a national gallery of art, her collection should be transferred to it and become its absolute property.
The Corcoran Gallery declined the gift under such conditions and thereby created a dilemma.

In 1906, after two years of deliberation, the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia decided that the Smithsonian's gallery was in effect a national gallery of art and the Johnston collection came to the Smithsonian Building.

In 1937, Andrew Mellon made his remarkable gift to the nation. By act of Congress, the designation of National Gallery of Art was transferred to the building which was to house the Mellon collection. The National Gallery of Art was established as a bureau of the Smithsonian, but with its direction given to a Board of Trustees, to include ex officio the Chief Justice, the Secretaries of State and Treasury and the Secretary of the Smithsonian, plus five general or citizen members.

During approximately the same time (1938) a companion piece of legislation was enacted to take care of the art collections of the Smithsonian itself, (now known as the National Collection of Fine Arts) and authorized a commission to search for a suitable building for it. It provided that the National Collection of Fine Arts “displaying the national collections of fine arts, comprising painting, sculptures, bronzes, glass, porcelain, tapestry, furniture, jewelry, and other types of art; to display portraits of eminent American men and women, and to exhibit the works of artists deserving of recognition”.

The act thus gave to the National Collection of Fine Arts a preeminent national or American character, as opposed to the universal values of the Mellon collection. It also contained some far-sighted provisions to foster a growing appreciation of both past and contemporary art “by public exhibitions from time to time in Washington and other parts of the United States” and by award of scholarships and staff positions to artists.

(6) National Advisory Council on Aeronautics

It should be mentioned for the historical record that the enabling act of this progenitor of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) in March 1915 was an outgrowth of the work of Langley’s Aerodynamical Laboratory and the work of the Smithsonian’s fourth Secretary, Charles D. Walcott.

(7) Canal Zone Biological Area

In 1940 the Congress authorized and directed the President to set aside within the Panama Canal Zone an area in Gatun Lake known as Barro Colorado Island which should be left as nearly as possible, in “a natural state for scientific observation and investigation”. The following year additional legislation made more specific the purpose of this natural reserve as “a place where duly qualified students can make observations and scientific investigations for increase of knowledge, under such conditions and regulations as may be prescribed by the Smithsonian Institution”. The act provided further that the Smithsonian should “be responsible for the construction and maintenance of laboratory and other facilities” and, at its discretion, fix charges for the use of the facilities.

(8) National Air and Space Museum

This Smithsonian bureau was established as the National Air Museum by act of Congress in August 1946 to “memorialize the national development of aviation and space flight; collect, preserve, and display aeronautical and space flight equipment of historical interest and significance; serve as a repository for scientific equipment and data pertaining to the development of aviation and space flight; and provide educational material for the historic study of aviation and space flight.” (The act was amended in 1966 to include references to “space flight” and “space flight equipment”.)

(9) John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (formerly the National Cultural Center) was established as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution to be directed by a Board of Trustees by legislation enacted in September 1962 (and later amended), which provides for construction of a cultural center on the banks of the Potomac River as the “sole national memorial to the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy. . . .” Funds for the Center are to be raised by voluntary contributions and by Congress. Construction began in the spring of 1966.

The duties of the Board of Trustees are to:

(a) Present classical and contemporary music, opera, drama, dance, and poetry from this and other countries,

(b) Present lectures and other programs,
(c) Develop programs for children and youth and the elderly (and for other age groups as well) in such arts designed specifically for their participation, education, and recreation.

(d) Provide facilities for other civic activities at the Center.

(e) Provide within the Center a suitable memorial in honor of the late President, John F. Kennedy.

The Board of Trustees is composed of ex officio trustees designated by the act and thirty general trustees who are appointed by the President of the United States and serve for 10-year overlapping terms.

(10) National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board

The National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board, established by the act of August 30, 1961, advises and assists the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution on matters concerned with portraying the contributions which the Armed Forces of the United States have made to American society and culture. The Board conducts studies of lands and buildings suitable for a proposed National Armed Forces II Historical Museum Park and Study Center; plans the concept of the Park; performs research on the contributions of the Armed Forces; and collects and preserves materials for exhibition and study.

(11) National Portrait Gallery

In April 1962 the National Portrait Gallery was established by the Congress to "function as a free public museum for the exhibition and study of portraiture and statuary depicting men and women who have made significant contributions to the history, development, and culture of the people of the United States and of the artists who created such portraiture and statuary."

(12) National Museum Act

The National Museum Act of 1966, passed by the Congress and approved by the President in October 1966, reaffirmed the Smithsonian's role of assistance to museums and authorized appropriations to meet needs and to study problems common to all museums. In the Act, Congress recognized that museums are important elements of the cultural and educational development of the United States.

The Act provides that the Director of the National Museum, under the direction of the Secretary of the Smithsonian, shall "cooperate with museums and their professional organizations in a continuing study of museum problems," conduct training programs for museum employees in museum publications, contribute to the development of museum techniques, cooperate with Federal organizations concerned with museums, and report annually to the Congress on progress in these activities.

(13) Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden

This public museum and sculpture garden was established within the Smithsonian by legislative act, approved November 7, 1966, and will upon completion house sculpture and painting and a program of exhibition, education, research and publication devoted principally to art of the twentieth century.

The Act establishes a Board of Trustees, consisting of the Chief Justice of the United States, the Secretary of the Smithsonian, and eight members appointed by the President, which will advise and assist the Smithsonian Regents on matters concerning administration, operation, maintenance, and preservation of the museum and sculpture garden.

(14) Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

The Center was established within the Smithsonian, by act of October 24, 1968, as a bureau of the Smithsonian under guidance of a Board of Trustees. The Center will serve as a living memorial to Woodrow Wilson, "symbolizing and strengthening the fruitful relation between the world of learning and the world of public affairs."

Dr. Ripley. Also, we have recently issued a publication which actually lists comprehensively our subdivisions within the Smithsonian, and I would appreciate it very much if this could be incorporated in the record.

Mr. Thompson. It will be so incorporated.

(The publication follows:)
MEET THE SMITHSONIAN

This brief introduction to the Smithsonian Institution is intended to provide a short, basic volume of facts about one of America's oldest institutions—a complex of science, history, and art museums, research organizations, and educational programs centered in Washington, D.C., but stretching to many other parts of the United States and indeed around the world.

*Increase and Diffusion*, its title taken from the bequest establishing the Smithsonian, is designed to meet the needs of the press, the general public, and members of the many specialized communities here and overseas whose concerns bring them into contact with the Institution.

This booklet covers only the major elements and activities of the Smithsonian today, set against the background of a history that began in the early days of the Republic. Here, then, is the great and broad and complex and inspiring national institution known as the Smithsonian.

Frederic M. Philips
Director, Office of Public Affairs
Smithsonian Institution

February 1970
THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

THE SMITHSONIAN TODAY

The Smithsonian Institution is an independent establishment devoted to public education, basic research, and national service in the arts, sciences, and history. Centered on the Mall in Washington, D.C., it also operates major facilities and activities elsewhere in Washington, across the country, and overseas.

One of the world's leading research centers, the Smithsonian is as well one of the world's largest museum complexes, attracting upward of fifteen million visitors yearly. It possesses a cataloged inventory of more than sixty-two million objects and specimens, only about three percent of which is on public display at one time.

The Smithsonian complex includes as major components four history and science museums (the combined National Museum of Natural History and National Museum of Man, the National Museum of History and Technology, and the National Air and Space Museum). A fifth (the National Armed Forces Historical Museum Park) is in the planning stage under an advisory group established by Congress.

There are five art museums (the Freer Gallery of Art, the separately administered National Gallery of Art, the National Collection of Fine Arts, the National Portrait Gallery, and the Cooper-Hewitt Museum of Decorative Arts and Design in New York). Another art museum (the Renwick Gallery) is being readied, and a seventh (the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden) is being constructed on the Mall. Under a deed from Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post, the lovely northwest Washington estate known as Hillwood, with its great Russian and French collections, will in the future become an eighth public art museum.

There are a number of other major components of the Smithsonian in Washington. The Radiation Biology Laboratory plays a unique role in the study of the effects of solar radiation. The National Zoological Park, with facilities in
Rock Creek Park, annually attracts millions of visitors. A national cultural center, the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, is nearing completion along the Potomac River; the Center will be a separately administered bureau of the Smithsonian.

Also in Washington, the highly innovative Anacostia Neighborhood Museum operates in a low-income area of the city in cooperation with the local community. There is an oceanographic sorting center at the Washington Navy Yard. And in the development stage by the Smithsonian is a center for advanced study, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

Smithsonian facilities and activities stretch across the nation and the world. Chief among these installations elsewhere is the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory in Cambridge, Massachusetts, which itself operates major installations in other parts of the United States and field stations in several nations around the globe.

Major elements in the Smithsonian further include a conference center in nearby Maryland; a biological research center on the Chesapeake Bay; offices in New York and Detroit supporting the work of the Washington-based Archives of American Art; an oceanographic sorting center in Salammbo, Tunisia, whose work parallels the programs of the Institution’s oceanographic center in the Washington Navy Yard; and one of the world’s leading tropical research institutes, centered in Panama.

A wide range of programs is conducted in cooperation with other institutions, universities, and government agencies here in the United States and on every continent. The Institution offers its massive facilities and vast intellectual resources for research and education, from the elementary to post-graduate levels, in hundreds of areas of Smithsonian scientific and cultural interest.

More than two thousand scientific expeditions, many of them major ones, to the far corners of the world have been sponsored or participated in by staff members over the decades. The Smithsonian participates in continuing research projects in many nations abroad, in some cases using United States government surplus commodity funds for this purpose.

For more than a century, the Smithsonian has circulated research and other publications here and abroad in voluminous quantities. Today, a number of its components are engaged in varying aspects of publication, distribution, exchange, and information-retrieval services. Communications activities also include radio, television, and motion picture programs.

At the same time, the Smithsonian’s performing arts activities cover a wide spectrum—puppet shows to classical concerts to a college drama festival. During the Fourth of July holidays, a Festival of American Folklife is presented on the Mall with representation from every region of the country.

All told, the Smithsonian has more than three thousand one hundred employees including a staff of more than three hundred professional scholars and scientists, many of them leading experts in their fields. A dues-paying membership program set up in 1965, the Smithsonian Associates, has a sizable total of members in the Washington area and in other parts of the nation.

The Smithsonian is a national institution that receives substantial support from the federal government as well as essential funding from private sources, including an endowment that traces to the very beginning of the Institution.
HISTORY

The Smithsonian owes its origin to James Smithson, a wealthy English scientist who never visited this country. Smithson, who died in Italy in 1829, willed his entire fortune to the United States "to found in Washington, under the name of the Smithsonian Institution, an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men." The bequest totaled more than half a million dollars, a great fortune in that day.

Receipt of the bequest in America in 1838 precipitated a lengthy debate in Congress on whether the nation should or indeed legally could accept the funds and the accompanying trust. Congress ultimately determined, in 1846, that the federal government did not have authority to administer such a trust directly. Consequently, it created by enactment a discrete corporate entity, "The Establishment," to undertake the charge of the Smithson will. This body, in effect constituting the Smithsonian Institution, consists of the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Chief Justice, and heads of the executive departments.

The Board of Regents was created to govern the Institution thus established. Fittingly, reflecting the origins and the dual public and private nature of the Institution, it was to be composed of the Vice President and Chief Justice, three members of the Senate, three members of the House of Representatives, and six citizen members. The Vice President and Chief Justice were named both to The Establishment and the Board of Regents. Of the citizen members, it was stipulated that two must be residents of the District of Columbia and no two of the remaining four may be from the same state.

The position of Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution also was established at the outset, the incumbent serving as well as Secretary of the Board of Regents.

The Smithson bequest was lent by law to the United States Treasury. The federal government agreed to pay six percent interest on it to the Smithsonian in perpetuity.

Provision was made in formal creation of the Smithsonian for work in the areas of concern that have since occupied the Institution through succeeding generations—art, science, and history, research, museum and library operation, the dissemination of information.

Congress, in taking action on the Smithson bequest, stated its purpose was to provide "for the faithful execution of said trust agreeable to the will of the liberal and enlightened donor." The United States thus solemnly bound itself to the administration of a trust, and the relations of the federal government to the Smithsonian Institution became as a guardian to a ward. Probably never has any ward found so powerful a guardian.

Very eminent men have served on the Board of Regents through the years, among them Presidents Fillmore, Andrew Johnson, Garfield, Arthur, Theodore Roosevelt, Coolidge, Truman, Lyndon Johnson, and Nixon, as well as the President of the Confederacy, Jefferson Davis, when he was a United States Senator. Others have been Louis Agassiz, Dwight W. Morrow, William B. Astor,

Current Regents are Chief Justice Warren Burger, Vice President Spiro Agnew, Senators J. William Fulbright, Clinton P. Anderson, and Hugh Scott; Representatives Frank T. Bow, Michael J. Kirwan, and George H. Mahon; and citizen members John Nicholas Brown, William A. M. Burden, Crawford H. Greenewalt, Caryl P. Haskins, and Thomas J. Watson Jr. One vacancy exists in the citizen membership following the death of Robert V. Fleming of Washington, D.C.

The Smithsonian's facilities have grown with the passage of time along with the national collections, the range of responsibilities and programs, the size of the staff, and, indeed, with the City of Washington and the Nation itself. The first Smithsonian building was the "red castle" on the Washington Mall designed by architect James Renwick. Constructed between 1847 and 1855, the structure is now known as the Smithsonian Institution Building. The Arts and Industries Building was opened nearby in 1881, the Natural History Building in 1911, the Air and Space Building in 1920, the Freer Gallery of Art in 1923, the National Gallery of Art in 1941, the National Museum of History and Technology in 1964, and the Fine Arts and Portrait Galleries in 1968. The Fine Arts and Portrait Galleries Building houses the National Collection of Fine Arts, the National Portrait Gallery, and the Archives of American Art.

The Cooper Union Museum for the Arts of Decoration, in New York City, became a part of the Smithsonian in 1968, and was later renamed the Cooper-Hewitt Museum of Decorative Arts and Design. The Smithsonian assigned a limited number of staff members to office space in the massive old Pension Building in downtown Washington in 1968, itself one of the most architecturally interesting, historic buildings in Washington.

ADMINISTRATION

S. Dillon Ripley, as Secretary of the Smithsonian, serves as its chief executive officer. He was appointed in 1964 and is the eighth Secretary since 1846.

A biologist, ecologist, and authority on the birds of the Far East, Dr. Ripley previously served as Director of Yale University's Peabody Museum of Natural History for four years, and as a member of the Yale faculty for eighteen years. He has been on the staffs of the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia, the American Museum of Natural History in New York, and Harvard University, and was also a staff member of the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History at an earlier stage in his career.

Dr. Ripley holds degrees from Yale and Harvard and has been the recipient of a number of fellowships. During World War II, he served in the Office of Strategic Services. He is the author of eight books, and is a member or officer of numerous distinguished honorary and professional groups here and overseas, including the National Academy of Sciences.

His innovations at the Smithsonian since taking office have been many and far-reaching, broadening and extending the Institution's responsibilities and participation across a broad spectrum—including education, research, public service, community activities, conservation, and the performing as well as visual arts. Bureaus and other major divisions have been added or revivified. An additional number of distinguished scholars have joined the staff. International symposia and other significant events of international scope have been held.

Rigorous emphasis has been placed on scholarship and research within Secretary Ripley's concept of the Smithsonian as a kind of open university in the manner of the earliest museums of classical times, an approach that also accords with the Institution's traditions from the days of the first Secretary, Joseph Henry. At the same time, his determination that museums should serve a wide public in imaginative ways has provided livelier exhibit techniques and exhibitions; a new, imaginative use of the Mall through such events as the Festival of American Folklife, which annually draws more than half a million visitors; and a greatly expanded range of activities that has brought into being such units as the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, the Smithsonian Associates, and the Division of Performing Arts.

Administration of the Smithsonian under the Secretary is the responsibility of a central Secretariat and the Directors of the bureaus and offices of the Institution.

The Secretariat includes the following positions: Assistant Secretary, Director General of Museums, Assistant Secretary for Science, Assistant Secretary for History and Art, Assistant Secretary for Public Service, Treasurer, General Counsel, the Directors of the Offices of Academic Programs, Personnel and Management Resources, Public Affairs, International Activities, and Development, and the Executive Assistant to the Secretary.

A body of boards and commissions also plays a major role in connection with the Smithsonian and its components. Members of these groups, in the manner
of the Board of Regents, include some of the most distinguished men and women in the United States. These groups include:

- Smithsonian Council
- National Collection of Fine Arts Commission
- National Gallery of Art Board of Trustees
- John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts Board of Trustees
- National Portrait Gallery Commission
- Cooper-Hewitt Museum of Decorative Arts and Design Advisory Board
- National Air and Space Museum Advisory Board
- National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board
- Smithsonian Foreign Currency Program Advisory Councils
- Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars Board of Trustees
- Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum Board of Trustees

In addition to members of these groups, primary contributions in all Smithsonian disciplines are made by the Institution’s Senior Scientists and Research Associates.

The Smithsonian comprises a major complex of buildings and grounds. Physical responsibility for this complex is assigned to the Buildings Management Department.
ARCHIVES OF AMERICAN ART

The Archives of American Art is the nation's largest collection of materials documenting the history of the visual arts in the United States. This great archival collection makes primary sources widely and easily available for research and publication.

The Archives preserves and makes accessible for scholars the papers of artists, craftsmen, collectors, dealers, critics, historians, museums, societies, and institutions. The Archives collection consists of original and secondary source material, manuscripts, letters, notebooks, sketchbooks, clippings, exhibition catalogs, publications of societies, rare and out-of-print material, recorded interviews, and photographs of works of art and artists.

The microfilm library of the Archives, which now exceeds three thousand rolls, or some three million photographic frames, includes large bodies of material not belonging to the Archives but recorded by it with permission of the owning museums, art groups, dealers, collectors, educational institutions, and so forth.

After becoming a bureau of the Smithsonian in 1970, the Archives of American Art established its central repository and reference center in the Smithsonian's Fine Arts and Portrait Galleries, where it shares library and office facilities with the joint library of the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery. Additional archival material is housed elsewhere in the Washington area.

The Archives' executive office, along with another collection and reference center, are located in New York. A branch office and study-collection center are also located in Detroit, where the Archives was founded in 1954 and centered until it became a component of the Smithsonian. In the planning stage are offices on the West Coast and in other parts of the country. The director of the Archives divides his time among the three centers, with primary headquarters in New York. Archivists administer the Washington and Detroit facilities.
The Archives was founded in 1954 as a non-profit, independent national research institution when E. P. Richardson, then Director of the Detroit Institute of Arts, and collector Lawrence Fleischman found themselves at a loss for biographical material on many artists who interested them. Dr. Richardson was conducting research for his book, *Painting in America—The Story of 450 Years*. Fleischman sought documentation on artists whose works he had bought. Faced with similar problems, they conceived the idea of establishing a research center with the fundamental goal of encouraging research and publication on art in the United States. With generous support in the Detroit community, and broad cooperation throughout the country, the concept came to fruition and flowered in subsequent years.

Microfilm permitted the collection of historical records maintained in other repositories, as well as the orderly recording of collections of original papers that quickly began to be offered as donations to the Archives. Additional advantages springing from the use of microfilm were more intensive cataloging efforts, preservation of old, often delicate records, and the easy transmission of copies of papers through the mails on interlibrary loan.

The earliest original item owned by the Archives is a 1743 letter from John Smith, one of the few well-trained European painter emigrants. Much other early material was obtained when the Archives in a two-year project filmed the records of seventeen historical society, museum, college, and other libraries in the Philadelphia area. A similar undertaking was later carried out in the vast holdings of the Manuscript Division, the Art Division, and the Prints Division of the New York Public Library.

Copies of the sixteen thousand known art auction catalogs published in this country from 1785 to 1950 have been made by the Archives. A similar compilation of art exhibition catalogs is under way. Tape-recorded interviews have been energetically collected and now total more than seven hundred, some running as long as twelve hours.

The reminiscences and comments of artists ranging in time from Abraham Walkowitz and Charles Sheeler to Robert Rauschenberg and George Segal have been gathered and transcribed. Edward Hopper, Adolph Gottlieb, Helen Frankenthaler, Ben Shahn, Barnett Newman, Louise Nevelson, Claes Oldenburg, Jacques Lipchitz, Robert Indiana, Roy Lichtenstein, and Seymour Lipton are among the artists who have been interviewed. Henri Cartier-Bresson did commissioned photographic essays on six artists, including Marcel Duchamp, for the Archives.

Important holdings include the Macbeth Gallery records, constituting more than 150,000 items from the first gallery to devote itself exclusively to American art and covering the years 1892 to 1954; the Rehn Gallery records, covering the decade following World War I; Walt Kuhn’s records of the historic Armory Show in 1913; records of the Whitney Museum; the Max Weber and Abraham Walkowitz papers; the correspondence and writing of Kenneth Hayes Miller; a major collection of papers belonging to administrators and artists active in federally sponsored art projects during the New Deal era; and the papers of painter Franz Kline and sculptors Louise Nevelson and David Smith.
FRER GALLERY OF ART

The Freer Gallery of Art presents one of the world’s most distinguished collections of Oriental art. Including works of art from China, Japan, Korea, India, and the Near East, the collection covers paintings, sculptures and other objects in stone, wood, lacquer, jade, pottery, porcelain, bronze, gold, and silver.

West also meets East at the Freer. Although primarily devoted to Oriental objects, the Gallery has an important American collection that includes works by Dewing, Hassam, Ryder, and Sargent. Most important in this field is the largest collection in any one place of paintings, prints, and other works by the American artist James McNeill Whistler. Included are more than three hundred oils, pastels, and drawings, as well as some seven hundred prints. Whistler’s Peacock Room, designed for a prosperous British merchant in 1877, is one of the museum’s most striking displays.

Only a fraction of the Freer’s more than 10,000 cataloged items can be displayed at once in the nineteen galleries. The oldest exhibit is a collection of Chinese bronzes, the earliest of which date from the twelfth century B.C.

The Freer Gallery of Art collections were deeded to the nation by Charles Lang Freer, a Detroit industrialist, in 1906. The Gallery, built in Florentine Renaissance style, was completed in 1921 and opened to the public two years later. President Theodore Roosevelt hailed the gift as “one of the most valuable collections which any private individual has ever given to any people.”

The deed of gift included a generous endowment for the study, care, and development of the collection, as well as funds to construct the building. The collection has been continuously and importantly augmented by purchase through the years.

Together with the collections, the Gallery library of some 40,000 volumes (about half of which are in Chinese and Japanese) serves to make this a leading center of research in the various fields of Oriental art. The Gallery’s publications, numbering some thirty volumes by members of the staff and other outstanding scholars, are distributed to museums and libraries all over the world. The Gallery also collaborates closely with the University of Michigan in the training of graduate students majoring in Oriental art; and graduate students from such universities as Harvard, Princeton, New York University, and elsewhere pay regular visits to the Gallery to study the collections at first hand. According to the terms of Mr. Freer’s will, objects in the collection are not permitted to leave the building on loan, nor is the Gallery allowed to exhibit anything it does not own.

The Gallery is located on the south side of the Mall at Twelfth Street.
INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE SERVICE

Through the Smithsonian's International Exchange Service, public and private institutions in the United States transmit their publications to other countries and receive publications from foreign institutions.

The service was begun in 1849 by the Smithsonian's first Secretary, Joseph Henry. The previous year Secretary Henry had started publication of the series, *Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge*. He wanted these research papers widely distributed as a means of "entering into friendly relations and correspondence with all the learned societies in the world." In return, he asked that the societies send the Smithsonian their publications.

So successful was the program that five years later he expanded its operations to other American libraries, scientific societies, and educational institutions. Later Congress designated the Service as the agency through which official United States publications would be exchanged for official printed materials of other countries.

This system grew rapidly and the quantity of material transmitted has steadily increased through the years. Today many libraries are dependent upon the exchange program for their foreign publications.

In a recent year, publications were received from some four hundred organizations in the United States for transmission to more than one hundred countries. Approximately 345,000 pounds of official United States publications were sent out to foreign depository libraries in exchange for official publications of other countries.

Included in this vast exchange, which comes to more than a million pounds of publications in a typical year, are daily issues of the *Federal Register* and the *Congressional Record*, sent in exchange for the parliamentary journals of other countries. United States patent specifications are sent to patent offices in other countries in exchange for foreign patent specifications. Bulletins, journals, reports, and transactions of universities, observatories, societies, government agencies, agricultural experiment stations, and Congressional committees are transmitted to libraries throughout the world in exchange for publications of similar foreign organizations.
JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Organized in 1958 as the National Cultural Center and renamed in 1964 as a memorial to the late President Kennedy, the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is under construction in the Foggy Bottom section of Washington along the Potomac River. It is scheduled for completion in 1971.

Construction of the Center is being financed by contributions from private citizens, matched by federal appropriations and a loan from the United States Treasury. In addition, gifts of construction materials have been received from foreign governments. The total cost is estimated at over $60 million.

The building's 630-foot grand foyer will extend the length of its front on the river. Opening onto the foyer will be a concert hall, opera hall, and theater, with respective seating capacities of 2,770, 2,300, and 1,150. On the roof terrace will be two large restaurants, a playhouse and film theater, and an atrium gallery for exhibitions and receptions. Underground parking for 1,600 cars will be provided.

By Congressional mandate, the Center will present classical and contemporary music, opera, drama, dance, and poetry from this and other countries. It will also present lectures, foster participation in educational and recreational programs for people of various age groups, and provide facilities for other civic activities. It is anticipated that several performing companies will be in residence. As representatives of a major national cultural institution, these resident companies will be charged with maintaining the highest standards of artistic achievement and of doing innovative work of a highly creative order.

The Center is an independently administered bureau of the Smithsonian.
JOSEPH H. HIRSHHORN MUSEUM AND SCULPTURE GARDEN

Under construction in the area of Washington's Mall bounded by Seventh and Ninth Streets, Independence Avenue, and Madison Drive—just east of the Smithsonian's Arts and Industries Building—the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden will be the permanent home of the magnificent collection of painting and sculpture donated to the United States in 1966 by the Greenwich, Connecticut, financier Joseph H. Hirshhorn.

Secretary Ripley called the Hirshhorn gift "one of the three outstanding cultural events connected with Washington in this century." The other two were the gifts made in connection with the National Gallery of Art and the Freer Gallery.

The Hirshhorn Museum will be a circular building supported by four hollow piers. It will float fifteen feet above a broad paved plaza. The sunken sculpture garden, extending northward across the Mall, will include a reflecting pool eighty feet wide and four hundred fifty feet long. Monumental sculpture will be displayed on the broad walks bordering the pool.

Born of one man's unique passion for art, the Hirshhorn Collection is committed to major developments in painting and sculpture. The superlative collection of over 2,000 sculptures is international in scope, ranging from antiquity through Benin bronzes of the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries to the work of today's young creators. A focal point is its outstanding sculptures, both European and American, from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

More than a hundred of these, including such world-renowned sculptures as Rodin's The Burghers of Calais, Matisse's four bas-reliefs The Backs, and Moore's King and Queen, will be on view in the museum's open court and along the walks bordering the reflecting pool of the sculpture garden.

The painting collection, comprising over 4,000 works, focuses on the current century. From the works of precursors such as Thomas Eakins and Winslow Homer to the canvases of the 1960s, the course of modern painting in America is covered in depth.

Complementing the United States section is a strong selection of paintings by modern European masters of the past three decades.

Because of the size and range of its collections, the Hirshhorn Museum will permit the study and exhibition of many major artists in a manner rarely possible elsewhere. Eakins, Gorky, De Kooning, Matisse, Moore, Miro, and Giacometti are among the outstanding artists represented by large holdings in the permanent collection.

Upon its formal opening the Hirshhorn Museum will offer the public alternating exhibitions of its permanent collections, a varied schedule of educational programs, and a series of special rotating exhibitions devoted to major developments in the fields of contemporary painting and sculpture. Plans call for the opening of the museum and sculpture garden in 1971.
NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM

The National Air and Space Museum possesses an unparalleled collection tracing the history of man's aviation and space achievements from the dawn of flight to the exploration of space.

Now in the planning stage at Congressional direction is a major new National Air and Space Museum on Washington's Mall to present this collection and carry forward programs of education and research. This building will be located between Fourth and Seventh Streets, Independence Avenue, and Jefferson Drive.

Pending this construction, the museum exhibits a range of selected items in the Arts and Industries Building and the adjacent temporary Air and Space Building. Included are the Wright Brothers' Kitty Hawk Flyer, Lindbergh's Spirit of St. Louis, John Glenn's Friendship 7 space capsule, the X-15 experimental rocket plane, Wiley Post's globe-circling Winnie Mae, the Bell X-1 (first plane to fly faster than the speed of sound), other historic airplanes and gliders, space vehicles, model airplanes, missiles, rockets, engines, trophies, and memorabilia. The remainder of the collection is stored at a Silver Hill, Maryland, restoration center not open to the public.

The planned National Air and Space Museum will be 784 by 250 feet and contain over one million square feet of floor space. It will contain a library, a laboratory, and study facilities for research by staff and visiting scholars on the history and technology of flight.

The Smithsonian's involvement with flight goes back to 1861 when Joseph Henry, the first Secretary, recommended to President Lincoln that balloons be used for aerial spotting in the Civil War. Other key dates have been 1887-1903, when active research in aerodynamics by Samuel P. Langley, third Secretary of the Smithsonian, resulted in successful flights of unmanned model airdromes; 1915, with establishment at the Smithsonian of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which was to evolve into the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; 1917, when Dr. Robert H. Goddard was granted Smithsonian funds for research in rocket propulsion; 1920, when a World War I temporary building, the present Air and Space Building, was opened to the public to display the aeronautical collections; 1932, when a Section of Aeronautics was established at the Smithsonian; 1946, in which year the National Air Museum was created; and 1966, when the National Air Museum was renamed the National Air and Space Museum to recognize its role in the field of space flight and an appropriation of funds was authorized by Congress for construction of the new building. In 1967, the museum took formal responsibility, in agreement with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, for preservation and selected display of space craft and related materials produced in the national space program.
NATIONAL ARMED FORCES MUSEUM ADVISORY BOARD

The National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board's principal work is to advise and assist the Board of Regents on matters relating to the establishment of a National Armed Forces Historical Museum Park and Study Center to portray the contributions of the armed forces to American society and culture. A site on the Potomac River in the Fort Foote area of Maryland's Prince Georges County, within a short distance of downtown Washington, has received preliminary approval for the outdoor museum.

Envisioned for the historical museum park are outdoor displays tracing the evolution of warfare from the Revolutionary War period up to recent times: a visitor center and exhibit hall; a study center, the Dwight D. Eisenhower Center for Historical Research, for scholarly study into the meaning of war and its effect on civilization; a ship basin containing historically significant vessels; a large parade ground to accommodate parades, tattoos, and similar events; and exhibits showing historical contributions of the armed forces in a range of areas including aviation and space, polar exploration, and technological development.

The board is engaged in collecting materials—especially unique items that might disappear if not acquired immediately—for use in the projected historical museum park. Recent acquisitions include Trieste I, the bathyscaphe which explored the Challenger Deep near the island of Guam; the United States Testing Machine, built in 1879 and used by Army Ordnance to measure with extreme accuracy tensile and compressive forces ranging from one to 800,000 pounds; and the last operational flying boat in the United States Navy, a P5M patrol plane.

The Advisory Board has also turned its attention to armed forces materials other than hardware. Recent acquisitions include original dormitory furniture from the United States Military Academy at West Point. Posters and other artwork also form a sizable portion of the collections. The first public exhibition sponsored by the Board was "The Armed Forces of the United States as Seen by the Contemporary Artist," art works depicting the American serviceman at work and leisure around the world, commissioned by and on loan from the United States military forces.

The U.S.S. Tecumseh will offer Civil War historians an unprecedented resource if current salvage operations are successful. This Union vessel was sunk in Mobile Bay in 1864 within a minute of striking a Confederate mine, carrying with her most of her crew. By raising her intact, the Board hopes to gain a unique opportunity to examine in detail a United States man-of-war of a century ago as she appeared in battle-ready condition.

In addition, the Board is building a reference library of military-related graphics—photographs, drawings, and maps—as well as technical manuals and other resource books.
NATIONAL COLLECTION OF FINE ARTS

The National Collection of Fine Arts traces its beginning to the establishment of the Smithsonian, when it was conceived as a respository for all art donated to the federal government. It became known by law as the National Gallery of Art in 1906 and was renamed the National Collection of Fine Arts in 1937 when Andrew Mellon’s great gift of art to the nation assumed the designation of the National Gallery of Art.

After years as a tenant in the Smithsonian’s Natural History Building, the National Collection of Fine Arts moved into a permanent new home in Washington’s Old Patent Office Building at Eighth and G Streets, NW, a few blocks north of Washington’s Mall, in May of 1968. The Old Patent Office Building, renamed the Fine Arts and Portrait Galleries, is one of Washington’s most monumental and beautiful structures. The National Collection of Fine Arts shares the building with the National Portrait Gallery, a new Smithsonian art museum. Constructed between 1836 and 1867 and partially rebuilt in the late nineteenth century after a fire, the Greek Revival-style building served as a Civil War hospital and was the scene of Lincoln’s second inaugural ball. The great marble-pillared hall where the ball was held is now known as the Lincoln Gallery.

Strongly emphasizing American art, the National Collection’s body of more than 11,000 paintings, sculptures, and prints includes the John Gellatly, Henry Ward Ranger, William T. Evans, and the C. S. Johnson & Co. “Art: USA” collections; 18 oils by Albert Pinkham Ryder, the largest single holding of his work; and the 445 paintings of George Catlin’s famous Indian Gallery. There are major collections of sculpture by Paul Manship, William Zorach, and Hiram Powers, whose Florence, Italy, studio will be reconstructed by the museum.

A large, representative selection of contemporary art, thousands of graphics, and a large collection of miniature paintings are other areas of museum strength. The museum also has deposits of works of the government-supported art program of the 1930s. In addition to a series of major temporary exhibitions, the National Collection of Fine Arts surveys in permanent exhibitions the scope of American art from its beginnings to the present.

Under Congressional mandate, the National Collection of Fine Arts is charged with inventorying, studying, and conserving art belonging to other branches of the government (WPA murals, for example); encouraging the development of art on a national scale through exhibits and educational materials designed for schools, art councils, and other organizations at the state and community level; maintaining an art research library; aiding the Art-in-Embassies program which puts American art in the United States embassies abroad; advising on a national crafts
program; and lending works of art to government agencies, including the White House, where curatorial assistance is given as well.

A major division of the National Collection of Fine Arts is the International Art Program, which brings to audiences all over the world the considerable artistic achievement of the United States. This division organizes the official American representation at the large recurring international exhibitions, such as the Venice and São Paulo biennials, circulates around the globe touring exhibitions of American art, has organized a print workshop staffed by an American expert that travels from country to country teaching techniques and providing the equipment with which to make prints, produces and circulates catalogs in many foreign languages to foster the understanding of American art, conducts art research for foreign groups, and acts as a liaison between overseas and American art organizations.
NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Founded in 1937 when financier Andrew Mellon gave his remarkable collection of Old Master paintings and sculptures to the nation, along with funds for the building, the National Gallery of Art is widely recognized as one of the world’s great art museums. A major masterwork collection is on permanent exhibition and a continuing series of temporary exhibitions is presented.

The original Mellon bequest included Raphael’s Alba Madonna, Botticelli’s Adoration of the Magi, and Jan Van Eyck’s Annunciation.

Four other great private collections soon joined that of Andrew Mellon—the collection of Peter A. B. Widener and his son Joseph E. Widener, and those of Samuel H. Kress, Chester Dale, and Lessing J. Rosenwald. Among the Widener gifts were Vermeer’s A Woman Weighing Gold, Titian’s Venus and Adonis, and fourteen of the Gallery’s twenty-four Rembrandts. Kress bequests have included The Adoration of the Magi by Fra Angelico and Fra Filippo Lippi, and Bellini’s Feast of the Gods. The Chester Dale Collection specializes in the most brilliant works of modern French art of the past century and a half, with particular attention to Impressionism. The Rosenwald Collection consists of more than 20,000 prints assembled with unsurpassed esthetic and technical selectivity.

An important recent accession by the gallery was Leonardo da Vinci’s beautiful Ginevra de’ Benci, the only painting in America generally acknowledged to be by Leonardo.

The Gallery now owns upward of 1,600 paintings and 1,700 sculptures.

Besides its permanent and temporary exhibitions, the National Gallery sponsors lectures, maintains a research service, circulates reproductions and printed materials around the world, administers fellowships for scholarly research, and maintains its own orchestra.

A center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts is planned by the Gallery. It will be housed in a new facility, designed by I. M. Pei and Partners, to the east of the present museum. As well as housing the Center, the east building, scheduled to be opened in 1973, will contain extension services and additional exhibition facilities.

Located on the Mall at Sixth Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, the National Gallery of Art is an independently administered bureau of the Smithsonian with a separate board of trustees. The Center for Advanced Study is being constructed at the junction of Pennsylvania Avenue and the Mall.
The National Museum of History and Technology tells the story of America and studies the story of America. From household goods the colonists brought from their native lands—to weapons, military and otherwise, that made them free—to technology that helped make them wealthy and strong—to memorabilia of men and women who led them—the museum’s collections comprise a tangible biography of the Republic. The depth and scope of these collections are unparalleled.

Visitors to the museum can see the American flag that inspired Francis Scott Key to write “The Star Spangled Banner,” the gowns of every First Lady from Martha Washington onward, the desk at which Thomas Jefferson drafted the Declaration of Independence. Reflecting the heroic image Americans hold of their first President, Horatio Greenough’s monumental statue of a toga-clad George Washington surveys the surveyors of the American scene.

Tourists can watch a Foucault pendulum demonstrating the earth’s rotation. They can see the only surviving gunboat from the Revolutionary War, the Philadelphia. They can see the clothes their ancestors wore, the beds they slept in, and the plows they used to till their land. They can see a torchlight political rally of the last century, visit a Victorian confectionery shop and smell the fragrance of chocolate and vanilla drifting around them, or be awed by a 300-ton Southern Railway locomotive complete with the nostalgic sounds of hissing steam and shrieking whistle.

A talented and imaginative exhibits staff works closely with the curators to make these objects come alive for today’s viewers. This staff is adept not only at creating a total environment, such as a diorama of underwater exploration that makes the viewer feel he is under the sea, but also at preserving or restoring historic objects to make them more meaningful to scholars.

While tourists are absorbing the visual panorama of American and scientific history, curators and other scholars behind the scenes, using the vast number of objects and archival materials at their disposal, pursue continuing programs of research and publication.

The National Museum of History and Technology is located at Fourteenth Street and Constitution Avenue on the north side of the Mall. The museum is organized into five departments and an office of special programs, as follows:
Department of Applied Arts

The Graphic Arts and Photography Division of the Department of Applied Arts is concerned with the history and technology of photography, commercial printing, and hand-printing processes. The collection of approximately 50,000 specimens consists of prints of all periods, with particular emphasis on photomechanical prints of the pioneer period 1850-1900; approximately 250 photographic lenses and shutters; 1,500 still- and motion-picture cameras; 300 Patent Office models covering the period 1840-1905, and related materials in each of the subject areas. In addition to its exhibit and research programs, the division is responsible for a continuing program of restoration of old photographs by nuclear activation.

The Division of Numismatics is concerned with the general history of money and monetary art, medallic art, the history of banking, and financial history. Its holdings are extensive and worldwide in scope. A recent acquisition was the Josiah K. Lilly, Jr., Collection of 6,125 gold coins. It supplements the United States Mint and Paul A. Straub Collections of United States coins, giving an almost complete series of official issues of the Philadelphia and five branch mints and an unparalleled series of pioneer and territorial issues. Other particularly important holdings are the collections of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Russian coins and medals donated by Willis H. duPont; the series of foreign paper currencies and scrip, which is the largest of its kind in the United States; and the study collections of ancient Greek and Roman as well as medieval coins.

All aspects of American and foreign mail service, from the beginning to the present, are included in the broad field of activity of the Division of Postal History. Research and study of American and foreign postal history are facilitated by one of the world’s most comprehensive philatelic libraries, as well as the National Postage Stamp Collection. This vast philatelic treasure consists of almost 12,000,000 specimens. In addition to stamps, the holdings include pre-stamp envelopes, postal markings, United States certified plate proof sheets, postal stationery, specialized collections, postal history material, three-dimensional objects, and study material of the postal issues of virtually all countries.

The Division of Textiles includes collections of fabrics and the raw materials and the implements and machines used to produce the fabrics. American textiles—both those of domestic production and the imported fabrics in common use—are the substance of the collection. The period covered is the seventeenth century to the present. The popular collections of samplers, quilts, coverlets, shawls, laces, spinning wheels, hand looms, and sewing machines are of continuing interest to scholars, collectors, and the casual visitor. The important historical holdings include Whitney’s cotton gin, the Slater cotton carding and spinning machines of 1790, the Howe and Singer sewing machines, and the first pair of nylon stockings. Staff researches include the historical and technical aspects of the collections and the development of scientific methods of cleaning and conserving the historic fabrics.
Department of Cultural History

The Costume and Furnishings Division includes the collection of American costume, wearing apparel and personal adornment, as well as the furnishings of the post-Civil War period, including furniture and related household materials. The museum has a large collection of garments and accessories of dress, including an important selection assembled by the Copp Family of Stonington, Connecticut. An outstanding specimen on display in the Hall of American Costume is the "freedom suit" of an apprentice cabinet maker of the late eighteenth century; a freedom suit was the clothing given an indentured servant when he fulfilled his term of bondage and became a free man. Important parts of the collections of Victorian furnishings are exhibited in period rooms in the Hall of Everyday Life in the American Past. The Victorian scene also may be examined in The Harry T. Peters "America on Stone" Lithography Collection housed in this division.

The Ethnic and Western Cultural History Division includes collections relating to Spanish American, Afro-American, and Western American cultural history. Among the earliest materials collected in the nineteenth century were ritual and secular objects relating to Spanish culture in the American Southwest, many of which are now displayed in the Hall of Everyday Life in the American Past. Afro-American history collections are being gathered, exhibits are being prepared, and a center of bibliographical source materials is being developed. The material culture of the frontier and settlement periods of the Midwest and the Far West is a new subject area recently added by the Department.

The Musical Instruments Division is concerned with performance as well as research exhibits relating to its collection of musical instruments from Western Europe and America. The collection is especially notable for its fine examples of keyboard instruments of the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries. A well-equipped conservation laboratory provides facilities for restoring most types of instruments, for studying the techniques of instrument making and for constructing reproductions. A comprehensive and continuing restoration program makes it possible for a wide variety of instruments to be played in frequent public performances and demonstrations. Maintained in the division's reference library is a growing iconographic file, including the Hugo Worch Collection of photographs of keyboard instruments and advertisements.

The Preindustrial Cultural History Division includes three areas of collections and research: preindustrial crafts, including hand tools and processes of historic crafts as well as an important collection of tools and implements of the 19th-century whaling industry; northeastern preindustrial cultural history, which is concerned with the tradition of handcrafts in New England, New York, and New Jersey from the Colonial period into the nineteenth century; and southeastern preindustrial cultural history covering the same categories of materials of the states from Pennsylvania southward. These collections of furniture, silver, pewter, woodenware, pottery, educational materials, and folk art are displayed in a series of period rooms in the Hall of Everyday Life in the American Past. This division also administers the museum's interdisciplinary Growth of the United States exhibit halls. These contain chronologically-grouped displays and objects of outstanding historical, cultural, and technological interest, ranging from a 17th-century house frame to the first locomotive in America, and exemplifying impor-
tant aspects of national development. In collaboration with the city of Alexandria, Virginia, a long-range archeological salvage project is being conducted in urban renewal areas of Alexandria from which significant artifacts have been acquired.

Department of Industries

The Agriculture and Mining Division has 1,500 American agricultural implements and machines in its collections, with particular emphasis on the evolution of 19th-century plowing and harvesting equipment. The Division holds a large collection of 20th-century gasoline tractors. A collection of tools and equipment and specimens relating to forest products and the coal mining industry is augmented by photographs and annual reports, with current emphasis on Pennsylvania's anthracite. The Dewey Collection of 19th-century mining and metallurgical products and the Grant Wheat mine-lighting collection are significant components of the mining collection.

The Ceramics and Glass Division includes examples of American and Old World glass from 1500 B.C. to the present, European and American ceramics ranging from the fourteenth through the twentieth centuries, and Oriental export ceramics and wares which influenced American and European production. The research effort involves archeological excavation, and research and classification on recovered materials in collaboration with government and private scholarly institutions. Studies are also conducted of production techniques currently used in glass and ceramics factories and by individual artisans. Outstanding individual collections are the Hans Syz Collection of 18th-century European porcelain, the Larsen Collection of 19th-century transfer-printed English earthenware, and the McCauley Collection of English Liverpool-type earthenware, early American glass, and late-19th and early-20th-century American art glass.

The Manufacturing Division is concerned with the collection and documentation of machines, equipment and artifacts related to American industrial development, including the history of petroleum, iron and steel, metallurgy, and general manufactures. The collection consists of several major groupings of archival materials and artifacts, including more than a thousand Patent Office models. Another major research interest is business and industrial history, for which the Warshaw Collection of Business Americana provides a basis.

The Transportation Division holds a rich collection of ship plans and approximately two hundred half-models relating to the evolution of American merchant ship types as well as specialized craft from 1650 to the present day. Other collections include a large number of restored road and railroad vehicles, fire-fighting equipment, and important associated archival materials.
Department of National and Military History

The Historic Archeology Division coordinates programs in areas that include historic site archeology, industrial archeology, and underwater exploration. Field research in some of these activities is also carried on by curators in other divisions and coordinated here. The Underwater Exploration Program is administered by this Division. The programs of the Division are directed to the increase of our knowledge of economic, social, and military history through the exploration of historic sites, both on land and underwater.

The Military History Division holds particularly rich collections of American firearms, edged weapons, heavy ordnance, military dress and equipment, heraldry, and military graphics—presenting broad opportunities for research in the military history of the United States from the establishment of the first colonies to the present day. The weapons collection includes a wide variety of developmental models and patent models, representing the evolution of the firearm from its primitive state to the modern period. The uniform collection is the largest single grouping of American regular Army dress in existence, supplemented by a significant selection of European uniforms for comparative study. The heraldry collections are extensive and include United States Army decorations, service medals, and distinctive insignia. Many items in the collections of the Division are associated with distinguished American soldiers.

The Naval History Division maintains a varied collection of materials which reflect the intellectual, material and operational history of the United States Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. The role of all the services in the development of the United States is presented in a unified way through exhibits, which highlight service in past wars as well as the peacetime work of diplomacy and exploration, including expeditions to the polar regions. The Division maintains reference collections of uniforms, equipment, models, manuscripts, and other items which mirror the role of the Navy in the life of the nation. An extensive collection of plans and half-models is in constant use by scholars and other interested persons studying the evolution of the warship.

The Political History Division collections are composed of objects associated with material, social, and intellectual aspects of American history. The collections of political memorabilia are rich and diversified and illustrate comprehensively the growth and development of the process of campaigning for office and of the impact of political and social movements. Also in the Division are collections of memorabilia of historic Americans including Presidents, governmental officials, and other intellectual and social and political leaders of our nation.

Another aspect of American history in this Division centers on the First Ladies of the United States. The gowns worn by these ladies and the objects they owned show the influence that the nation's First Family has always had on social customs, and other aspects of social history.
Department of Science and Technology

The collections and research activities of the Division of Electricity and Nuclear Energy relate to telegraphy, telephony, radio, and nuclear energy. Comprehensive collections of instruments, motors, generators, and meters are supplemented by important archival holdings. The most significant materials are displayed in the Hall of Electricity and the special exhibit on nuclear energy.

The Mechanical and Civil Engineering Division's extensive collections of original objects, models, and archival materials represent the historical development of mechanical and civil engineering. Included are a great variety of hand and machine tools, power machinery, clocks, watches, typewriters, and phonographs. As in other Divisions, materials on exhibition and in the reference collections provide the basis for scholarly research being conducted by the staff and visiting scholars and students.

The Medical Sciences Division is concerned with the historical development of medicine, dentistry, surgery, pharmacy, health, and related sciences. Among the division's resources are reference collections of drugs, apothecary jars, and other artifacts of pharmaceutical history, dental and surgical instruments, and a reference library of professional journals and works on the history of medicine, pharmacy, dentistry, and public health.

The Division of Physical Sciences embraces chemistry, astronomy, surveying, and the several branches of physics, such as acoustics, thermodynamics, meteorology, oceanography, and optics. Among the apparatus preserved are important American telescopes, a collection of 18th-century chemical glassware, and a broad selection of geodetic surveying instruments and science-teaching apparatus from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Office of Special Programs

The Office of Special Programs of the National Museum of History and Technology encompasses four individual programs.

An extensive collection of trade catalogs, instruction manuals, and price lists relating to industrial products of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries provides a valuable source of data for technological and statistical studies in the American Business and Industrial History Program. The material is supplemented by a unique collection of business memorabilia consisting of upward of a million trade circulars, brochures, price lists, pamphlets, and letterheads covering every aspect of American business. This collection provides valuable information about technical development, especially in the field of consumer goods, in the past a research field greatly neglected by historians.

Thanks to the support of the American Federation of Information Processing Societies, a special Computer History Program is currently under way. In this project software and other forms of documentation are being supplemented with taped interviews of participants in the development of the modern computers.
The Section of Mathematics, under which this program is conducted, is concerned with the history of mathematical instruments and machines. This involves instruments such as simple counting and calculating aids, astrolabes and gnomonic instruments, calendrical computing devices, and miscellaneous mathematical scales, including sectors. Among the more modern items are adding and calculating machines, modern computers, cash registers, tabulators, slide rules, planimeters and other simple integrators, harmonic and differential analyzers, and ruling and dividing engines.

In addition to maintaining the national collection in this field and conducting the special computer program, this section presents exhibits and conducts research on the technological and mathematical aspects of these objects.

The Industrial Archeology Program—involving on-site investigation of physical remains of industries, civil engineering works, and such mechanical engineering creations as canal locks and power plants—has in recent years become a major concern of the Smithsonian. The emphasis by the unit of the Office of Special Programs concerned with this study is on field recording, an important contribution because only a small portion of the finest and most important industrial monuments stand a chance of being preserved. Among the surveys conducted have been studies of the C. P. Bradway Machine Works in Connecticut, a builder of water turbines; Dudley Shuttles Inc., in Wilkinsonville, Massachusetts, which manufactures wood shuttles and power looms; a series of iron bridges built between 1850 and 1875; textile mills in New England, the first of a series to determine how the physical plant that housed the machine evolved; and entire villages central to the history of the textile industry in New England. The industrial archeology group, by the example of its work, is seeking to foster similar small and large studies of American technology across the nation by specialists and students in this relatively new discipline.

The Underwater Exploration Program performs research in underwater exploration techniques and documentation of historical underwater sites. Field surveys using electronic gear have been conducted primarily in the Bermuda area, the Strait of Florida, and at Port Royal, Jamaica. A number of shipwreck remains have been located and are being investigated in connection with the study of early shipping in the New World. The staff also studies methods of preservation of materials recovered from underwater sites.

The National Museum of History and Technology opened to the public in 1964.
The National Museum of Natural History and National Museum of Man together comprise one of the world's major centers for the study of natural sciences—in terms both of collections and programs of research on plants, animals, rocks and minerals, fossil organisms, and man himself.

Both museums are located in the Smithsonian's Natural History Building on the Mall at Tenth Street and Constitution Avenue. The building was completed in 1911, and wings were added in 1963 and 1965. Caretaking of the national collections of natural history—in excess of fifty million specimens—is a major responsibility. This includes not only the acquisition and maintenance of these collections, which are the largest in the nation, but also making them available for study by Smithsonian and outside scientists.

In addition, the scientific staff conducts research on the collections in order to develop a better understanding of the natural world and the processes that mold it. The plants, animals, and fossils of the world are described so that they may be recognized by systematic biologists and other scientists concerned with learning about the world's environment for the benefit of man.

These studies involve descriptions of not only the external characteristics, but also the internal ones, the interrelationships of the species, their geographic range, and their ecological interactions with the total environment. This work provides critical data for further studies of pollution, medicine, development of food sources, and extraterrestrial materials.

The museum exhibit halls, which display only about one percent of the collections, are visited by millions of persons each year, many of them school children for whom the displays supplement classroom work.

In the halls are exhibits of physical anthropology: osteology: minerals, gems, jade, and meteorites; Latin American archeology; birds of the world: life in the sea; the world of mammals: dinosaurs and other fossil reptiles: fossil plants and invertebrate animals; fossil fishes and amphibians: North American archeology; American mammals: the age of mammals in North America; and prehistoric peoples of North America.

The old-fashioned style of exhibits, in which specimens were displayed in rows of mahogany and glass cases, has given way in large measure in recent years to modernized exhibits that make use of a wide variety of techniques (visual, auditory, and olfactory) to add interest and immediacy to the explanation of the biological principles governing the development of the natural world.

Among the most popular exhibits is the Fenykovi elephant in the building's rotunda, a twelve-ton African giant that is the largest land animal in modern
records. A short distance away are two other monsters: in the Hall of Fossil Reptiles, the 70-foot skeleton of a giant diplodocus, a 135-million-year-old dinosaur whose bones were dug up in Utah; and in the Hall of Life in the Sea, arched in a diving position thirty feet above the floor, the life-size model of a 92-foot blue whale that took the museum's staff more than two years to construct. Inside one main entrance to the museum is poised an Indian tiger, menacing in appearance and of record size.

The Gem and Mineral Hall features the world's finest mineral collection and the most extensive collection of gems ever put on display. One of the Hall's highlights is the 44.5-carat Hope Diamond, which because of its long and dramatic history and its rare and deep blue color is probably the best known diamond in the world.

The anthropological halls use life-size plaster figures and a broad range of artifacts and specimens to depict a panorama of human customs throughout the world, from an American Indian making pottery to an eskimo hunting for seal. These displays can be seen in the halls of the Native Peoples of the Americas, the Cultures of the Pacific and Asia, and the Cultures of Africa and Asia.

Exhibits such as these are painstakingly prepared by close coordination between the skilled exhibits staff—which includes designers, illustrators, cabinet makers, painters, model makers, plastic specialists, and graphic production men—and the curators. Among the newest exhibits being developed is a dramatic ecological exhibit, The Hall of Living Things, planned by the author and naturalist Peter Farb. This hall will explore the interrelationships and mutual dependence of all forms of life on earth.

Behind the scenes, using refined laboratory techniques, the approximately one hundred scientists of the staff perform research based on collections and on field observations made throughout the world. Since its inception the Smithsonian has been actively involved in the exploration and study of little-known areas of the world and with the collection of specimens and data from such areas. Famous expeditions have included the Theodore Roosevelt African Expedition in 1909 and 1910 that brought back a rich collection of African fauna. Other notable expeditions have been the polar expeditions, exploration of prehistoric Indian ruins in the Southwest and in Latin America, and former Smithsonian Secretary Dr. Charles D. Walcott's studies of Cambrian fossils in the Canadian Northwest.

The museums are organized into eight component parts—seven departments and one special program office encouraging interdisciplinary communication and research in systematic biology.
Department of Anthropology

In an age of rapid change and ever-increasing need for understanding man, the opportunity to study various cultures, past and present, and to apply the knowledge thus gained is fading. The Department of Anthropology studies mankind as both a cultural and biological species, from the earliest to present-day human beings, on a worldwide basis. Man’s role, past, present, and future, in the ecosystem is vital to our understanding of current problems of world concern such as pollution, over-population, and use of resources.

The Department consists of the Divisions of North American Anthropology, Latin American Anthropology, Old World Anthropology, and Physical Anthropology. Available to the staff and visiting scholars are archeological and ethnological collections containing about one million specimens from all parts of the world, as well as some 15,000 human skulls and 7,000 complete skeletons. The National Anthropological Archives, dealing with the American Indian, contains thousands of manuscripts and photographs dating from 1848 to the present covering languages, ethnology, history, and archeology.

One of the Department’s major programs involves ancient technology. Teams have gathered collections and obtained data in various parts of South Asia on traditional crafts, industries, and technologies, which will soon be lost to industrialization. These constitute a unique historical recording of the beginnings of modern technology. New world pre-Columbian metal artifacts have been analyzed by means of metallographic and spectrochemical techniques, revealing important information concerning aboriginal methods of working metals which have been shown to be as technically advanced and sophisticated as those used today. In Africa and Asia, staff members are conducting a number of ethnological and archeological studies—among the southwestern Bantu, in rural Korea, in Syria. In North America continuing projects include ethnography, cultural history, material culture, and linguistic studies of eastern Indians.

Other important staff projects include a long-range archeological program in Saudi Arabia, in areas never before visited by archeologists; continued excavation of American Indian village sites; direction of comprehensive archeological research and training programs in Brazil and in the highlands of Peru; compilation of a dictionary of a Mexican native language; study of the ethnohistory and of the seafaring traditions of Caroline Island natives; and studies on forensic osteology, human aging, microevolution, paleopathology, and new methods for dating human burials using decay of proteins as an index.

Department of Botany

The Department of Botany is involved in a broad range of collection and research activities on a worldwide basis.

The United States National Herbarium, located within the Department, has a collection that includes more than three million dried specimens of plants. It is especially rich in specimens from North and South America, but Asia, Africa, Australia, and the Pacific Islands are also well represented.
Research in the Department is concerned with plant systematics in the broadest sense: classification, identification, and nomenclature; cytology; palynology; plant geography; ecology; and economic botany. Most studies are aimed at elucidating evolutionary development.

Under way at present in the Department is a monumental, definitive project on North American plants called "Flora North America." This is a fifteen-year survey of plant life of North America in which many botanists from the United States and Canada are participating. The results will be published in a four-volume work.

Historically, the Department has been deeply involved in collection and research in the tropics, where a large percentage of the plants still remain unknown to science.

Department of Entomology

Three quarters of the world's animal species are insects. The classification and understanding of them are the responsibilities of the Department of Entomology, whose reference collections contain more than nineteen million specimens, a large part of the entire Smithsonian collection of cataloged specimens and objects. Nonetheless, the Department's task of collecting and classifying has hardly begun. It is estimated that of the two million different insect species in the world, perhaps a third have not been studied.

Research emphasis in the Department is on classifying the multitude of known insect species. This work is supplemented by studies of the life history, ecology, and behavior of insect groups.

Administratively the Department consists of the Divisions of Coleoptera (a group that includes beetles and weevils) Hemiptera and Hymenoptera (including bedbugs, water bugs, lice, aphids, wasps, bees, and ants); Myriapoda and Arachnida (including millipedes, centipedes, spiders, scorpions, ticks, and mites); Neuropteroids (including lacewings and ant lions); and Lepidoptera and Diptera (including butterflies, moths, flies, and gnats).

Department of Invertebrate Zoology

Increasing interest in oceanography and the necessity of developing sources of food from the sea are reflected in the research activities of this Department, which is primarily concerned with aquatic invertebrate animals from both ocean and fresh-water habitats. One of the largest departments of its kind in the world, it has collections of twelve million specimens to draw upon for its investigations.

The Department is comprised of the Divisions of Crustacea, Echinoderms, Worms, and Mollusks. Its collections of crustaceans and mollusks (the latter number more than ten million), accumulated in over a century of exploration, are considered the finest in the world.
Invertebrate animals are still so little known with respect to their kinds and diversity, their distributions, and the mechanisms that control these distributions that much of the Department's research is necessarily fundamental and exploratory, with strong emphasis on fundamental classification and secondary emphasis on aspects such as community structure and evolutionary history.

The staff is at work on diverse projects that include studies in comparative anatomy, embryology and larval development, biochemistry as it relates to systematics, biology of plankton, ecology of warm temperate communities, biology of deep-sea invertebrates, and the evolution of parasites in relation to their hosts.

Department of Mineral Sciences

Well known for its displays of the Hope Diamond and other beautiful gems, the Department is also engaged in broad basic research, so broad and basic as to cover not only the formation of the earth but also the origins of the extra-terrestrial matter that has fallen upon it or been brought back from the Moon by Apollo program astronauts. Of the world's 2,000 known meteorites, the Department has specimens of some 1,200, making it one of the world centers for research in this field. Research now under way in Department laboratories includes studies of the composition and origin of meteorites by means of sophisticated equipment such as an electron microprobe. This activity is expected to expand in scope as the exploration of space advances.

In addition to its meteorites, the Department has a collection of over 150,000 minerals and gems, one of the largest and most complete reference accumulations in the world.

The Department has made major contributions in petrology research in recent years, especially in its study of the rocks of the oceanic crust in the mid-Atlantic Ridge. Findings tend to support the theory that the sea floor in this area is spreading, causing the continents on both sides of the Atlantic to drift apart.

The Department's volcanologists have made on-the-scene observation of volcanic eruptions and in another case studied an extinct submerged ocean volcano in an attempt to reconstruct its development.

Department of Paleobiology

Called by a distinguished British paleontologist "one of the great world centers in paleobiological research," this Department studies both plant and animal fossils, the keys to understanding evolutionary development and the forces of erosion, sedimentation, and upheaval that have shaped the face of the earth.
The Department has over thirteen million specimens of fossil plants and animals in its study collections. Its vertebrate fossil collections are especially extensive with rich and important finds from North America like the O. C. Marsh dinosaur bone collection. The collection of fossil plants is also excellent, with fine representatives of the Mesozoic and Tertiary period plants of the Western Hemisphere. The staff continues to conduct collection expeditions all over the world.

Projects in the Department include electron microscope scanning of deep-sea fossil microorganisms, a paleobiological study of 250-million-year-old brachiopods that have been processed in acid baths to separate them from rock matrices, and X-ray examination of deep-sea sediment cores.

Though studies of the Department tend to deal primarily with the preserved hard parts of animals and plants, a number of members of the staff go on underwater diving expeditions because they have found that the study of living animals undersea makes it easier to understand the physical and biological environment, evolution, and characteristics of fossil animals.

Department of Vertebrate Zoology

A center for research on the ecology, life histories and behavior of fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals, this Department’s collections have millions of specimens as a basis for its investigations.

The Bird Division collections include some 500,000 specimens, representing a majority of the world’s 8,600 bird species. Since it is unlikely that anyone will discover many new bird species to be described, the Division’s ornithologists are free to explore other kinds of biological problems like the complex relationship between the birds and their environments and functional anatomy. Staff projects include ecological studies of marine and tropical forest birds.

Current research of the Division of Reptiles and Amphibians, with its extensive collections, includes the systematics, zoogeography, and ecology of North and South American reptiles and amphibians, as well as collection-based ecological studies.

Research in the Division of Fishes, based on what is probably the largest fish collection in the world, is directed mainly toward the comprehensive systematic studies of natural groups of marine and freshwater fishes, involving their morphology, classification, relationships, evolution, and distribution.

The collection of mammals, numbering more than 350,000 specimens, is one of the largest in the world. Research of this Division currently centers on the animals of the American tropics, Africa, the Middle East, and eastern Asia. Studies include definition and nomenclature of species, generic revisions, zoogeography, ecology, and epidemiology.

Two new facilities initiated in 1967 will provide unique opportunities for the study of marine mammals and primates. A Marine Mammal Study Center in Alexandria, Virginia, about ten minutes from the Museum, will eventually have
facilities for preparation, storage, and study of the largest marine mammals. The Primate Biology Program in the Division is a multi-disciplinary approach to systematics, ecological and behavioral research, and teaching.

Office of Systematics

This special Office was established in 1965 as a focus for efforts to catalyze progress in systematic biology and its study within the Smithsonian Institution and elsewhere. Although it seeks to develop support for conventional approaches, it is increasingly concerned with projects of an interdisciplinary, problem-oriented nature and with the introduction of new techniques, new facilities, and new attitudes in systematic biology.

The most important achievements have been in the areas of education and the application of automatic data-processing techniques and technology to systematic problems. Annually, a Summer Institute in Systematics brings together twenty-five highly qualified young teaching-researching systematists from the academic community with fifteen of the most stimulating speakers obtainable on the many facets that comprise systematic biology. This program is designed to combat the ever-present threat of obsolescence among the practitioners of a rapidly evolving, interpretive science.

Since its inception, the Office has been concerned with the application of computers to the problems of retrieving information from growing numbers of biological collections and the burgeoning systematic literature. In identifying this need and in the resolution of it, the Office works closely with the National Museum of Natural History and its scientific staff. More recently, the Office has supported the development of facilities for the inclusion of behavior in studies of Smithsonian systematists. Planning for the future includes the addition of biostatistics, palynology, cytotaxonomy, and biochemistry to the classical methodology.

In general, the Office will provide leadership and support for broader involvement of systematics and systematists in solutions of current and future biological, ecological, and socio-economic problems.
NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY

Established in 1962 by an Act of Congress and opened to the public in 1968, the National Portrait Gallery occupies the southern portion of the Fine Arts and Portrait Galleries (the Old Patent Office Building) at Eighth and F Streets, NW, north of the Mall. The Greek Revival-style structure is one of the most monumental and distinguished in Washington, occupying a site that Pierre L'Enfant had designated as the location of a national pantheon in his original plan for the Capital of the United States.

Portraits of men and women who have made significant contributions to the history and culture of the nation are exhibited in the National Portrait Gallery, which is the only major museum in the Western Hemisphere devoted exclusively to portraiture and one of only four such galleries in the world.

Included on permanent exhibition is the Presidential Gallery, an assemblage of portraits from George Washington onward. A Presidential Alcove at the end of the stately hall in which the presidential likenesses hang is reserved for a portrait of the incumbent President, if available, or of the most recent former President.

In the galleries, the National Portrait Gallery shows a portion of its permanent collection of portraits in a survey of the character and history of the American people. These cover a broad range of personalities and portraits from the seventeenth century to the present day—from Pocahontas to Mary Baker Eddy; from Daniel Webster to Chief Joseph to General George Custer; from Billy Rose to John Calhoun to Joe Louis.

Important temporary shows augment the permanent exhibitions. They focus on aspects of American portraiture never before explored.


Portrait sculptures, miniatures, and reliefs are also exhibited or held in the large and growing study collection, a valuable adjunct to the Gallery open to study by scholars and students.

Through its substantial and expanding library of books on portraiture and American history, the Gallery has become a major study center for scholars, students, and the public seeking information on distinguished Americans and the artists who portrayed them down through the history of our country.
NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

The National Zoological Park is located in a beautiful woodland tract of 175 acres in Washington's Rock Creek Valley. About three thousand animals make up the population of the National Zoo, many of them rare creatures not shown elsewhere in the country.

Samuel Pierpont Langley, third Secretary of the Smithsonian, established the National Zoo. Having in mind the saving of the American bison from extinction at a time when this species was at low ebb, he interested Congress in providing a site where these animals, and others of equal interest, could be protected and displayed to visitors in natural surroundings. A bill was passed in 1889 providing funds for purchase of land, and the tract in Rock Creek Valley was acquired the following year. Washington's great Rock Creek Park had not been established when the Smithsonian established the Zoo in its present location. Among the animals first shown in the Zoo was a sizable herd of bison.

Under plans laid out by Frederick Law Olmsted, the renowned landscape architect, the National Zoological Park was built with an eye to future development. A collection of live animals that had been kept near the Smithsonian Building was transferred to the new buildings and enclosures, and many other animals were added by gift, exchange, and purchase. By 1926 the collection numbered 1,700 and in that year the figure was nearly doubled by the addition of animals brought back by the Smithsonian-Chrysler African Expedition headed by Dr. William M. Mann, former head of the National Zoological Park. This was the largest collection of animals ever imported for the National Zoo at one time. It included several kinds of monkeys, five leopards, thirty-five antelopes, and many other rare animals and birds.

In 1937 the National Geographic-Smithsonian Expedition brought back 879 specimens from the East Indies, and a few years later the Smithsonian-Firestone Expedition obtained many rare and interesting animals from Liberia. The collection has continued to grow through gifts and exchanges with other nations and zoos throughout the world, as well as through collecting activities.

The Zoo's present population includes Mohini Rewa, a rare white tiger; Smokey the Bear; and the only real dragon in the Western Hemisphere, a komodo lizard from Indonesia.

In 1961, the Zoo embarked on a comprehensive program of physical redevelopment. A soaring and airy free-flight cage, which allows the visitor to walk among the birds, has received acclaim for its architecture. An outdoor hoofed-stock area allows an almost unobstructed view of a variety of animals from antelopes to rhinos.

New additions, including a modern animal hospital and climate-controlled research buildings, give the Zoo staff excellent facilities for continuing research on the conservational maintenance of wild populations and in long-term captive breeding and care of animals. Special attention is paid, in both research and exhibition, to species that face possible extinction. The cages of about 30 species bear the dramatic "Vanishing Animal" symbol adopted by the Wild Animal Propagation Trust and the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums. Among them are such crowd favorites as the polar bear and the orangutan.
RADIATION BIOLOGY LABORATORY

The Radiation Biology Laboratory studies the effects of sunlight on living things. Its scientists are interested, above all, in the intricacies of plant life, and how and why plants respond to the different quantities and qualities of radiant energy.

Their research seeks to understand the processes by which sunlight, through the low-energy process called photoregulation, can alter the structure and behavior of plants. Another vitally important and basic quest is to understand how the sun’s radiant energy is converted by green plants into chemical energy in the form of carbohydrates which, with proteins, are the basic food of all creatures on earth.

In the Laboratory greenhouses, researchers record the influence of humidity, of light intensity, and of atmospheric content on growth and development cycles of plants.

Changes in quantities and qualities of light, for example, produce interesting photoregulatory effects in plants. Laboratory experimenters have postponed the flowering of “short day” plants and thus manipulated the most rudimentary habits of nature.

In its efforts to understand photosynthesis, the process by which light stimulates plants to take up carbon dioxide from the air and transform it into sugar, the Laboratory has shown that various portions of the spectrum can be more effective than others in promoting the process—red light, for example, makes wheat plants assimilate the greatest quantities of carbon dioxide.

The Laboratory has been credited with major contributions in photobiology—which includes such diverse responses as photosynthesis, photocontrol of seed germination, the induction and reversal of photomorphogenesis, and phototropism. Another achievement has been the purification and characterization of the plant pigment photochrome, a photoreceptor that absorbs light energy and uses it to regulate growth and development in plants.

Recently developed in the Laboratory is a sophisticated instrumentation system for acquiring a continuous series of solar energy measurements. For the past several years the Laboratory, continuing its pioneering tradition, has been collecting physical measurement data in a long-term program to correlate daily and seasonal variations in spectral quality of natural daylight with biological responses of growth and development. During the course of recording these measurements, it has been observed that solar energy incident to the earth’s surface has decreased some sixteen percent since measurements were taken.
about sixty years ago by Dr. Charles G. Abbot, the fifth Secretary of the Smithsonian.

A carbon-14 dating section is maintained by the Laboratory as a service facility and also for original research. Ages of samples of archeological and biological materials are determined for Smithsonian scientists and for other agencies. An improved system has been developed for quantitatively removing radioactive radon from samples, now making it possible to count samples immediately without the thirty- to forty-day delay previously necessary.

Studies are also in progress to determine the influence of ionizing radiation on processes of cell division and growth and development in plants. Modifying effects of non-ionizing radiation (light) on the influence of ionizing radiation (gamma or X-rays) on biological responses are also being studied.

Research facilities of the Radiation Biology Laboratory include chemical laboratories, constant environmental condition rooms, a radioisotope laboratory, environmental greenhouses, solar energy measurement facilities, the carbon-14 dating laboratory, and instrument shops.

The Laboratory dates back to 1929 when Secretary Abbot founded a Division of Radiation and Organisms within the Smithsonian Astrophysical Laboratory. It became an independent bureau of the Institution in 1965.

Housed in the basement of the old Smithsonian Institution Building for many years, the Laboratory is moving into a new building in the Rockville, Maryland, area in 1970.
SCIENCE INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The Science Information Exchange provides for the national research community a comprehensive, computerized source of pre-publication information about research programs that are planned or actually in progress in the biomedical, social, behavioral, physical, and engineering sciences.

The Exchange, located at 1730 M Street, NW, in downtown Washington, was founded in 1948 by a number of federal agencies for the purpose of coordination and communication in research programming.

The number of participating agencies has grown steadily through the years. Most federal research programs as well as those of a substantial number of private foundations, professional organizations, industries, and local governments are now included. Both federal and nonfederal users pay a nominal fee for services.

More than 100,000 notices of research projects are received and processed annually. These records in most cases are prepared by principal investigators and updated each year. Registration of foreign research is limited but growing.

Each record fed into the Exchange's computer data bank contains a brief technical summary of the program in question together with other essential information—who the principal investigators are, where the work is taking place, pertinent dates, and sources of support.

The subjects of research recorded in this continually updated system cover basic and applied work across a full spectrum of subject areas including matters of broad, general interest such as nuclear fuel technology, oceanography, public health, highway technology, linguistics, crime and delinquency, agriculture, and wildlife conservation.

Scientists make thousands of requests each year for information about who is currently working on specified problems or projects in these fields. Often they want to know about others working in their specialties in order to avoid overlapping research.

Such requests, for example, might call for all current research on hemopoiesis in the fetal egg yolk sac; electron microscopy of damaged muscle and cerebral edema tissue; and sterility agents and sex attraction in insects.

Another type of request handled by the Exchange comes from administrators or managers who want compilations, collations, or tabulations of data that show how a research program is distributed over a broad subject field, over geographical areas, or among different types of research organizations.
For instance, an administrator might want to know how many dollars went for cancer research in Pennsylvania in 1966, 1967, and 1968. One recent request asked for a list of all research overseas in a number of areas, sorted by country, by university or research institute, and by supporting agency.

Quite often there are requests for the tabulation of all work in a broad subject field, such as pesticides or rehabilitation cardiology sorted into meaningful sub-specialties or categories as specified by the requester. Generally they are used for program analysis in order to gain some insight as to whether special areas are being over-emphasized or perhaps neglected.

These requests might be further complicated by the specific needs or viewpoints of the individual administrator. For example, one may want all studies on pesticides, sorted out according to the chemical nature of the pesticide. Another may want to look at these programs from the viewpoint of the toxicological and physiological effects.

Overall, such information helps research directors, administrators, and research scientists to reach informed decisions in establishment and conduct of research programs and in allocation of available resources.
SMITHSONIAN ASTROPHYSICAL OBSERVATORY

The Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory pursues a broad program of research in astrophysics and related space sciences. The Observatory is located in Cambridge, Massachusetts, where it works in close association with the Harvard College Observatory, and maintains scientific facilities elsewhere in the United States and overseas.

More than sixty Observatory scientists are concerned with investigations in nine general areas.

Research in planetary studies includes geodesy and geophysics, the physics of the upper atmosphere, celestial mechanics, planetary environments, and exobiology. One program involves laboratory efforts to simulate planetary environments, particularly that of the early Earth. The work in celestial mechanics has pioneered in the development of high-speed computer programs for the calculation of the orbits of bodies in the solar system. A worldwide network of Baker-Nunn camera stations, which plays a role in a number of Observatory programs, provides data for measuring the Earth’s shape, size, and gravitational potential and for determining the density, temperature, and structure of the upper atmosphere.

Comets and meteors are also studied through the Baker-Nunn network. Concerning these it provides data for the photometric study of the structure of comet heads, for the confirmation of cometary orbits, and for the analysis of the motion and development of comet tails. In addition, a laboratory project simulates cometary models. The Observatory maintains a network of sixteen automatic cameras in the Midwestern United States for photographing bright meteors, determining their orbits, and facilitating recovery of fallen meteorites. A radar network, also in the Midwest, measures the speed, trajectory, and distribution of micrometeoroids and also the velocity and direction of winds in the upper atmosphere.

The Observatory is an important center for the analysis of meteoritic matter. Several research groups are studying the composition, distribution, and history of meteoritical material in space, in orbit around the Earth, and in the Earth’s atmosphere. The Observatory also maintains laboratories for the radioisotopic analysis of meteorites, cosmic dust, and recovered satellite material, as well as facilities for the study of the metallurgy, mineralogy, and petrology of meteorites.

Among these investigations are studies in high-energy physics and the development of gamma-ray detection and measurement instruments for balloon and satellite flights. The Observatory is expanding its ground-based gamma-ray
research with the construction of a 34-foot light collector designed to register the Cherenkov radiation generated by the particle shower resulting when primary gamma rays strike the upper atmosphere.

Current flight experiments emphasize satellite instrumentation to observe ultraviolet radiation from stars, galaxies, and other celestial sources. Development of this satellite package, called Project Celescope, is part of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration’s Orbiting Astronomical Observatory program. It should yield new information unobtainable from ground-based observatories. Smithsonian scientists have also taken part in the analysis of data from NASA’s Orbiting Solar Observatory program.

Theoretical astronomy and astrophysics investigations comprise studies of the history and evolution of the solar system, stellar atmospheres, atmospheric physics, and other subjects. Observatory scientists pioneered in the application of high-speed digital computers to the analysis of the physical processes that create the spectra of stars. By comparing predicted stellar spectra with actual observations, they have already developed important new theories concerning the structure, composition, and evolution of stars.

The radio astronomy program at the Observatory includes, in addition to the radar network, the joint use with Harvard College Observatory of an 84-foot radio telescope for the investigation of atomic and molecular constituents of the interstellar medium.

In the optical astronomy program are such diverse activities as the tracking of artificial satellites, the study of comets, and the observation of flare stars and stellar spectra. The Baker-Nunn camera is one primary observing instrument. The Observatory is constructing on Mt. Hopkins, Arizona, a multi-purpose observatory that will add to the program several conventional telescopes, including a 60-inch one chiefly for stellar observations.

Historical astronomy and astroarcheology are studied by Observatory scientists who have used computers to check astronomical theories of the past and to develop new theories about the possible astronomical uses of megalithic structures and monuments. For example, one scientist has found that the alignment of stones and stone holes at Stonehenge in England with important positions of the sun and the moon indicates the mysterious monument may have been used as a calendar and a computer for predicting celestial events such as eclipses.

Established in 1890, the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory was reorganized in 1955 and moved to Cambridge. Two years later, as its part of the International Geophysical Year (1957-58), the Observatory assumed responsibility for optical tracking of artificial satellites, launched during that period. The Baker-Nunn camera network was designed and constructed for that purpose, with stations in Spain, South Africa, India, Argentina, Peru, Curaçao, Florida, New Mexico, Hawaii, Iran, Japan, and Australia. In more recent years, NASA has provided funds for network tracking operations in support of the national space program.
The Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in Panama is a research organization devoted to the study and support of tropical biology, education, and conservation. Its research focuses broadly on the evolution of patterns of behavior and ecological adaptations. The tropics offer the richest natural laboratory for these purposes. Panama further offers unique zoogeographic characteristics—it is a land bridge to terrestrial life forms of two continents and a water barrier to marine life of two oceans.

Within a range of a few hours, field studies in Panama can be conducted on an extraordinary array of habitats—rain forest, montane cloud forest, savannah, mixed grassland and second growth, Pacific Ocean, Atlantic Ocean, Gatun Lake, a multitude of living coral reefs, sandy bottoms, rocky shores along both oceans, great untouched stands of mangrove swamp, estuaries, and the offshore islands of San Blas and Las Perlas.

The Institute operates Barro Colorado Island, which was set aside for science in 1923 as a 55-square-mile tropical forest research preserve in Gatun Lake, which is the great freshwater lake formed when the Panama Canal was built. Having a very rich fauna of at least 465 species of land vertebrates, the island provides an undisturbed laboratory for use by scientists and students. The Institute also operates a mainland laboratory in Ancon which includes one of the world’s finest tropical biology libraries.

The latest additions to the Institute’s research complex are two marine biology laboratories on the Caribbean and Pacific sides of the isthmus, at Galeta Island and Fort Amador, respectively. These offer unique opportunities for simultaneous research in two oceans separated by five million years of substantially independent evolution but fifty miles of land. The Institute’s staff, fellows and interns conduct research in these areas as well as in other parts of Central and South America, the Pacific, Asia and Africa where comparative studies are clarifying the distinctive biological role of the tropics.

The Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute provides a base of operations and an intellectual center for exploring the frontiers of biology across the varied land and sea scapes of the tropical world.
“An institution of learning that the 22nd century will regard as having influenced the 21st,” as President Nixon expressed it, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars is being developed as the official national memorial to the twenty-eighth President of the United States.

Congress established the Woodrow Wilson Center in 1968 as a resource for leading scholars from around the world.

President Johnson called for establishment of the Center in a speech at the James Smithson Bicentennial Convocation in 1965, when he said that “The Institution financed by Smithson breathed life into the idea that the growth and the spread of learning must be the first work of a nation that seeks to be free. We support Secretary Ripley’s dream of creating a center here at the Smithsonian where great scholars from every nation will come and collaborate.”

The concept of the Woodrow Wilson Center was embodied in a report by the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission published in 1966. Faced with the challenge of proposing a suitable memorial to a President who was also a scholar, a university president, and a leading advocate of international understanding, the Commission sought to express in a living institution the ideals and concerns of President Wilson. Their proposal for an advanced study center was expanded by the President’s Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue, which President Johnson had asked to develop the Center proposal in greater detail.

After reviewing numerous proposals, the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission concluded that “an international center for scholars in the Nation’s Capital would be both useful in itself and appropriate as a memorial to President Wilson.” They proposed that it should be a component of the Smithsonian with its history of advanced scholarship and international programs.

Joseph Henry, first Secretary of the Smithsonian, fashioned the Institution as an advanced study center at a time when there were few graduate schools. At his request, the first Board of Regents established as basic policy that “the increase of knowledge by original research shall form an essential function” of the Smithsonian.

In Henry’s day, and for years thereafter, visiting scholars were frequently given living accommodations in the Smithsonian building. Interestingly, temporary headquarters for the Woodrow Wilson Center were established in these very rooms at the start of 1969.
The Center’s independent Board of Trustees, a distinguished fifteen-man group of top government officials and private citizens appointed by Presidents Johnson and Nixon, thus began the process of bringing into being a center that Congress visualized in its enactment as “symbolizing and strengthening the fruitful relation between the world of learning and the world of public affairs.” Former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey was named chairman of the first Board of Trustees. An acting director was also named to head a small initial staff.

The board includes the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare; the chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities; the Secretary of the Smithsonian; the Librarian of Congress; the Archivist of the United States; one official appointed by the President from within the Federal Government; and eight appointed by the President from private life. The board has invited the advice of several hundred persons in the United States and abroad in setting up the Center, and is making an inventory of the programs of other advanced studies centers to avoid duplication and utilize relevant experience elsewhere.

A site north of Washington’s Mall has been proposed for the center, with temporary quarters remaining in the Smithsonian Institution Building until a permanent headquarters is established. Congress granted the Center’s board wide powers to appoint scholars from all over the world and, where appropriate, provide stipends for them; to solicit and to accept gifts of funds and property; and to seek government funding. A grant of $45,000 from the Ford Foundation helped to meet the Center’s initial expenses.
OTHER PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

ART

COOPER-HEWITT MUSEUM OF DECORATIVE ARTS AND DESIGN

This famous New York City decorative arts collection and library, previously known as the Cooper Union Museum for the Arts of Decoration, was faced with discontinuance in the early 1960s because of lack of space and financial problems. It was saved by a major fund-raising drive by supporters of the museum, coupled with transfer from the Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art, a tuition-free educational institution, to the Smithsonian.

The transfer agreement, made final in 1968, provides for the permanent retention of the Museum in the City of New York. The Smithsonian will, before mid-1971, move the collection to its new home in the historic Carnegie Mansion at Fifth Avenue and Ninety-First Street. The mansion has been provided rent-free by the Carnegie Corporation with an option to buy in 1981. The 64-room mansion was built in 1901 at a cost of a million and a half dollars.

Of a scope and quality unequalled in this country, the Cooper-Hewitt collection consists of more than 85,000 decorative arts items. The Museum, opened in 1897, is not only a major assemblage of these materials but also a research laboratory serving professionals and students of design.

Major elements of the collection are textiles, drawings, prints, wallpaper, metalwork, woodwork and furniture, ceramics, and glass. There are small collections of costume accessories. The library contains some 13,000 volumes, of which nearly 2,000 are rare books.

Of the woven fabrics, the Spanish and early medieval weaves are the most extensive anywhere, while the lace collection surpasses that of any other museum in the country. The drawing collection totals more than 30,000 items and
includes old-master drawings, more than 300 works by Winslow Homer, and nearly all the sketches of the Hudson River School artist, Frederic Church. Major collections of Rembrandt and Durer prints are supported by a large holding of architectural and ornamental prints numbering more than 10,000 works.

The Cooper-Hewitt is the only American museum that supports a special department of wallpaper. Its holdings are rivaled only by the Deutsches Tapeten-Museum in Cassel, Germany. Supplementing this collection is one of more than one hundred hatboxes, an important facet of Americana. The Museum's small but select holdings of silver, pewter, brass, and tole supplement outstanding collections of gilt-bronze ormolu, large ironwork pieces, and Japanese sword fittings.

Examples of French 18th-century room paneling in the Museum's collection are unmatched elsewhere in this country. The furniture collection contains interesting examples of European and American pieces. While the ceramics and glass collections are small, they are of first quality. The Meissen porcelain figures and tiles rank among the finest of collections. The small collections of costume accessories, including fans and jewelry, leather and lacquer work, enamels and other minor arts, help to convey an understanding of material, technique, and ideas concerning their creation.

A major private fund-raising drive is now being undertaken by the Museum and its friends to help meet the expenses of future development of this important public collection.

HILLWOOD

Hillwood is a strikingly beautiful 25-acre estate in northwest Washington. There Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post has brought together very major collections of Imperial Russian and French art works. Mrs. Post, in early 1969, deeded Hillwood to the Smithsonian Institution subject to a life estate.

Under the terms of the title transfer, Hillwood will become a public art museum. Mrs. Post's gift also included a monetary bequest to provide for all expenses of the museum and gardens.

A red brick Georgian structure, Hillwood is surrounded by carefully kept formal and informal gardens. It houses the finest collection of Imperial Russian art of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries anywhere outside the Soviet Union, as well as a collection of superb 18th-century French furniture and works of art.

Among the treasures of Hillwood are dozens of creations by Fabergé, jeweler to the Czars; Sèvres porcelain; Beauvais tapestries; portraits of French nobility; Imperial Russian portraits; and 18th-century French furniture.
A full room is dedicated to Russian porcelain. Another, the Icon Room, which contains the major portion of the Russian works, houses a unique collection of chalices made in Moscow and ranging in date from the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries. One of the most recent items to enter the collection, the nuptial crown made for the marriage of Marie Alexandrovna to the Grand Duke Alexander Alexandrovitch, later Czar Alexander III, is also on display in this room. It is the only Imperial Russian crown outside the Soviet Union.

As a charming addition to the estate, a colorfully painted Russian dacha was constructed on the property by Mrs. Post to house the Russian collection of Mrs. Augusto Russo, of Washington, widow of the former Italian ambassador to Moscow. The collection has been given for permanent display at Hillwood. It includes paintings, furniture, and objects of art.

Items from the Hillwood collection are made available for special exhibitions, and Hillwood itself is frequently opened to students and scholars.

RENWICK GALLERY

Located at Pennsylvania Avenue and Seventeenth Street NW, the Renwick Gallery is expected to open in 1970, after extensive structural renovation. The building, constructed before and after the American Civil War, was made available to the Smithsonian in 1966. Designed as the original Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington's first public art gallery, the ornate structure for most of its history housed the United States Court of Claims. The Gallery will exhibit American design and decorative arts. It will serve as an exhibition showcase for distinguished international guests next door at Blair House, and will be available for certain Presidential ceremonial activities. The major renovation has faithfully restored the intricate detail of the building, while returning it to the purpose for which it was designed.
HISTORY

JOSEPH HENRY PAPERS

The Smithsonian is undertaking publication of the papers of Joseph Henry (1799-1878), a pioneer of physics in America and the first Secretary of the Institution. A select but extensive series of perhaps twenty volumes as well as a microfilm edition of all the known Henry manuscripts is projected. Research on the Henry papers, formerly widely scattered, will consider the history of physics, the history of higher education, development of Federal policy in regard to science, the origins of ethnology in America, American attitudes toward learning, and concepts of the relationship of theory and practice. All are topics relevant to a study of Henry's far-ranging career.

OFFICE OF AMERICAN STUDIES

The Office of American Studies was established in 1965 to develop and maintain a bond of common goals and purpose between the various Smithsonian activities related to American studies and the academic community under the Assistant Secretary for History and Art. The Office fulfills its responsibility for advancing and diffusing knowledge of American history and culture in a variety of ways: by the encouragement of research and publication in neglected areas of American history by scholars both inside and outside the Smithsonian; by a program of graduate education emphasizing the material culture of the United States, given in cooperation with affiliated universities and the Smithsonian's Office of Academic Programs; and by conferences of invited scholars convened for the purpose of dealing with problems in the field of American studies.

The Office is charged with the responsibility for making use of all the Institution's resources in the field of American history, culture, technology, and art in its programs, in close cooperation with Bureaus and Offices in the respective subject areas.
SMITHSONIAN ARCHIVES

The official correspondence of Smithsonian Secretaries, including many letters to and from the world's leading scientists, constitutes a primary source for the history of science in this country and Europe since the middle of the nineteenth century. Private correspondence of several of the Smithsonian's early Secretaries, as well as notes, field books, and correspondence of many of the eminent scientists who have worked for the Smithsonian, supplement this unique source material held by the Archives. Material of particular interest includes papers concerning numerous surveys of the American West, records of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, manuscripts and records of Samuel P. Langley's early experiments in flight, and a collection of papers and correspondence between the Smithsonian and Robert H. Goddard concerning support of his early work on rockets. The bulk of the Smithsonian archival material concerns itself with science. Also covered, however, is the whole range of Smithsonian interests in history, art, and the humanities.
OFFICE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The Office of Academic Programs helps to place the Smithsonian's vast resources at the disposal of schools and scholars from the pre-kindergarten to post-doctoral levels. The Office conducts a broad range of programs for this purpose.

Visiting research appointments, some of which include stipends, are awarded through competitive selection on the undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral levels. These visiting researchers—and other students and scholars who come to the Institution under cooperative agreements with universities, on foundation grants or on their own—work in their fields of interest in close association with Smithsonian professional staff members. An individual preparing a thesis in an area of the material culture of the United States, for example, might be given access to the study collections and be assigned desk space and a curatorial adviser from the staff of the National Museum of History and Technology.

The Smithsonian's resources for scholars are outlined in *Smithsonian Research Opportunities*, published by the Office of Academic Programs. The book details the visiting research appointments available, the subject areas covered at the Smithsonian, and the backgrounds and academic specialties of the professional staff.

Cooperative agreements with universities make the resources of the Institution available to even more students. With some schools the Smithsonian has set up actual degree-conferring programs, such as a doctorate in American material culture offered jointly by the Institution with the George Washington University. In other instances staff members may spend a semester on the faculty of a university.

Symposia and seminars bring together not only the Smithsonian's own scholars and visiting students, but also distinguished minds from every area of intellectual accomplishment. A Division of Seminars organizes an annual international symposium of the world's top scholars in a given field to discuss a subject of urgent interest. Two recent topics have been "The Quality of Man's
Environment” and “Man and Beast: Comparative Social Behavior.” The division also organizes inter-disciplinary seminars on a smaller scale within the broad spectrum of Smithsonian interests.

Elementary and secondary school teachers find the Smithsonian an invaluable resource for bringing their subjects to life. The Office of Academic Programs Division of Elementary and Secondary Education makes it easier for teachers to use this resource effectively. The division provides educational tours of specific halls for thousands of school children each year. In addition there are broadly-structured tours on subjects that might be treated in part in several halls, such as the Industrial Revolution.

The division offers a considerable number of services to schools and teachers. A junior natural science library provides the opportunity for students at the intermediate level to perform simple research on several projects. Outstanding high school science students in the area are invited each year to spend part of the Christmas holiday at the Smithsonian listening to and questioning notable scholars or teachers. Special teaching materials of various sorts are offered.

The Academic Calendar, another service of the office, provides a general liaison among the local academic community. The twice-monthly bulletin lists lectures, meetings, exhibits, and other events of interest to scholars taking place throughout the Washington area. And, through workshops, experimentation, and continual evaluation, the Office of Academic Programs seeks an understanding of the educational process and how it can be applied most effectively to museums.
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF MUSEUMS

CONSERVATION ANALYTICAL LABORATORY

The Conservation Analytical Laboratory serves the various Smithsonian Museums. It provides continuing technical advice on the environment of museum objects during storage, transport and exhibition, and on processes safe for application to specific objects.

Analytical facilities adapted for application to museum problems include chemical microscopy, optical emission spectrography, X-ray fluorescence analysis, X-ray diffraction analysis, infra-red spectrophotometry, and the preparation and examination of cross-sections. Laboratory technicians are also experienced in neutron-activation methods.

NATIONAL MUSEUM ACT

Under the National Museum Act, passed by Congress in late 1966, the Smithsonian acts as a clearinghouse for advice and assistance to other museums throughout the nation and the world. The Institution, through the Office of the Director General of Museums, fills about 5,000 widely varying requests a year, from information on the role of museums in the life of a city to help in dating a burial.

Museums large and small are aided in training personnel, setting up exhibits, and finding sources of funds. The emphasis of the Act is on advisory programs, and on cooperative efforts with such groups as the American Association of Museums and the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities.
OFFICE OF EXHIBITS

In consultation with museum scientists and historians, a skilled staff of 165 in the Office of Exhibits designs, prepares, and installs exhibitions in Smithsonian museums, and occasionally for the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service.

New techniques such as freeze-drying of animal and plant specimens and new methods of presentation are developed. Many staff innovations have been widely copied around the world. By counseling visiting experts and by sending its experts elsewhere in the world, the Office has had a significant effect on museum installations in many countries.

Continuing staff research focuses on basic factors in the viewer's involvement with museum objects and his perception of exhibits. There is considerable emphasis on the use of audio-visual devices, touch, and appropriate odors to enhance the visitor's participation and to contribute to his learning experience.

OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR

The Office of the Registrar records accessions and preserves the original documents for all objects and specimens in the National Museum of Natural History, National Museum of Man, and National Museum of History and Technology collections. It routinely handles such cargo as 16,000 pounds of whale bones and skulls from California, an insect collection from Peru, or a 40-ton iron sculpture from Paris; and annually it receives, sorts, and delivers more than 1,500,000 pieces of mail, including many thousands of requests from the general public for information.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION TRAVELING EXHIBITION SERVICE

Exhibitions for art and science museums, community colleges, and other educational institutions are organized and circulated around the United States and Canada by the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service.
Receiving no federal funding, this unit obtains its main source of income from rental fees charged to exhibitors on the basis of actual costs incurred in producing the shows. Help in organizing exhibitions comes from members of the various Smithsonian staffs, the Library of Congress, National Geographic Society, galleries, private lenders, and foreign governments either at home or through their embassies in Washington. Originally focusing on paintings, sculpture and graphics, the Service has expanded its exhibition range to include designs and crafts, architecture, history, natural history and science, photography, technology, and reproductions. More than one hundred twenty-five exhibitions are on continuous tour, with fifty or sixty openings of these shows occurring monthly across the country.
PUBLIC SERVICE

ANACOSTIA NEIGHBORHOOD MUSEUM

An innovative experiment in public education in one of the poorer neighborhoods of Washington, this capsule museum in a converted movie theater is operated in close cooperation between the Smithsonian and the local community. Permanent exhibits include a reproduction of an 1890 Anacostia store and a small zoo. Among the museum’s most successful projects has been an exhibit on African culture, featuring art, foods, and fashion. Special exhibits on topics of interest to the community are organized periodically. An exhibition entitled “This Thing Called Jazz,” organized by the museum and featuring live demonstrations, recordings, artifacts, and an environmental room that put the viewer in the middle of a simulated New Orleans jazz parade, was widely acclaimed. A Negro History Week exhibition focused on one of Anacostia’s best known residents, Frederick Douglass, a former slave who became a noted journalist, orator, and abolitionist. Included in the exhibit was the world premiere performance of “The Ballad of the Black Dragon,” a play on the life of Douglass. By taking its exhibit ideas from an advisory committee of neighborhood residents, the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum has linked its activities directly to the needs of the community and has assured a fresh, nontraditional approach to the role of the museum generally.

BELMONT CONFERENCE CENTER

An 18th-century estate at Elkridge, Maryland, thirty-five miles north of Washington, Belmont serves as the Smithsonian’s conference center. It was opened in 1967. Meetings there focus on the Institution’s fields of special interest—science, history, art, and education. Conferences of educators and others devoted to the increase and diffusion of knowledge in any field are welcomed. Belmont is a non-profit component operating under the aegis of the Smithsonian as a private educational agency.
DIVISION OF PERFORMING ARTS

By staging such events as the annual Festival of American Folklife, which in 1969 drew more than 600,000 persons to the Mall over a six-day period, this division undertakes to extend and further enliven the Smithsonian's service to the public.

At the Festival, more than two hundred weavers, tub makers, brick makers, egg decorators, distillers, cooks, log rollers, and traditional dancers and musicians from many regions of the United States demonstrated the survival of American folklife in performances which reminded visitors of their still-flourishing cultural heritage.

Other Division of Performing Arts activities have included concert programs, modern and folk dance programs, a Christmas Mummers Play, the Japanese Kyogen Theater, and a wide variety of outdoor activities on the Mall, including a summer children's tent theater.

The Smithsonian Puppet Theater, which had performed during the summer months on the Mall, was so popular it began year-round performances indoors in the National Museum of History and Technology. The Division produced three performing programs as part of the official United States participation in the Cultural Festival of the Olympics in Mexico and provided production support for the first American College Theater Festival in 1969.

The Division offers a variety of touring performances such as lectures, theater, and musical concerts, which are available to other museums, universities, and cultural centers throughout the United States.

NATIONAL READING IS FUN-DAMENTAL PROGRAM

An outgrowth of a District of Columbia experiment to motivate children to read by providing them with free books of their own choice, the Reading-Is-Fun-damental Program helps underprivileged communities across the country set up and maintain their own local projects modeled on the pilot project. The Program was established within the Smithsonian under a Ford Foundation grant.

The Program operates as an independent unit in association with the Smithsonian. One Smithsonian facility, the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, has been actively involved in the District of Columbia portion of the project. The museum has been a distribution point for books selected to relate to its exhibits.
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

This Office has as its primary role initiation and coordination of international programs and activities.

As administrator of the Foreign Currency Program, the Office awards research grants for programs abroad by American researchers and institutions of higher learning. This program provides major support for the Smithsonian's own scientific work overseas. Funds come from the appropriation of the nation's excess currencies abroad arising from the sale of agricultural commodities under Public Law 480. Programs have operated in Burma, Ceylon, Egypt, Guinea, India, Israel, Morocco, Pakistan, Poland, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia. Anthropology, archeology, systematic and environmental biology, astrophysics, ecological studies, radiation biology, history, art, and museology are among the disciplines that have been supported.

The Office also coordinates travel and research plans of the many foreign scholars visiting the Smithsonian.

It coordinates certain cooperative programs as well, one of which involved negotiations between the Department of Defense, the National Academy of Sciences, and the British Royal Society in establishing the Indian Ocean island of Aldabra as an international conservation area. Another negotiation, between the United Fruit Company and the Organization for Tropical Studies, a consortium of twenty-two universities and the Smithsonian, resulted in the establishment of formal courses in tropical biology at the Botanical Gardens of Lancetilla, Honduras.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

This Office is charged with serving visitors to the Smithsonian and the public at large through a range of activities in the fields of information and public education—radio, television, documentary films, news releases, guide pamphlets, tours, public functions and ceremonies, automatic telephone information services, publications, photography, a public inquiry desk, and other programs.

The Smithsonian Film Theatre presents a weekly program of documentary motion pictures and arranges special showings of movies for interested groups. Still photographs, slides, and films are available to educational organizations and others on request. Institution documentary film production is centered in the Smithsonian Institution Motion Picture Unit, a component of the Office. "Festival in Washington," a documentary produced by this group, has been an award winner and an entrant in a number of foreign film festivals.
The Torch newspaper and the Smithsonian Calendar of Events are widely circulated monthly publications. News releases in all areas of Smithsonian activity are distributed regularly. Current information on daily events and exhibits is provided on the recorded telephone service Dial-a-Museum. From information furnished by the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, Dial-a-Satellite service provides information enabling callers to locate and observe artificial satellites as well as to identify celestial bodies.

"Radio Smithsonian," the Office's radio component, develops educational and public service program materials. A weekly half-hour broadcast is heard on Station WGMS in Washington.

SMITHSONIAN ASSOCIATES

By transforming spectators into participants, the Smithsonian Associates has reached the public in a new and personal way. More than 15,000 members participate in a program of great breadth—lectures, demonstrations, choral, folk and chamber concerts, exhibition previews, films, theater, field trips, tours, presentations and other activities. The Kite Carnival on the Mall has become an annual favorite, as have Zoo Night and the Potomac Cruise. "Creative Person," "New Film and Producer," and "Young Composers" series have been initiated. For young people, puppet shows, concerts, talks, and a sketch-in at the Zoo were organized in conjunction with other components of the Institution. Several thousand young people and adults have taken seminars and workshops in which subjects ranged from antiques to zoology. The curriculum includes workshops in painting, photography, and puppet- and film-making. Workshops on ancient crafts revived have taught stained glass, bookbinding, raku (a kind of rough Japanese earthenware), mosaic, and batik (cloth-dyeing) techniques. A Japanese Drama Festival, presented by twelve Japanese accorded recognition as "national treasures" by their government, was staged. Walking tours in Washington and trips out of town to major museums, historic houses, and private collections have been organized. Camping trips and field trips in search of fossils, industrial archeological sites, rocks, and mushrooms have been undertaken in a flexible program that both responds to the members' interests and encourages the broadest participation in the diverse activities of the Institution. For its membership, the Associates publishes Smithsonian, a monthly magazine of the arts, sciences and history.
Smithsonian library holdings are divided between the 750,000 volumes in the working collections of the Institution and the Smithsonian deposit of more than 500,000 items housed in the Library of Congress. Scientific publications, reports, proceedings, and transactions of the learned societies and institutions of the world constitute the bulk of the collection.

The library system consists of a central library in the Natural History Building, several branches, and a number of departmental collections. Many of the specialized holdings are without parallel in the world. Facilities of the entire library system are made readily available to all qualified scholars. Research in reference accessibility is being pursued by the Libraries.

For almost a century and a quarter, the Smithsonian has achieved its “diffusion of knowledge” aim principally through its voluminous publications, issued by or in collaboration with the Smithsonian Institution Press. In these volumes are represented most of the branches of science—anthropology, ethnology and archeology, botany, zoology, mechanics and aeronautics, physics, chemistry, geology, astronomy and astrophysics, meteorology—as well as art history, the history of science and technology, and the history of American institutions.

In all, many millions of publications have been distributed to institutions and private individuals. The Institution’s publications are widely known abroad and have given great impetus to scholarly pursuits.

In his design for the Institution, Joseph Henry, the first Secretary, elaborated schemes both for scholarly and popular publications. In the former, he put the emphasis squarely on basic research. This has been adhered to in the serial reports which commenced in 1848 with the *Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge*. Eight series are currently active: *Smithsonian Annals of Flight, Smithsonian Contributions to Anthropology, Smithsonian Contributions to Astrophysics, Smithsonian Contributions to Botany, Smithsonian Contributions to the Earth Sciences, Smithsonian Contributions to Paleobiology, Smithsonian Contributions to Zoology, and Smithsonian Studies in History and Technology*.

In these series, the Institution publishes original articles and monographs reporting newly acquired facts, interpretations of data, or original theory in the specialized fields of research and collections of its museums and laboratories, and of professional colleagues at other institutions of learning. By this
means, the Press, a member of the Association of American University Presses, discharges its obligation to scholarship.

Unlike its fellow academic publishers, the Press responds to the needs of the general public by publishing museum guides, pamphlets, exhibit catalogs, and information leaflets. It is also collaborates with commercial publishers.

Secretary Henry's plan called also for the publication of "separate treatises on subjects of general interest." In 1966, the Press began a program of trade book publishing in art, history, and science.

Operations are financed from the Institution's private income and from funds appropriated by Congress. Publications funded by the federal government are distributed by the Press to selected scholars and libraries throughout the world. Many are available from the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, as well as from the Press. Popular guides and booklets are sold directly by the Press, and privately funded books are sold in the United States and Canada by Random House.

The current output of the Press exceeds one hundred titles annually.

SMITHSONIAN MUSEUM SHOPS

The Smithsonian Museum Shops offer for sale to visitors a wide range of educationally and culturally oriented objects as an extension of Smithsonian educational-cultural activities. They feature examples, for sale to visitors, of arts, crafts, and science objects displayed in Smithsonian collections. The range is from mineral specimens to model airplanes, from weavings to toys, from sculpture to sea shells. The vanishing hand-skills of American and other craftsmen of the world receive vital support through the sales.

There are nine shops in five museum buildings, five of which devote themselves exclusively to the sale of publications, cards, and slides. A continuing program of sales exhibitions is pursued. In the past two years, more than twenty-four special exhibitions have been given, including "Tribal Arts of Africa," "American Movie Posters of the '40s," "Eskimo Sculpture and Prints," "First Annual Aerospace Modeling Exhibition," "Arts and Crafts of Mexico," "Folk Arts from the Netherlands," and "American Printmakers."

The long-range goal of the Museum Shops is a definitive survey of American contemporary craft products manufactured by machine and hand, with emphasis on ceramics, glass, textiles and graphics.
SCIENCE

CENTER FOR SHORT-LIVED PHENOMENA

Founded in early 1968, the Center for Short-Lived Phenomena provides the international scientific community with a reporting and information service on such phenomena as volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, animal migrations, tidal waves, the fall of meteorites, or apparent biological or ecological changes anywhere in the world.

The Center makes it possible for expeditions to mobilize and travel to areas where momentous but short-lived environmental changes are occurring. Fundamental data can thus be obtained in a timely manner.

Event reports are received by mail, cable and telephone from a network of more than four hundred correspondents located in seventy-one countries. Sources include news media, private citizens, individual scientists and scientific organizations. Similarly, reports then go to scientists concerned within the Smithsonian, elsewhere in the United States, and overseas.

Scientists and scientific organizations in the network may also be asked to obtain additional information about events that occur in their areas, and provide assistance to research teams that might go to investigate.

The Center’s Administrative Office in Cambridge, Massachusetts, maintains a log of events reported to the Center, notifies correspondents of these events and of significant developments in event areas and in some cases further coordinates investigations. It issues periodic status reports on each active event and final reports when activities are concluded.

Phenomena with which the Center has been concerned in its first years of operation have covered a broad scientific spectrum: a fireball over Mexico, oil spills in the various oceans of the world, the short-lived “birth” of an island in the Pacific, a massive migration of squirrels in the Appalachians, an earthquake in the Middle East, volcanoes in the Philippines and Costa Rica, a “floating island” of earth and trees in the Caribbean, and deaths of large numbers of shearwaters along the east coast of the United States. Information on hundreds of phenomena are provided on a regular basis.
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF MAN

The Center for the Study of Man coordinates a concerted worldwide program of interdisciplinary studies in the human sciences. Its primary focus is on species-wide problems to which the human sciences can contribute valuable knowledge. Members of the Center include anthropologists and other scholars from around the globe.

Programs under development include a major encyclopedic work on North American Indians that might serve as a prototype for similar works on other peoples and cultures of the world, a research film archive, and manuscript archives.

The staff is also placing special emphasis on urgent anthropology, with initial emphasis on the identification of research problems that must be considered immediately because of pressures for rapid social, cultural, and economic change. A small grants program has been instituted and has supported a number of urgent research projects throughout the world.

Also being developed is an information exchange system to include current research and publication and data on anthropological research institutions and individuals in all parts of the world as a means of coordinating and providing impetus and direction for enhanced research on a worldwide scale.

Smithsonian-based members of the Center meet regularly as an executive committee of the whole Center and report to the body on working activities. It is expected that membership in the Center will be further broadened in terms of disciplines and international representation as the range of present and planned programs moves forward.

CHESAPEAKE BAY CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

The Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies, seven miles south of Annapolis, Maryland, is a 700-acre outdoor research laboratory. It is operated jointly with Johns Hopkins University and the University of Maryland. Smithsonian responsibility resides in the Office of Environmental Sciences.

The Center is situated on the western shore of Chesapeake Bay, a terrestrial setting ranging from marshes, abandoned pastures, and upland hardwood forests to land still in cultivation. Directly across the estuary from the Center are densely populated residential communities, a contrasting type of land use valuable for comparative study.
The Center’s diverse natural life, reflecting the varied conditions of the Central Atlantic region, makes it an excellent site for ecologically oriented research and education dealing with the changing environment of man in the eastern United States.

The primary general objective of the Center is to advance existing knowledge of the area’s biological populations, communities and ecosystems, and their environmental relationships, through:

(1) Methodically inventorying plants and animals—on land and in adjacent estuaries—to provide a scientific base for the study of all aspects of the natural environment.

(2) Conducting appropriate studies of water quality, diseases of aquatic plants, distribution of fish populations, ecology of aquatic birds like ducks, geese and swans, and underlying mechanisms of vegetation change.

(3) Using the Center as an outdoor laboratory to teach ecology on both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

(4) Sponsoring seminars, colloquia, public talks, and demonstrations in ecology for both participating students and the general public.

(5) Using the personnel, research, and facilities of the Center to assist local county and civic organizations in planning rational land use for the community.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS DIVISION

This office was established in 1966 in response to the growing awareness within the Smithsonian that it had to take advantage of computer technology or face the possibility of losing access to masses of information associated with its collections. The Division serves as an interpreter and diagnostician of information processing problems, it develops information retrieval systems for use within the Smithsonian, and to the extent that its resources permit, it provides expertise to the museum community in general.

In addition to operating a variety of automatic data-processing equipment, the Division has telecommunications access to the computer at the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Additional support is available at the Smithsonian’s Science Information Exchange in Washington, D.C., and at the Center for Computer Sciences and Technology at the National Bureau of Standards in Gaithersburg, Maryland.
The Information Systems Division is comprised of an information retrieval section, a mathematical computation section, and a management systems section.

The staff contains experts in various areas of information processing, organized to bring a broad range of capabilities to bear on specific problems. The recently developed Global Reference Index, by which geographic location data for any given area may be retrieved, is an example of such collaboration. Techniques used are not those usually associated with the natural sciences. It was the knowledge of mathematics, of algorithm structure, and of computer techniques, combined with the traditional means of identifying a point on the globe, which produced this international index.

The Division offers training programs to Federal personnel in computer programming, provides self-study material for the scientific and curatorial staffs, and has established a library of statistical programs. Museums and universities around the world have a keen interest in the technological aspects of data-processing and information-storage techniques developed at the Division. Specific technical advice has been provided to major museums in Canada, England, Mexico, and Sweden on computer techniques for museum purposes.

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES—
ECOLOGY PROGRAM

The web of interdependence connecting all living things to each other and their environment is the ecological balance of nature. In the modern world, this can be in many respects a delicate balance.

The primary responsibility of the Ecology Program is to develop meaningful opportunities for ecological studies by Smithsonian and cooperating scientists.

The foundation of such studies has existed for some time in the extensive biological collections and programs of research of the National Museum of Natural History, the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, the Radiation Biology Laboratory, the Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies, and the National Zoological Park.

In the past ecological research and theory has to a substantial extent been based on Europe and North America. However, with rapid increases in world population and technological development in recent years, there has been a growing realization of an increasingly urgent need for basic applied research on ecosystems in all parts of the world.

Accordingly, the Program has given attention to the development of research programs in Ceylon, India, Tunisia, Indonesia, and the Mekong Basin. There has also been development of opportunities in Poland, Morocco, and Brazil.
The Program constitutes a focal point for Smithsonian staff participation in the International Biological Program (IBP), a major multi-nation effort in this area.

In conjunction with the IBP, the Smithsonian is concerned with development of an international program in terrestrial conservation, one of the objectives of which is to create a world network of nature reserves. When such reserves are established, the Smithsonian will help with inventories of the biological components and general descriptions of the ecosystems preserved.

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES--
OCEANOGRAPHY AND LIMNOLOGY PROGRAM

The Oceanography and Limnology Program conducts aquatic research, operates or maintains liaison with vessels used for oceanographic research, supports scientists engaged in collecting biological and geological materials, operates sorting centers for marine biological and geological materials, and provides coordination and technical assistance for marine scientists of other Smithsonian components and other organizations.

Smithsonian scientists participate in expeditions to all oceans. The Program participates in projects such as the International Indian Ocean Expedition, the International Cooperative Investigations of the Tropical Atlantic, the Guinean Trawling Survey and the International Decade of Ocean Exploration.

The Smithsonian receives a substantial portion of the marine specimens gathered by some eighty United States vessels engaged in part- or full-time oceanographic research. Also, as repository for collections made with federal funds, the Smithsonian receives specimens from the Coast Guard, the National Science Foundation, the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, the Navy Department, the Army Coastal Engineering Research Center, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Public Health Service, the Department of State, and other agencies and universities.

The Smithsonian Oceanographic Sorting Center, located in the Washington Navy Yard with a second unit in Carthage, Tunisia, coordinates collections of marine specimens gathered by governmental and non-governmental scientists and insures that collections are processed for the benefit of science.

Center specialists sort out the specimens, identify and inventory them, label them with the proper environmental data, and store them in preservatives. They are then shipped to more than 350 scientists around the world for research in population and interrelationships of marine organisms. Geological specimens are processed in a similar manner. To date, more than twenty-five million specimens have been sorted by the Centers and nearly ten million of these have been shipped to specialists for study.
In addition to research on the biology and geology of the oceans, staff members of the Oceanography and Limnology Program and other Smithsonian scientists working in these areas are encouraged to supplement existing collections, report unusual findings such as the presence of cancer and other abnormalities, develop field guides for identification of marine specimens, test basic collecting gear for use in studying marine organisms, and improve curating, preservation, and storage techniques.
FORMER SECRETARIES

JOSEPH HENRY. 1846-1878

The first meeting of the Smithsonian's Board of Regents was held on 7 September 1846. The Board elected Joseph Henry Secretary on 3 December of that year. At that time Henry was a professor at Princeton who was known for his valuable discoveries on the electromagnet and other subjects relating to electricity. His name is perpetuated in the term "henry," the international standard unit of electrical induction. He served as Secretary from 1846 until his death in 1878. Secretary Henry was the principal organizer of the work of the Smithsonian. It was under his guidance that the Smithsonian Building was constructed between 1847 and 1855.

The work of the Smithsonian at first consisted largely of the publication of original research findings, contributions to knowledge, and their free distribution to important libraries throughout the world; the presentation of popular lectures in Washington and their publication and distribution to libraries and individuals; the stimulation of scientific work by providing apparatus and by making grants of money to worthy investigators; and cooperation with government departments in the advancement of work useful to the federal government. These were the principal methods used by Henry to carry out Smithson's purpose—the increase and diffusion of knowledge.

Certain studies were initiated at the Smithsonian that became more fruitful and resulted in important government work. Several of the present scientific activities of the government grew out of these investigations or were stimulated by them, as, for example, the Weather Bureau. Cooperation in library work had its beginnings at the Institution. Experiments in fog signaling, in acoustics, in the ventilation of public buildings, and in numerous other fields were inaugurated. With only a few exceptions, the Smithsonian during that period was the sole representative of active scientific work directly or indirectly connected with the United States government. Its influence upon the character of private scientific work, too, was very great. The Smithsonian was the first
institution in America to undertake general scientific work with a full-time staff.

SPENCER FULLERTON BAIRD, 1878-1887

In 1850, Spencer Fullerton Baird, a distinguished naturalist, was elected Assistant Secretary of the Institution. After Henry's death in 1878, Baird became Secretary and he continued in that office until his own death in 1887.

Secretary Baird was for thirty-seven years continually in the scientific service of the Smithsonian and the government. He developed the museums of the Smithsonian. An opportunity never to come again was presented by the many great expeditions sent by the government about this time into virgin areas. Railroads were being built, territories surveyed, and Arctic and Antarctic explorations undertaken. In addition, the Army had numerous outposts in the wilderness of the West. Baird seized on these opportunities to arrange for the amassing of outstanding collections. He trained young men, as enthusiastic as himself, to whom was due the continued development of the museums in the years that followed.

Secretary Baird was especially instrumental in developing the system of international exchange of publications, a service that remained under his direct charge until his death. He was the moving spirit in the establishment and organization of the United States Fish Commission, and was its Commissioner from its founding until his death. Methods that he invented for fish culture and the studies of the natural history of our waters that he inaugurated were epoch making. He originated the marine biological station at Woods Hole, Massachusetts.

SAMUEL PIERPONT LANGLEY, 1887-1906

Dr. Samuel Pierpont Langley, who succeeded Baird as Secretary, was a pioneer of the new astronomy. His most important contribution to astrophysics was the invention of the bolometer, an extraordinarily sensitive thermometer, and its application to the study of the energy of the sun and the distribution of the sun's radiation in the spectrum. Secretary Langley also made similar investigations of the radiation of the moon. He established the Astrophysical Observatory
at the Smithsonian Institution to carry on such investigations of the sun and moon.

To the public, Secretary Langley has long been best known for his studies on aviation. He performed careful investigations of the physics of mechanical flight. As early as 1896 he built steam-driven aircraft models with thirteen-foot wingspreads that made successful unmanned test flights of one half to three quarters of a mile. Although his contributions to aerodynamics were many, he was not successful in launching his full-scale aircraft intended to carry a man. The historic achievement of the first manned, heavier-than-air flight was of course recorded by his contemporaries, the Wright brothers.

Dr. Langley's interest in the preservation of rapidly disappearing forms of the larger animals of the United States led to the establishment during his administration of the National Zoological Park.

CHARLES DOOLITTLE WALCOTT, 1907-1927

The fourth Secretary, Dr. Charles Doolittle Walcott, elected in 1907, had been in the service of the United States Geological Survey for over a quarter of a century, from 1891 as its Director. His researches covered many fields but were preeminent in Cambrian and pre-Cambrian geology and paleontology. Knowledge of the earliest fossil forms of life is indelibly associated with the name of Walcott.

Dr. Walcott exercised a highly salutary and important influence on the development of forestry and reclamation. He was also the moving spirit in the establishment of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and was for many years a member of its board of trustees.

During World War I, Dr. Walcott served on numerous committees engaged in coordinating scientific activities. He took a prominent part in the organization of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, serving as chairman of its executive committee from its establishment in 1915. From 1917 to 1923 he was president of the National Academy of Sciences, and in 1923 was president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. During Secretary Walcott's administration, the National Museum of Natural History opened to the public, the National Collection of Fine Arts was made a separate branch of the Institution, and the Freer Gallery of Art was added as a bureau.
CHARLES GREELEY ABBOT, 1928-1944

Dr. Charles Greeley Abbot, who became Secretary in 1928, came to the Smithsonian in 1895 as an aide in the Astrophysical Observatory. On the death of Secretary Langley, he became Director of the Observatory. In 1918 he was designated Assistant Secretary of the Institution and served in this position until election as Secretary in 1928.

Dr. Abbot engaged principally in researches on the sun. Besides publishing several books relating to the sun and the stars he made many contributions to scientific and technical journals on solar radiation, solar power, and kindred subjects. He established and was first Director of the Division of Radiation and Organisms, which later became the Radiation Biology Laboratory, for the study of the effect of light on plant and animal life.

The National Gallery of Art was added to the bureaus of the Institution during his administration.

Dr. Abbot retired as Secretary in 1944, at the age of seventy-two, but continues his solar investigations as a research associate of the Institution.

ALEXANDER WETMORE, 1945-1952

Upon the retirement of Dr. Abbot, Dr. Alexander Wetmore, who had been Assistant Secretary since 1925, became Acting Secretary. In 1945 he was elected Secretary. Dr. Wetmore’s studies in ornithology in many parts of the world are well known. To the broader aspects of his science he contributed a Systematic Classification for the Birds of the World, monographs on the fossil birds of North America, and monographs and smaller papers on birds of various regions, particularly of Latin America.

Dr. Wetmore came to the Smithsonian as the administrative head of the National Zoological Park in 1924, serving in that capacity until the following spring. Throughout his twenty years as Assistant Secretary he directed the United States National Museum. During this time the number of specimens in the Museum’s collection increased from ten million to more than eighteen million, and the annual count of visitors rose from one million to two and a half million.

During Dr. Wetmore’s administration as Secretary of the Smithsonian, two bureaus were added to the organization—the National Air Museum and the Canal Zone Biological Area, now known as the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institution. It was also during Dr. Wetmore’s administration, in 1946, that the Smithsonian celebrated the 100th anniversary of its founding.
Following retirement as Secretary, Dr. Wetmore also continued his scientific work at the Institution as a Research Associate.

LEONARD CARMICHAEL, 1953-1964

Dr. Leonard Carmichael became the seventh Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution in 1953. Before coming to the Smithsonian, Dr. Carmichael was President of Tufts University and also director of its laboratories of sensory psychology and physiology. A prominent physiological psychologist, he had formerly been a member of the faculties of Princeton and Brown and dean at the University of Rochester.

In Dr. Carmichael’s administration two bureaus were added to the Smithsonian organization. These were the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and the National Portrait Gallery. The Museum of History and Technology was opened. Exhibit halls in the Museum of Natural History were modernized. A new east wing of the Natural History building, adding 214,000 square feet, was completed. The number of cataloged objects in the Smithsonian increased from 34 million to over 57 million, and the annual number of visitors to the Smithsonian buildings on the Mall increased from three and a half million to more than ten million.

Dr. Carmichael retired in 1964. As had his distinguished predecessors, he continued his scientific work at the Smithsonian as a research associate.
Major Public Buildings

Smithsonian Institution Building

South side of the Mall at Tenth Street

This original building of the Smithsonian Institution, the so-called Castle on the Mall, was designed in the Norman, or Lombard, style of architecture by James Renwick, who also designed Grace Church and St. Patrick’s Cathedral in New York. Built of red sandstone from nearby Seneca Creek, Maryland, the structure consists of a two-story central building and two wings joined to it by connecting ranges. It is 447 feet long and has a maximum depth of 160 feet. The tallest of its nine towers is 145 feet.

The cornerstone was laid on 1 May 1847 at a gala public ceremony preceded by a parade of local dignitaries, militia, and Freemasons. The building was not completed until 1855, but it was partially occupied in 1849 when the east wing was opened for public lectures. During the Smithsonian’s early years the building housed all operations of the Institution. It contained a museum, which opened in 1858, a lecture hall, an art gallery, research laboratories, administrative offices, and living quarters for the Secretary and his family.

Major reconstruction was undertaken following a fire that destroyed the upper story of the main building and the north and south towers on 24 January 1865. The east wing was enlarged in 1883.

In recent years, the interior has been partially reconstructed to reflect the high style of the Victorian era that produced the structure. The tomb of founder James Smithson is located in the north foyer.

In addition to being the administrative center of the Institution, the building has facilities for visiting scholars. A research and study center along with improved office space are planned for the building in coming years.
ARTS AND INDUSTRIES BUILDING
South side of the Mall, east of Smithsonian Institution Building

This structure of red brick and Ohio sandstone was designed by Washington architects Cluss and Schulze in a modernized Romanesque style. Construction began on 7 April 1879. It was first used on 4 March 1881 for the inaugural ball of President James A. Garfield, and was opened to the public later that year.

The building was designed to meet the Smithsonian’s need for more exhibit space after acquiring material from the Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia in 1876. The one-story plan, with a central rotunda from which radiated four naves, was at that time well suited for the exhibit of museum collections because it provided large halls having natural light.

The Arts and Industries Building, approximately 325 feet square, today contains exhibits of the National Air and Space Museum, as well as temporary exhibitions of a varied nature.

Plans call for the building to become a center for temporary exhibits and other activities, at which time it will be renamed the Smithsonian Exposition Hall.

NATURAL HISTORY BUILDING
(NATIONAL MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY AND NATIONAL MUSEUM OF MAN)
North side of the Mall between Ninth and Twelfth Streets

Authorized by Congress in March 1903, the original, or central, portion of this granite-faced building was designed in the classical style by the architectural firm of Hornblower & Marshall, of Washington. Construction began shortly after the groundbreaking ceremonies were held 15 June 1904. The building was completed in 1911, but was first used in 1908, and some exhibits were opened to the public on 17 March 1910. This central part of the building measures approximately 561 by 365 feet, has an octagonal rotunda 80 feet square and 124½ feet high, and contains almost ten acres of floor space on four floors.
Construction of the east and west wings of the building were authorized by Congress in 1930. Funds were not appropriated, however, until 1958. The Washington architectural firm of Mills, Petticord & Mills drew plans for the additions. Construction began in 1961, and both wings were completed and occupied by 1965. These additions brought the building’s total floor area to more than twenty acres.

The building houses the Smithsonian’s natural history collections and provides laboratory space for research programs. It also houses exhibits laboratories, shops, and the main Smithsonian Library.

AIR AND SPACE BUILDING
*Independence Avenue at Tenth Street*

This hangar-like steel structure was erected in 1917 as a temporary building to be used by the United States Signal Service during World War I as a testing laboratory for the Liberty aircraft engine. It was acquired by the Smithsonian Institution in November 1919 and, upon completion of repairs and renovations, was opened to the public 7 October 1920 to exhibit aircraft and accessories. The building contains about 14,000 square feet of floor space. Today it is used to display a portion of the collections of the National Air and Space Museum.

FREER GALLERY OF ART
*South side of the Mall at Twelfth Street*

Charles Lang Freer of Detroit gave the funds to erect this building to house the collection of Oriental and American art and art objects that he had given to the Smithsonian Institution. Designed by Charles A. Platt of New York in the style of a Florentine Renaissance palace, the Freer Gallery of Art is built of pink granite quarried near Milford, Massachusetts. It measures approximately 228 by 185 by 46 feet and has a central open court 65 feet square.
Groundbreaking ceremonies were held on 23 September 1916. The building was structurally completed in 1921 and was formally opened to the public on 2 May 1923. In addition to paintings and sculpture from the Orient, India, and Near East, works by American artists including Sargent and Homer are shown in the exhibition halls.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

North side of the Mall between Fourth and Seventh Streets

Andrew Mellon gave the funds to construct this building to house the art collection he gave the American people. Congress accepted the gift and authorized construction of the building on 24 March 1937. Completed in December 1940, the National Gallery of Art was dedicated on 17 March 1941, and was opened to the public the following day.

Designed by John Russell Pope in the classical style, the National Gallery of Art is built of rose-white Tennessee marble, and measures approximately 829 by 350 feet. The interior walls of the rotunda and east and west sculpture halls are of Alabama rockwood stone. Its two garden courts are of Indiana limestone. Monolithic columns of dark-green Italian marble surround the rotunda, which has a dome that rises almost 150 feet. The building contains more than a half million square feet of floor space and, in addition to the art galleries, houses administrative offices, a library, research facilities, and a public cafeteria.

NATIONAL MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY

North side of the Mall between Twelfth and Fourteenth Streets

Designed in a modified Classical style by the architectural firm of McKim, Mead & White of New York (succeeded in 1956 by Steinmann, Gain & White), this building is faced with rose-white Tennessee marble. Groundbreaking ceremonies were held 22 August 1958, and the cornerstone was laid 19 May 1961. The completed building was dedicated by President Johnson on 22 January 1964 and was opened to the public the following day.
Built to provide additional space for the care and exhibition of Smithsonian collections illustrating the cultural and technological development of our nation from colonial times, this vast building contains dozens of exhibit halls, storage areas for the collections, and offices for the use of the curatorial staff and visiting scholars, as well as an auditorium and a public cafeteria.

FINE ARTS AND PORTRAIT GALLERIES
In the block bounded by F, G, Seventh, and Ninth Streets, NW

Built for the Patent Office, this building was designed by William Parker Elliot of Washington in the Grecian Doric style of architecture, with details modeled after the Parthenon in Athens. It is constructed of marble and granite from Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Maryland, is quadrangular in shape, and has over-all measurements of 413 by 280 feet. An open central court graced by two Civil War era elms measures 270 by 112 feet.

The Building occupies a site Pierre L'Enfant had designated as the location of a national pantheon in his original plan for the Capital of the United States. Construction was begun in 1836 under the supervision of Robert Mills, architect of several major federal buildings, and the original or south front portion of the building was completed in 1840. The east, west, and north front portions, also included in the original plans, were begun in 1849, but the Civil War delayed their completion until 1867.

The Patent Office moved into the building in 1840, and the national collections were housed there until they were transferred to the Smithsonian Institution in 1858.

During the Civil War, portions of the building were used as a military hospital and barracks for the Rhode Island militia. President Lincoln's second inaugural ball was held there on 4 March 1865, and the great pillared hall in which it was held is now known as the Lincoln Gallery.

A fire partially destroyed the building in 1877 and necessitated a major reconstruction. Much of this work was done in a highly ornamental late Victorian Era mode, creating in the enormous Model Hall on the third floor of the south wing an elaborately decorated room that is considered one of the architectural sights of Washington.

In addition to the Patent Office, which used the building until 1932, the agricultural, Indian, land, pension, and other bureaus of the Department of Interior had offices in it between 1847 and 1917. The structure was taken over by the United States Civil Service Commission in 1932.
Acquiring the building in the early 1960s after it was saved from threatened demolition, the Smithsonian restored the monumental structure as a permanent home for two art museums, the National Collection of Fine Arts, in the north wing, and the National Portrait Gallery, in the south wing. Renamed the Fine Arts and Portrait Galleries (although the name "Old Patent Office Building" still is often used), the building opened in 1968 to the public. The Archives of American Art moved into the building along with the two museums after becoming a bureau of the Smithsonian in 1970.

RENWICK GALLERY

Pennsylvania Avenue and Seventeenth Street, NW

This structure was designed by James Renwick Jr., architect of the original Smithsonian Building, to house the collection of paintings and art objects that W. W. Corcoran presented to the city of Washington. It is reputed to be the first building in this country designed in the French Renaissance Revival style of architecture as well as the first American building built especially for use as an art gallery.

Construction began in 1857, but after the Civil War began, Montgomery C. Meigs, Quartermaster General of the Union Army, took over the unfinished building in 1861 and used it to house his staff and supplies for the Army. It was returned to the trustees of the Corcoran Gallery in 1869. Construction was completed in 1874.

The Corcoran Gallery occupied the building until 1897 when it moved to its present home at Seventeenth Street and New York Avenue. The old gallery was purchased by the Government in 1901 and was occupied by the United States Court of Claims from 1899 until 1964.

The Smithsonian Institution acquired the Renwick Gallery in 1966 and is now renovating it for the display and study of American arts, crafts, and design. The museum is expected to be opened in late 1970.
CARNegie MANSION (NEW YORK CITY)
Fifth Avenue and Ninety-First Street, New York

Future home of the Smithsonian’s Cooper-Hewitt Museum of Decorative Arts and Design, the historic Carnegie Mansion with its sixty-four rooms and elaborate facilities is a notable architectural showcase in its own right. The Smithsonian leased the mansion from the Carnegie Corporation, effective 1 July, 1970, with plans to move the Cooper-Hewitt collection there before 1 July, 1971, from the Cooper Union Building at Third Avenue and Seventh Street, in New York City. The rent-free lease provides an option to purchase the mansion in 1981.

Built for Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Carnegie in 1901 at a cost of about $1.5 million by architects Babb, Cook & Willard, the Carnegie Mansion was previously leased to the Columbia University School of Social Work following Mrs. Carnegie’s death in 1946.

The mansion as it exists today is one of New York’s finest examples of a post-Victorian style of life notable for its elegance and graciousness.

The house is elaborate in its detail. Handsome paneling and a beautiful ceiling are to be seen in the main hall. This wood, Scottish oak, was selected, carved and prepared in Scotland and brought over ready to be installed. The same is true of the large wooden stairway which extends to the third floor.

The dining room was used as a banquet hall, with many notable guests—Presidents of the United States, Mme Curie, Paderewski, and Booker T. Washington, to name a few.

Pump and water filter machinery are housed in a remarkable pump room. Two large Babcock & Wilcox steam boilers were installed when the house was built, and they are still in use. There are tracks and a turntable upon which a coal car, holding three quarters of a ton of coal, conveys the coal from coal bunker to the furnace.

The garden, which was the pride of Mrs. Carnegie, has chestnut, crabapple, and other varieties of trees, as well as azalea bushes, rhododendron, ivy, and numerous other plants. The wisteria and Boston ivy vines are almost as old as the building itself. A doll house was built in the garden for their daughter.

The pavements around the entire property are of Vermont granite and will last indefinitely.
NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM
*South side of the Mall between Fourth and Seventh Streets*

This projected building is expected to be completed and opened to the public in the 1970s. Designed by Gyo Obata of the architectural firm of Hellmuth, Obata, & Kassabaum of St. Louis, it will be the first building of its scope designed especially to house exhibits tracing the evolution and principles of air and space flight.

To be constructed of textured stone, glass, and anodized aluminum in a style intended to harmonize with the neighboring buildings, the new museum will measure 784 by 250 feet and contain over one million square feet of floor space. By using a combination of varying exhibit levels suspended between great columns, the architect has created a spaciousness appropriate for the exhibition of large aircraft, space vehicles, and rocket boosters, as well as a flexibility which will permit the display of the sub-miniaturized instruments important in aerospace developments.

In addition to its exhibit halls, the National Air and Space Museum will contain administrative offices, libraries, conference rooms, reading rooms, and other facilities for the use of the curatorial staff and visiting scholars and researchers interested in the history and technology of air and space flight.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS
*On bank of Potomac River along Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway*

Designed by the American architect Edward Durell Stone, the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is under construction on an eighteen-acre setting on the east bank of the Potomac River on the edge of Georgetown in Northwest Washington. The cultural complex is being built partially of marble donated by the Italian government. Groundbreaking ceremonies were held 2 December 1964; completion is expected in 1971.

The Center's main entrance hall, the Grand Foyer, will measure 630 by 40 feet and extends the entire length of the building. Opening onto it will be a concert hall, an opera hall, and a theater, with respective seating capacities of 2,770, 2,300, and 1,150. Underground parking for 1,600 cars will be provided.

The roof terrace level will house other facilities of the Center. Two large restaurants will occupy one end of the area. An atrium gallery, a 225-by-40-foot area running through the center of the roof terrace level, will connect the restaurants, with a playhouse and a film theater at the opposite end of the building.
Tapestries, chandeliers, and other decorative furnishings for the halls and rooms of the Center have been donated by foreign governments. Construction of the Center is being financed by contributions from private citizens, matched by federal appropriations and supplemented by a loan from the United States Treasury.

JOSEPH H. HIRSHHORN MUSEUM AND SCULPTURE GARDEN
South side of the Mall between Seventh and Ninth Streets

The Hirshhorn Museum, now under preliminary construction on the Mall with a projected 1971 completion date, will house financier Joseph H. Hirshhorn’s great gift to the nation of more than 6,000 paintings and sculptures. The gift was made on 17 May 1966, at a White House ceremony.

On 7 November 1966, Congress provided a site and voted statutory authority for the appropriation of construction and operating funds. The Ninetieth Congress on 26 July 1968, appropriated the initial $2 million of the total $15 million authorization for the Museum, and ground was broken at the site on 8 January 1969.

Designed by architect Gordon Bunshaft of the firm of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, of New York, the building will be a large cylinder containing three levels of gallery space and a central sculpture court. The height of the structure will be 60 feet, the outer diameter 231 feet, and the diameter of the inner circle defining the sculpture court 115 feet. Four massive piers will support the circular form over a plaza level.

The circular form is designed to express the circulation within the museum and to permit space to flow around and under the building so as to extend the visual limits from the Mall to Independence Avenue. The architectural solution of a circular design also blends the new building with existing Smithsonian buildings, particularly the adjacent and colorful Arts and Industries Building.

The Hirshhorn Sculpture Garden will bisect the Mall to form a cross-axis paralleling the cross-axis extending from the White House to the Jefferson Memorial. Anchoring the new cross-axis will be the Department of Transportation Building on the south and the National Archives on the north. The Sculpture Garden will be nine feet below the level of the Mall, so as to permit an unbroken vista. In its center will be a large reflecting pool 80 feet by 450 feet, and monumental sculpture will be displayed on the broad walks bordering it. Access to the sunken Sculpture Garden will be from the ground floor of the building and by wide stairways leading down from the Mall on the east and west sides.

In addition to gallery space, the building will house offices, library, seminar room, study area, museum shop, an auditorium seating 500, conservation laboratories, workshops, painting and sculpture storage areas, and a restaurant seating 170 people.
SMITHSONIAN MEDALS

The Smithsonian awards four medals for distinguished achievement in major areas of Institutional concern.

The Hodgkins gold medal honors important contributions to the knowledge of the nature and properties of atmospheric air, or practical applications of existing knowledge in this field to the welfare of mankind. Established in 1891, it has been granted to nine men:

J. J. Thompson, University of Cambridge, England, 1902
Sydney Chapman, University of Alaska, 1965
Joseph Kaplan, University of California at Berkeley, 1965
Marcel Nicolet, Centre Nationale de Recherche de l’Espace, Brussels, Belgium, 1965
Frits S. Went, University of Nevada Desert Research Institute, 1967
Jule Gregory Charney, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1969
Arie Haagen-Smith, California Institute of Technology, 1969

The Langley Gold Medal for Aerodromics was established by the Board of Regents in 1909 “to be awarded for specially meritorious investigations in connection with the science of aerodromics and its application to aviation.” It has been awarded twelve times:

Wilbur and Orville Wright, 1909
Glenn H. Curtiss, 1913
Gustave Eiffel, 1913
Charles A. Lindbergh, 1927
Charles Matthews Manly (posthumously), 1929
Richard Evelyn Byrd, 1929
Joseph S. Ames, 1935
Jerome Clarke Hunsaker, 1955
Robert H. Goddard (posthumously), 1960
Hugh Latimer Dryden, 1962
Alan B. Shepard Jr., 1964
Wernher von Braun, 1967

The Smithsonian Medal, the Smithsonian’s highest award, was instituted in 1965
in memory of the founder of the Institution. It has been awarded twice. The
first recipient was Lord Howard W. Florey, who accepted it on behalf of the
Royal Society of London, of which he was then President. It was granted to the
Society for its outstanding contributions to “the increase and diffusion of
knowledge among men.” The second recipient was Edgar P. Richardson, in 1968,
“for helping to shape the course of art scholarship in this country, interweaving
the two streams of history and of men into effective unity.” Dr. Richardson
formerly directed the Detroit Institute of Arts and Winterthur Museum, and
served as Chairman of the Smithsonian Art Commission.

The Henry Medal, honoring Joseph Henry, the first Secretary of the Smith-
sonian, is awarded for outstanding service to the nation. The Medal was designed
following Secretary Henry’s death in 1879. Although never officially presented
until 1967, a few Medals were struck and given to Henry’s friends and associates
in 1879 on the first anniversary of his death. It was granted in 1967 to David E.
Finley, first Director of the National Gallery of Art and a moving force in the
cultural life of Washington and of the United States. Dr. Finley was cited for
thirty years of service as “an arbiter of taste, a moulder of form and a con-
servator of all that is eclectic.” The second recipient in 1968 was Frank A.
Taylor, the Smithsonian’s Director-General of Museums and Director, United
States National Museum. Taylor, a career employee for forty-seven years, was
cited for “unique services to this institution, and through the National Museum,
to the Nation.”
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Dr. Ripley. In order to attempt a definition of the Smithsonian, I would like to begin from the beginning, if I may, and discuss something about its purposes.

The Smithsonian is a unique organization, and it does seem difficult at first to find any unifying force or common purpose in an institution whose interests range so widely within the spectrum of current concerns, from the Anacostia Naval Museum, on the one hand, to the National Zoological Park.

A British critic writing in Punch put the question this way a few years ago: "What is the common factor linking an island in the Panama Canal, the trilithons of Stonehenge, and a Victorian Gothic building in blood red sandstone on the central axis of Washington, D.C.?

Of course, the critic agonized about this and came back to some of the origins which have been so celebrated in stories about the Smithsonian's founding.

We know little about James Smithson except that he was an English scientist and a natural philosopher, the illegitimate son of the then first Duke of Northumberland, and that on his death he left a will in which he distributed his money which he had inherited essentially from his mother, who was an heiress descended indirectly from Henry VII, to his immediate relatives. He had another illegitimate brother, and that brother had one son. Should these relatives die without issue, the entire sum of his residuary estate was to be left to the United States to found in Washington, D.C., an institution for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men, to be known as the Smithsonian Institution.

The will was probated during the term of President Andrew Jackson, and subsequently the money was received by the intervention of Richard Rush, who was a prominent citizen in Philadelphia, the son of a signer of the Declaration, a one-time Minister to the Court of St. James and the Quai d'Orsay, and who by perseverance and diplomatic skill managed to extract the fund from the courts of chancery where they then were held, in record time, I think within 8 or 9 months—within a period of a year. Everybody predicted he would be dead before his task was completed, but he managed to get it.

The sum he brought and put in the Mint in Philadelphia translated to something under $550,000, a considerable sum in the 1830's.

The President of the United States requested an opinion of the Congress about how to dispose of these funds and enact the will, and a very considerable amount of debate ensued in the Congress. The history of this is revealing and interesting.

It seems quite obvious that there were as many opinions as there were Members of the Congress at that time who had the slightest interest in the will and bequest. We had examples of people, such as John Quincy Adams, a retired President who was serving in the Congress, requesting a national observatory. We had others who wanted to have a normal school, a school for teachers, an agricultural college, a great library, and so on.

It took some time, in fact nearly 11 years, for the debates and discussions to produce an effective solution. Finally, the Congress voted
in 1846 to set the Smithsonian Institution up under an independent Board of Regents. The interpretation of this Board of Regents has subsequently been maintained by various Chief Justices as being independent. That is to say, the Board is to consist of three Members of the House and three Members of the Senate who, in their capacity as Regents, are to act as private citizens—these Members are to be appointed, in turn, by the current Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate—the Chief Justice ex officio, the Vice President of the United States ex officio, and six citizen Regents.

In 1846 the population of the United States was about 10 percent of the present population, and there were approximately half of the existing States of the Union. That is why we recently appeared before your subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, with the suggestion carried from the Regents and proposed as a bill before the Congress, that the private body of the Regents should be enlarged by three, a modest increment to a private representation of six citizens of individual States.

Under the original legislation, two of these private citizens were to be citizens of the District of Columbia and members of the National Institute, an important organization, semiprivate in character, which constituted the foundation of the National Museum. That Institute was housed in the basement of the U.S. Patent Office, and a number of the then Members of the Congress, particularly Mr. Poinsett, were interested in somehow or other applying the funds of the Institution to support of the National Institute.

That subject I will touch on again. It has come up consistently in the organization of the Smithsonian Institution.

In any case, the concept was based on the fact that communications and travel were difficult in those days, and it was assumed that a quorum should always be present for meetings of the Board of Regents to decide the business of the Institution, and, therefore, two members of the Board should be resident in Washington.

It was also understood, even from the beginning, that those members who represented the Congress, who were to act as Regents, would occasionally find it difficult even to attend Regents' meetings, and it was hoped that the Chancellor of the Institution would be chosen from either the Vice President or the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court sitting in Washington and, with his authority, meetings of the Board could be constituted frequently.

Under the act, the powers of administration of this Institution were entrusted, through the Regents, to a person known as the Secretary of the Board of Regents and Secretary of the Institution. I assume the title was chosen because of the fact that there were then in Washington people who were heads of Government agencies known as Secretaries, but the Secretary of the Institution does not carry Cabinet rank and has consistently since the beginning been a private citizen, not sworn in or under the civil service, but chosen by the Board of Regents and considered to be an administrative, fiscal, and executive officer of the Institution.

I suppose it is unique to find, a private citizen, sitting before you today, Mr. Chairman, as the chief executive of this venerable, traditional establishment as provided in the original Act of Incorporation of the Institution.
In the years since 1846, there have been eight Secretaries of the Smithsonian Institution. In the hearings in 1855, there was a discussion by the congressional committee about why the Secretary was called professor. Of course, all the Secretaries of the Institution have been professors, anyway, in the sense that they have come from universities or held professorships, but it was decided in the beginning that the Secretary of the Board of Regents would be titled Professor, and his assistants would be titled Assistant Professor, because they were considered to be eminent and learned men, and they represented, therefore, chosen people selected by the Board for their academic distinction and because it was assumed that the Institution would act like a kind of college. So, Professor Henry was called Professor Henry, not because he had been professor at Princeton, but because he was Professor in the Smithsonian; Professor Baird was called Professor Baird, not because he had been a professor at Dickinson College, but because he was a Professor at the Smithsonian; and Professor Langley was called Professor Langley, not because he had been a professor at Western College in Pittsburgh, Pa., but, rather, because he was Secretary of the Smithsonian.

So, I would like to take this occasion to introduce, besides myself, Professor Bradley, here, the Under Secretary of the Smithsonian; Professor Blitzer, Assistant Secretary for History and Art; Professor Warner, Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs; Professor Wheeler, the Treasurer of the Institution; and Professor Powers, the General Counsel.

Mr. Thompson. I would like to introduce former Professor Brademas. You know Professor Bingham.

Dr. Ripley. This Institution was set up by an organic act, as I say, on August 10, 1846. Some historians say that Congress evaded any real interpretation by providing a Secretary and a Board of Regents and letting them best decide the intent of Smithson's will. I think to some extent this is true, as shown by the debate at the time, because it proved almost impossible to determine effectively how Congress itself was to increase and diffuse knowledge. Rather, this enigmatic and mysterious phrase could only be acted upon in the sense of setting up an organization and saying, "Let it increase and diffuse knowledge."

Another point of view, of course, is that Congress had the foresight to see the need for a center for basic research and public education with just such a broad charter as "the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men." This is true in the sense that, from George Washington's time on, there had been urgings in the public and speeches in the press that in the Nation's Capital there should be a center for the increase and diffusion of knowledge, but how that center was to be constituted evaded the final decision of the most learned men of the time.

However, Smithson's mandate was accepted and was written into the bill in the preamble and in the first section on the establishment.

The principal provisions of the Organic Act of 1846 provide that the President, the Vice President, the Cabinet heads, the Commissioner of the Patent Office, which is where the National Institute was located—that is a particularly important point—and the mayor of Washington, constituted an establishment by the name of the Smithsonian Institution.
In the beginning, it was assumed that the establishment would meet from time to time and meetings were attempted to be held, but from the letters of Joseph Henry, the first Secretary, and from the annual reports and from the subsequent discussions, it became apparent that attempting to convene a meeting of the establishment was almost impossible in the 1840's and 1850's as it would be, indeed, today. Only on the rarest occasions, culminating in 1878 and again in 1927, were informal meetings of the so-called establishment held. Failing that, the routine and pattern quickly developed that the Regents would meet regularly and conduct the business of the Institution.

The act also authorized private funding by having the principal of Smithson's gift deposited with the Treasury at 6 percent annual interest to the Smithsonian.

It provided that the business of the Institution be conducted by a Secretary and a Board of Regents, the general composition of which has been maintained to the present day.

It also provided for an executive committee to be formed by members of the Board.

It instructed the Regents to choose a site and erect a building "of plain and durable materials and structure * * * and with suitable rooms and halls for the reception and arrangement, upon a liberal scale, of objects of natural history, including a geological and mineralogical cabinet; also a chemical laboratory, a library, a gallery of art, and the necessary lecture rooms."

It authorized the transfer to this Institution of "all objects of art and of foreign and curious research, and all objects of natural history—belonging, or hereafter to belong, to the United States," as well as the minerals, books, manuscripts, and other properties of James Smithson.

It provided for the gradual establishment of a library, and authorized the managers of the Institution to spend the income of the Smithson fund "as they shall deem best suited for the promotion of the purposes of the testator."

The search for a first administrator or Secretary of this Institution quickly narrowed to Prof. Joseph Henry, who was the most eminent physical scientist of his day, a discoverer of the principle of electromagnetism, who along with Faraday worked in this area and provided some of the seminal research which resulted in the discoveries of Morse in telegraphy.

After some serious cogitation, he decided to accept the invitation of the Regents to become the first Secretary of the Institution, and arrived with a plan for the general purposes and organization of the Smithsonian which we have attempted to adhere to to this day.

The objectives of the Institution, Henry maintained, were very clear—first, to increase and, second, to diffuse knowledge among men. "Increase" meant original investigation or research on any subject in any field, inasmuch as Smithson's will did not define or restrict fields of knowledge. In the subsequent hearings in 1855, considerable discussion was held on whether or not the research had to be original or new research, and it was determined by the committee, and acceded to by Henry, that in fact research did not always have to be original research, but it could be the illumination of truth. In other
words, it could be continuing research, on collections or objects, the
general outlines of which might already have been known.

As Henry expressed it:

Smithsonian was well aware that knowledge should not be viewed as existing
in isolated parts, but as a whole, each portion of which throws light on all
the others, and that the tendency of all is to improve the human mind, and
give it new sources of power and enjoyment.

To increase knowledge, Henry provided grants—then called "pre-
miums" instead of research grants as they are today—for men of
talent to make original research and, in effect, converted the original
Smithsonian Institution and its subsequent building to a residential
center for scholars. He himself engaged in his own research (a tradi-
tion which has been maintained by every one of the seven subsequent
Secretaries) which, I might add, later led to the formation of the
Weather Bureau; and he encouraged studies in archeology, anthro-
pology, and natural history.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, I think every one of the Secretaries has
attempted to adhere to this mandate and attempted to incorporate,
and, at the same time, judiciously, to prune select objects and areas
of research which will follow this mandate without confusing or con-
tracting or expanding too much the original issues involved.

Secretary Baird, who followed him, was a naturalist, an ornitholo-
gist essentially, like myself. Secretary Langley, who followed him,
was an astrophysicist, in the terms of the day, of the 1870's. Secretary
Walcott was the outstanding geologist of his time, who became the
fourth Secretary. The remaining four Secretaries that I would like
to mention in passing are all alive. Secretary Abbot, who succeeded
Walcott, and retired in 1945, is 98 and still continuing his research
on solar tables, and has a laboratory in the Smithsonian. Secretary
Wetmore, who retired in 1952, is still continuing his seminal research
on the birds of Panama, and has a laboratory in the Smithsonian.
Secretary Carmichael, a specialist on infant psychology and tropisms,
is still continuing his research and has a laboratory in the Smith-
sonian. I, for my sins, am still continuing my research, and spend
a day in my laboratory each week as best I can.

This tradition is an honored one, and one which the colleagues of
ours in the Smithsonian, I think, like and respect because it estab-
lishes a continuing feeling that, although we are weighted with ad-
ministrative tasks, we still, as Secretaries, are part of the academic
fraternity.

Henry gave equal weight to the diffusion of knowledge as the
second aspect of the increase and diffusion, and therefore instituted
the "Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge" with the first publi-
cation coming out within 2 years of the founding of the Institution.
He instituted a library, but this responsibility was later to be trans-
ferred largely, by congressional legislation, to the Library of Con-
gress.

He instituted the international exchange of scholarly research
and publications, with the foundations of the Smithsonian's Inter-
national Exchange Service established in 1852.

Of all the acts of Henry, I think the International Exchange
was one of the most important for scholarship of the time. In the
19th century, scientists and academicians in this country were confined in their work, not to colleges, where we now assume they are largely finding a happy home for research, but, rather, to a very few institutes. The American Philosophical Society, the American Academy of Arts and Letters in Boston, and one or two other institutes of the time, were the only recourse that persons concerned with advanced research had for the outlet of their publications and their research and their communication with scholars in this entire Nation.

In the mid-19th century, the scholarly output of the United States was minuscule and confined to a very few institutions. In the colleges, as John Quincy Adams pointed out, the need was to train young men and women, as he once termed it, to “plow a straight furrow in life.” The colleges then were to be staffed by teachers rather than original research workers, and the transition to, and the evolution of, the graduate school arena, as it were, in the United States was largely instituted and developed by organizations such as the Smithsonian, as Wilcomb Washburn has pointed out in his book.

This indeed was a seminal act, and a way by which those scholars in this country, lacking facilities to travel abroad, could get about through the mails, as it were, through the International Service and the exchange procedures established by the Smithsonian, and trade their wares back and forth with scholars abroad.

In fact, at one point Henry proposed to the Secretary of State that the Smithsonian should establish agents abroad in the United States ministries. These agents might be roughly equated to cultural or scientific attachés of today. The idea was that these agents of the Smithsonian would be in close touch with Bibliotheques Nationales, Royal Societies, and similar organizations, with coordinating and assembling scholars and scholarly publications abroad. But nothing came of that. In any case, the International Exchange continues today.

Finally, Henry instituted the Smithsonian Lectures because, as a counterpart to his work in the Institution, he felt that public instruction was of the greatest importance; and the lecture series, popular especially in those days of atheneums and lecture series in Boston and other places, became extremely popular.

It was Henry’s hope that the annual lecture series would be attended by Members of the Congress, members of the Government, and others concerned with the Federal establishment in Washington, D.C., and that this would afford them an opportunity to be in touch with the new findings and new discussions of the times. This we have tried to continue down to the present day with our colloquia and seminars.

Henry at first did not give primary importance to creating a museum, since it was his view that the Smithsonian should concentrate its activities on matters of benefit to all mankind, in keeping with the will, rather than matters of local interest. But, of course, a museum role was ordained by the Congress in the 1846 act, and we believe that it was particularly put into the act by the sponsors of the National Institute, like Mr. Poinsett, whom I mentioned, who were so concerned with its fate.

By the late 1850’s, the Smithsonian was housing in its new building a large amount of natural history specimens collected through Government-sponsored exploration of our Western frontiers. By then, too,
it had been proposed that the Smithsonian receive the collections of the Patent Office, which included models of inventions, a section known as the American Museum of Art, and also natural history collections, notably those from the expeditions of Captain Wilkes to the Pacific.

Mr. Thompson. That patent collection is still in your possession, is it not?

Dr. Ripley. It is.

Mr. Thompson. It originally had been housed in the Patent Office building?

Dr. Ripley. In the basement of the U.S. Patent Office, right.

The Regents and Henry established a principle, as a result of the increase of collections, that is essential to the understanding of the Smithsonian and its subsequent growth. They held that limited income from the Smithsonian fund, which in these days totaled $30,000 to $33,000 a year, should be reserved for increase and diffusion of knowledge of worldwide benefit, and not spent on caretaking or maintenance of museum property and collections. But if the Congress wished the Smithsonian to take on the public responsibility for a national collection and, in effect, a national museum, in accord with the 1846 act, then the Smithsonian should do this for the people of the United States, but with appropriated funds.

In this spirit, the Patent Office collection was accepted in 1858, and the Congress acceded, and the first Federal appropriation was made to the Smithsonian through the Department of the Interior in the amount of $4,000 annually so, in Henry's own words, the Smithsonian could "become the curator of the national collections." This is the origin and the beginning of the annual Federal appropriation system as far as the Smithsonian is concerned.

Many special-purpose appropriations soon followed, because Henry, and especially his successor, Spencer Baird, were greatly interested in the development of the West, and Baird especially, who was something of a diplomat and something of a negotiator—I suppose you might call him a science administrator today—was influential in interesting the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior in the long-term results of the surveys being undertaken by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and other surveying organizations throughout the West, and felt that unless parallel collections and observations were made in two important areas—one, the general area of natural history, geology, and paleontology; and the other, the area of anthropology—the specimens and records would be lost, and the Nation would inevitably suffer in a long-term way from the loss of invaluable and unique material.

It was because of this that Maj. John Wesley Powell received a Smithsonian grant to explore the Colorado region, and in 1869 embarked on his famous trip down the Colorado, which we celebrated with a centennial last year at the Green River junction where the new Union Pacific tracks crossed the river, and discovered the Canyon of the Colorado.

His essential purpose, aside from mapping and geological studies, was a study of the Indian tribes. As a result, Congress subsequently approved Powell's activities and in 1879 reorganized and consolidated all Federal exploration, assigning geological investigation to the Department of the Interior, creating the U.S. Geological Survey, and
at the same time establishing anthropological studies within the Smithsonian, which were to be called the Bureau of Ethnology.

John Wesley Powell, a one-armed veteran of the Battle of Shiloh, an extraordinary explorer, became a Smithsonian employee in 1879, and continued until his death as director of this Bureau of American Ethnology.

Quite aside from his far-reaching discussions and writings about the dangers to the Western Badlands and the fragile environment of the desert in parts of the West and Southwest, he, more than anyone else, rallied and coalesced public opinion about the decline of the American Indian and the importance of making studies of Indian language, customs, and tribal activities before they vanished from the scene as rapidly as the antelope and the buffalo from the prairie.

Anthropology owes a continuing debt to Powell and, indeed, to the Smithsonian Institution, which founded the study of anthropology essentially in this country in the 1840's.

The second Secretary of the Smithsonian, Spencer Baird, whom I have mentioned, was a biologist, an avid museum man, what my former mentor at Harvard would call a "pack rat," and an enthusiastic proponent of the Smithsonian's early efforts toward museum exhibitions. When he came down to assume his post as Assistant Secretary of the Smithsonian, Professor Baird carried with him some eight freight-car loads of his personal collections, which were afterward incorporated in the Institution. So, you can see that he was well suited to enhance the museum role of the Institution.

At the same time, Baird was greatly interested in the fishes, especially of the Atlantic Coast, and his efforts were responsible for the creation of the U.S. Fish Commission, now a part of the Department of the Interior, perhaps soon to be legislated into another part of the Government organization. Baird essentially was the founder of the U.S. interest in fisheries and in oceanography. He was one of the founders of the Woods Hole Biological Laboratory in Massachusetts, and he was farsighted enough to have stated in the 1870's that it was quite likely that the food requirements of the growing Nation—the United States—would be such in the 20th century that harvesting the sea would have to be done in a highly sophisticated manner. So, he was prescient and an extraordinarily interesting biological organizer as well as a pioneer biologist himself.

One of the great things which Baird seized upon was the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exposition. The Smithsonian received a Federal appropriation to participate in the exposition and, in fact, was what might be called today the lead agency in this regard. The Smithsonian organized five separate exhibits, coordinating work of the Department of the Interior especially, and Spencer Baird was made a member of the board appointed by President Grant to plan the Government's participation.

If Federal funds were applied for the national collection and if the Smithsonian was to serve as a national museum in being, then the Smithsonian was to be the logical recipient of materials from this great exposition. Actually, the work was so well organized and the understanding so implicit in the exhibits prepared by the Smithsonian that, as a result, some 85 freight-car loads of materials from 45
nations and a number of States were brought back to Washington at the end of the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition.

It was quite obvious, in the characteristic overflow manner of museums, that we did not have space in 1877-78 to house all these extraordinary collections. Therefore, a proposal was made to the Congress that a new building should be erected to be known as the U.S. National Museum. In 1879, Congress appropriated $250,000 for construction of a new building for the National Museum. It was in effect a reaffirmation of the museum provision in the Organic Act of 1846 with the following specific language:

All collections of rocks, minerals, soils, fossils, and objects of natural history, archeology, and ethnology made by the Coast and Interior Survey, the Geological Survey, or by any other parties for the Government of the United States, when no longer needed for investigations in progress, shall be deposited in the National Museum.

This legislation and the accompanying appropriation reaffirmed the unique nature of the Smithsonian as a nongovernmental institution created by the Congress to which additional public responsibilities within the mandate for the increase and diffusion of knowledge have, with the consent of the Board of Regents, been legislated and supported in substantial part by appropriated funds.

In that regard, Mr. Chairman, as you know, we have before your committee a bill approved by the Regents and suggested in part by our curators in the U.S. National Museum, for the extension of this principle in the sense that, with the continuing amassing and developing of collections in the Institution since 1876, partially housed by a subsequent building in 1911, the Natural History Building, and a still subsequent building planned in the 1940's and 1950's and finally opened in 1964, the Museum of History and Technology, this continuing accretion of objects, which Henry so often complained about as financially draining the Institution, requires that a more sophisticated type of storage and research ability be thought about seriously and in depth. It is in this connection that we have requested this bill asking for study funds for the depository facilities in Maryland.

Mr. Thompson. What is the approximate rate of acquisition of objects under this section, Dr. Ripley?

Dr. Ripley. It is difficult to say exactly. I suppose perhaps 1 million objects a year; something of this sort. This consists of everything under the sun; from collections of insects, which can be relatively easily housed in small trays and generally tend to be small; to potsherds from archeological excavations in this country or the new world in general, which are aggregates of fragments of bone and pottery from excavations, often collected by the Department of the Interior, and which must be held for a certain period of time and then, indeed, may be disposed of; to palaeontological fossil specimens which vary from tiny micro-organisms to huge bones of fossil animals, reptiles mostly; to anthropological objects and collections; to art objects; and to meteorites, which rarely, and happily—appear—and of which we obtained a wonderful specimen weighing about 25 kilos in February of this year.

The rate of accretion is not constant nor, indeed, do we keep all the material. By selective processes we exchange or trade off many of these materials, particularly in the oceanographic field where we have as-
seemed a list of some 230 specialists around the world in 38 countries with whom we deposit collections taken in trawls, under the international oceanographic and geological programs.

NATIONAL COLLECTIONS—LISTING BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museum and gallery collections:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. National Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>48,965,103</td>
<td>50,246,165</td>
<td>51,224,353</td>
<td>52,161,392</td>
<td>52,916,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. National Museum of History and Technology</td>
<td>10,484,251</td>
<td>10,615,468</td>
<td>10,868,867</td>
<td>12,383,974</td>
<td>12,472,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. National Air and Space Museum</td>
<td>11,929</td>
<td>12,143</td>
<td>12,351</td>
<td>12,826</td>
<td>13,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. National Collection of Fine Arts</td>
<td>10,440</td>
<td>11,190</td>
<td>11,890</td>
<td>12,440</td>
<td>13,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Freer Gallery</td>
<td>10,139</td>
<td>10,174</td>
<td>10,202</td>
<td>10,279</td>
<td>10,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. National Armed Forces Museum</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>10,139</td>
<td>56,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,484,251</td>
<td>10,279</td>
<td>10,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cooper-Hewitt Museum</td>
<td>11,929</td>
<td>11,190</td>
<td>11,890</td>
<td>12,440</td>
<td>13,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoological Park collections:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library collections:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Smithsonian Institution Libraries system</td>
<td>594,113</td>
<td>606,646</td>
<td>624,585</td>
<td>640,642</td>
<td>656,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival and related collections:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Smithsonian Archives</td>
<td>830,000</td>
<td>830,000</td>
<td>830,000</td>
<td>1,160,000</td>
<td>1,160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Joseph Henry papers</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. National Air and Space Museum</td>
<td>4,160,000</td>
<td>7,530,000</td>
<td>8,330,000</td>
<td>10,330,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum and Gallery collections</td>
<td>59,482,051</td>
<td>60,895,475</td>
<td>62,135,391</td>
<td>64,589,570</td>
<td>65,334,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Zoological Park collections</td>
<td>2,628</td>
<td>3,223</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>2,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library collections</td>
<td>594,113</td>
<td>606,646</td>
<td>624,585</td>
<td>640,642</td>
<td>656,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival collections</td>
<td>4,990,000</td>
<td>8,360,000</td>
<td>9,163,000</td>
<td>11,501,000</td>
<td>16,644,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (rounded)</td>
<td>65,000,000</td>
<td>70,000,000</td>
<td>72,000,000</td>
<td>77,000,000</td>
<td>83,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 NASM states it was unable to accession instruments, uniforms, and navigational equipment since 1965 because of lack of curator and space.

2 Joined Smithsonian Institution in fiscal year 1967.

3 Joined Smithsonian Institution in fiscal year 1969.

Note.—The Archives of American Art joined the Smithsonian Institution in fiscal year 1970 so its collections were not included in the above breakdown. The growth of their collections prior to fiscal year 1970 is: 1965, 50,000; 1966, 120,000; 1967, 380,000; 1968, 556,000; 1969, 766,000.

Detailing very briefly the subsequent growth and legislation, if I may, I would like just to list briefly some of our subsequent bureaus.

The National Zoological Park had its origin in the fact that the National Museum had a Department of Living Animals which was maintained for a number of years on the Mall near the original Smithsonian Building. There was a fence and it was possible to see buffalo in the middle of the Mall in those days. Some of this material was gleaned by Dr. William Hornaday as potential subjects for his taxidermy, but much of it was gleaned by him because of his increasing concern and interest in conservation. Much of this material was involved in the West—buffalo, for example. Hornaday in the 1880's was concerned about the extinction of the symbol of America's West, the buffalo, along with the bald eagle, the most popular and current symbol of America. He was much concerned that the American public should be educated before it was too late in the imminent decline of certain large game species of animals.

He joins the ranks, therefore, with Gifford Pinchot, with Secretary Langley, who was then the Secretary of the Smithsonian, with Theodore Roosevelt and others in foreseeing the potential decline of great mammal and bird species in this country.
Congress authorized the National Zoological Park in 1889 and in 1890 appropriated $200,000 for the purchase of land in what was then known as Rock Creek Valley. This was before the creation of Rock Creek Park. This act placed the National Zoological Park under the direction of the Regents, who were authorized to transfer to it any living specimens of animals or plants, to accept gifts, to make exchanges of specimens, and generally to improve the park "for the advancement of science and the instruction and recreation of the people."

Conservation and public education were watchwords in the development of the zoo and were among the basic interests of Langley and Dr. Hornaday.

Incidentally, Hornaday subsequently went to New York to become the director of the New York Zoological Society, and in 1912, as I was able to point out to Congressman Albert recently, was able to sell 12 buffalo on flatcars from New York City to the Ouachita Reserve in eastern Oklahoma where they formed the nucleus of the subsequent herds of wild buffalo which now again roam parts of the Southwest.

Initially, the maintenance and operation of the zoo were attached to the District of Columbia appropriations bills. This was because the zoo legislation had finally been passed as a rider to an appropriation bill for the District. Beginning in 1962, however, the Smithsonian has been allotted increasing funds by the Congress, first for construction and finally, in the current fiscal year, for the entire operation and maintenance budget of the zoo.

The visitations to the zoo total over 3 million people a year, of which more than 50 percent come from outside the District. In fact, it is close to 80 percent. This means that the concept of its being a national enterprise, a national resource, has become a reality.

In 1890, Secretary Langley rekindled John Quincy Adams' idea that the Smithsonian should concern itself with an observatory, and sought to give the Smithsonian more balance in the physical sciences as opposed to its increasing concern with natural history, with ecology as we call it today, and with conservation. With contributions from James Kidder and Alexander Graham Bell, who was a Regent of the Smithsonian, he started a modest observatory in the Smithsonian's backyard. The next year, Congress appropriated $10,000 "for the maintenance of Astrophysical Observatory and the making of solar observations at high altitudes." Annual Federal support has continued ever since, but many private donations have been made along the way. For many years, John A. Roebling of New Jersey directly supported the research of Secretary Abbot in the Astrophysical Observatory.

This Astrophysical Observatory in 1955, under the prescient intuition and direction of my predecessor, Dr. Carmichael—Professor Carmichael, I should say—was relocated at Harvard with the idea that a totally integrated situation would better advance the cause of astronomical, astrophysical, and geodesic research.

I hope the committee will have an opportunity to hear from Dr. Whipple—Professor Whipple—who occupies two roles, both as Director of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory and as a professor on the faculty of Harvard, in this combined and integrated joint laboratory which is maintained through the constant supervision both of the Regents and the Secretary of the Smithsonian, and the president and fellows of Harvard University.
In 1903, the Congress authorized funds, not to exceed $3,500,000, for a new National Museum Building. This structure eventually came to house the U.S. National Museum of Natural History, which, as you know, lies on Constitution Avenue at 10th Street and was completed, as I recall, in 1911.

During the winter of 1905–06, Charles Lang Freer approached the Smithsonian. Through the intervention of President Theodore Roosevelt, the Regents visited Mr. Freer in Detroit to see his collection of oriental art which he would like to present to the Nation. He also suggested that he give money to house it in trust. Finally, the Regents accepted the offer, and in 1915 Freer waived the condition that the collection was to remain in his possession during his lifetime. It subsequently came to the Smithsonian in sections during the latter part of his life. He offered $1 million if the Smithsonian would go ahead with the construction of the Freer Gallery of Art.

I would like to note at this point, Mr. Chairman, that the foregoing outline has focused almost entirely on the public responsibilities and Federal financing of the Institution's development, with only parenthetical references to the fact that all through this time the Smithsonian was receiving many significant gifts and building up its private endowment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of fund</th>
<th>Balance at beginning of year</th>
<th>Gifts</th>
<th>Income added to principal</th>
<th>Net gain (loss) on sale of securities</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Balance at end of year</th>
<th>Additions (deductions)</th>
<th>Unexpended income</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Balance at end of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frer Gallery of Art</td>
<td>$12,458,167</td>
<td>$711,865</td>
<td>$13,170,032</td>
<td>$488,882</td>
<td>$640,579</td>
<td>$62,302</td>
<td>$719,491</td>
<td>$472,272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other endowment funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott, W. L.</td>
<td>180,767</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>11,037</td>
<td></td>
<td>191,804</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>9,142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong, Edwin James</td>
<td>2,943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,199</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>69,353</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73,597</td>
<td>19,131</td>
<td>3,515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon, Virginia Purdy</td>
<td>160,534</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>169,148</td>
<td>7,134</td>
<td>3,143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird, Lucy H.</td>
<td>63,493</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67,287</td>
<td>9,955</td>
<td>3,143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barney, Alice Pike</td>
<td>49,735</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52,776</td>
<td>3,059</td>
<td>2,519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barney Studio House</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barstow, Frederick D.</td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Roland W.</td>
<td>55,989</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58,889</td>
<td>6,424</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfield collection</td>
<td>66,878</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71,554</td>
<td>3,359</td>
<td>3,873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey, Thomas Lincoln</td>
<td>21,736</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,065</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain, Frances Lee</td>
<td>48,831</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51,817</td>
<td>5,054</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of mammals curators</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,578</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of reptiles and amphibians</td>
<td>35,246</td>
<td>235,102</td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>282,600</td>
<td>(6,163)</td>
<td>11,838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dykes, Charles</td>
<td>74,662</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79,226</td>
<td>3,401</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eickemeyer, Florence Brvoort</td>
<td>18,848</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,001</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleur</td>
<td>187,845</td>
<td>37,484</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>199,360</td>
<td>8,504</td>
<td>3,258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guggenheim, David and Florence</td>
<td>102,273</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>4,327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131,600</td>
<td>5,804</td>
<td>3,258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson</td>
<td>15,416</td>
<td></td>
<td>943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,359</td>
<td>8,069</td>
<td>781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewitt, E. G.</td>
<td>14,933</td>
<td></td>
<td>684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,617</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewitt, S. C.</td>
<td>88,222</td>
<td>4,041</td>
<td>92,263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96,304</td>
<td>11,745</td>
<td>578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillyer, Virgil</td>
<td>11,397</td>
<td></td>
<td>697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,094</td>
<td>11,745</td>
<td>578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitchcock Library</td>
<td>2,739</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,909</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgkins</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>8,884</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodleka research</td>
<td>104,317</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109,590</td>
<td>1,669</td>
<td>4,377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, Bruce</td>
<td>33,194</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,226</td>
<td>16,258</td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>14,390</td>
<td></td>
<td>698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,088</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay, Jetsee M. H.</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,730</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Freer Gallery is an outstanding example, but we have the Roebling collection of minerals, for example, which is an outstanding collection, and which Mr. Roebling sensibly endowed so that, during the periods of ups and downs of interest and concern in mineralogy, the Smithsonian was able to maintain its lead position in collecting and studying mineral specimens.

Mr. Thompson. In this connection, is the Freer trust fund your largest single one?

Dr. Ripley. It is the largest single fund within the endowment funds of the Institution.

Mr. Thompson. Is that several million dollars?

Dr. Ripley. At the moment, it is approximately $17 million, of which the income projected this year would be $740,000.

Mr. Thompson. That is to maintain the Gallery?

Dr. Ripley. Under the will, this is all used to maintain the facilities of the Freer. A small Federal appropriation each year helps to maintain guard, janitor, and electrical service. In his will, Mr. Freer stipulated that, as much as possible, the income of this fund should be used to support research and curation of the collection and acquisition of objects, and he assumed that it was the obligation of the U.S. Government, having accepted it, to appropriate to the Smithsonian sufficient funds for the physical administration of the building.

Mr. Thompson. So that fund, under Mr. Freer's will, is administered by trustees, is it not?

Dr. Ripley. No, sir. It is administered by the Secretary of the Smithsonian and the officers of the Institution and the Board of Regents.

Mr. Thompson. What is the amount of the Roebling endowment?

Dr. Ripley. I do not know if I have the exact figure of the Roebling endowment. It is several hundred thousand dollars. It, along with auxiliary funds that have subsequently been given, help to support our mineral collection. This is administered, again, in the same way as the Freer fund, in trust, entirely for mineralogical purposes.

This is an extremely pertinent and interesting point, Mr. Chairman. When people give collections they should, if possible, give some kind of endowment. Of course, this is something that has continually been encouraged, because an institution as old and venerable as the Smithsonian, which has seen the change and ebb and flow of fashions in research, has often found that at particular times other resources are not available to continue what may have been the original purposes of the gift. The recent renaissance of interest in meteoritics, for example, which has come along since the development of space research, is greatly benefited by the existence of the Smithsonian's collection of meteorites, and also because of the fact that endowment funds were available in the past to continue research in this field.

In looking forward and projecting future trends in important research, important to the Nation and to the people of America, provided endowment exist, it is possible to be able to support them. Many universities suffer from the fact that endowment funds are not sufficient to be able to continue in what have become unfashionable areas of research, which may over a long period of time become fashionable or even strategically important again, but in the interval have been seriously harmed or neglected.
On January 24, 1865, a fire in the original Smithsonian Building destroyed much of the original collections in art. Thereafter, Secretary Henry, very disturbed by the fact that art treasures were vulnerable even in the so-called fireproof building, encouraged the deposition of the collections in the Corcoran Gallery, which had been formed at this time, and in the Library of Congress, for safekeeping.

But the Philadelphia Centennial brought a great accretion in art material. Finally, in 1896, the Corcoran and Library of Congress deposits were recalled, and the east wing of the original Smithsonian Building was made an art gallery.

The art gallery, as you know, had been mentioned in the language of the original act. It was recognized officially, as a result of the gift of Harriet Lane Johnston, President Buchanan's niece, who acted as his social hostess in the White House and who assembled a valuable art collection of her own. When she died in 1903, she left her collection originally to the Corcoran, but with the stipulation that, should the U.S. Government ever establish a National Gallery of Art, her collection should be transferred to it and become its property.

In 1906, after 2 years of deliberation, the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia decided that indeed the Smithsonian's gallery was a national gallery, and the Johnston collection came to the Smithsonian.

Mr. Thompson. In order to give the members of the committee time to ask questions, may I ask that you summarize the remainder of your statement. We would appreciate that.

Dr. Ripley. I would be happy to, Mr. Chairman. Then perhaps I could point out something of the physical organization of the Institution. I could ask if you would incorporate some more material in the record, and I would like to make two additional statements which are not in the original statement, one in regard to present activities of the Institution, and one in regard to the future, both of which you suggested I make.

I will summarize the rest of this statement right now.

In 1937, the Mellon collection was discussed, and finally, by act of Congress, the designation of "National Gallery of Art" was transferred to the building which was to house the Mellon collection. The National Gallery, newly legislated, was established as a bureau of the Smithsonian, with its direction under a Board of Trustees including, ex officio, the Chief Justice, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Smithsonian, and five general members.

About the same time, an extremely important debate in the House and the Senate was held regarding the fate of the former National Gallery of Art collection. It was decided that these collections would be rechristened the "National Collection of Fine Arts," and a commission was set up to find a suitable building for it. The thrust of the new National Collection of Fine Arts was to encourage the collection, acquisition, and display of American objects, contemporary objects and, indeed, suggested in a precursor way the eventual National Endowment for the Arts. I had the honor of testifying before you, Mr. Chairman, on the foundation of the National Endowment for the Arts, by suggesting that scholarships and staff positions should be set up to encourage contemporary painting. How wonderful it would
have been if that had been undertaken earlier and appropriated for by the Congress. It might have anticipated by nearly 30 years the eventual setting up of the National Endowment for the Arts.

I should mention the National Advisory Council on Aeronautics which was legislated by the Congress in 1915 as an outgrowth of the work by Dr. Walcott, who in memory of Secretary Langley had set up the Langley Aerodynamical Laboratory. This was the direct precursor of NASA, because after World War II it was reconstituted as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Walcott and his successor Secretaries served as members or chairmen of the National Advisory Council on Aeronautics.

In 1940, the Congress authorized the setting up of a Canal Zone biological area, and eventually incorporated this within the Smithsonian. This area had been set aside in the 1920's by the intercession of the Governor of the Canal Zone, and essentially consisted of an island in Gatun Lake known as Barro Colorado, which was designated as a natural area for scientific observation and research. From the beginning table fees were charged to support the laboratory, and about 10 universities, the Eastman Kodak Co., and the Smithsonian formed the contributing group. This has continued up to the present. The Smithsonian assumed in 1945 full responsibility for the construction and maintenance of the laboratory, and has gradually taken on a lead position in tropical biology as a result of its concern and its laboratory.

The National Air Museum was established by act of Congress in August 1946 and amended in 1966 to include space flight and space flight equipment. It is hoped that the authorizing act of 1966, which includes the provision of land and a site for a building, can be actively studied in the next budget hearing for 1972, with the thought that we can restudy what now appears to be a building which has been designed too large and held waiting in the wings for too long, and with the hope of coming back to the Congress eventually for a far less expensive and smaller building than was originally intended.

The John F. Kennedy Center, formerly the National Cultural Center, was established by legislation in 1958 as a bureau of the Smithsonian under a separate Board of Trustees. Amendments in 1964 provided funds for the construction of the Kennedy Center on the banks of the Potomac.

In 1961, the National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board was authorized to assist the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian on matters concerned with portraying the contributions which the Armed Forces have made to American society and culture.

In 1962, the National Portrait Gallery was established by the Congress to function as a free public museum for the exhibition and study of portraiture and statuary depicting men and women who have made significant contributions to the history, development, and culture of the United States.

In 1966, the National Museum Act was passed by the Congress and approved by the President, reaffirming the Smithsonian's current and continuing role of unofficial assistance to museums throughout the Nation. The Smithsonian in its museum function under the U.S. National Museum has in effect become "Mr. Museum" to the community in constant examples of help and service to museums. We have
done our best to attempt to explain techniques, and to develop techni-
cians and technical training.

Finally, in 1966 and 1968, two additional pieces of legislation estab-
lished the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and
the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a diagram, and I would like to ask Mr.
Bradley perhaps briefly to explain it to you, and then I shall be
happy to accept questions at this point.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, Mr. Bradley?

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in
spite of the unique quality of the Smithsonian, I think our orga-
nization is fairly orthodox and conventional.

I would like to point out the Secretary was authorized by the act
of 1846 to have assistants, and there evolved from that the idea of
having an alter ego, originally one Assistant Secretary. We have on
another chart the growth curve of the Institution. It goes steadily
uphill. It has become necessary therefore to have three Assistant
Secretaries. Their function is the conventional one of assisting the
Secretary in his executive direction, responsibility, and accounta-
bility for the work of the program bureaus. These units perform the
work that represents the motivation and the principal programmatic
efforts of the Institution.

There also are administrative services and technical and support
services which are necessary to facilitate the work of the programmatic
organizations. We try to keep administration in the supporting units
and keep the professionalism in the main organizations free of ad-
ministrative responsibilities, to the extent we can.

We have a secretariat which is an extension, if you please, of the
assistants to the Secretary. This gives an opportunity for the Secre-
tary to get a broad spectrum of discussion and advice, and sometimes
dissent and opposing views, and helps to identify for him his options.

Because of its nature, with the diversity that the Secretary touched
on which arises from our interest in history, science, and art, and many
subramifications within those fields, the Smithsonian finds itself with
a number of advisory boards and commissions. We probably have
twice the number shown on the chart. We show here the principal
boards and commissions only, in order not to overweight the chart.
They represent advisory boards in various fields—space, a commis-
ion on portraits, on the collection of fine arts, the Armed Forces
Museum, the trustees of the Woodrow Wilson Center, the Smithsonian
overall council that meets periodically in order to evaluate the total
program—what are we doing, how well are we doing it, what should
we be doing, what should we not be doing—the Foreign Currency
Program Advisory Board which assists in doling out our $2 million
or $3 million worth of foreign currency, and then in New York City
the advisory board for the Cooper-Hewitt Museum.

Mr. THOMPSON. If that can be produced in reduced form, we will
put it in the record.

Mr. BRADLEY. Yes; we shall do that.

Mr. THOMPSON. And add any other boards and commissions.

Mr. BRADLEY. Yes, sir.
May I take just another few minutes?

Of course, the most recent organization of the Smithsonian is the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. This is statutory. It is a part of the Smithsonian, with its own board of trustees, but it is intertwined with the Smithsonian, and by law is a part of the Smithsonian.

We have also national museum programs. These are derivatives of the traditional programs. The traveling exhibition service is a derivative of the act creating the National Collection of Fine Arts, which says go, promote the appreciation of art, and take the exhibitions to the country. That is an example.

The Natural History Museum, evolving from the original museum founded by the act of 1846, the Air and Space Museum, the National Zoo, the Astrophysical Observatory, the Tropical Research Institute, all founded by statute, are other principal organizations.

Under history and art, we have the Museum of History and Technology, which was dedicated in 1964; the National Collection of Fine Arts; the National Portrait Gallery; the Freer Gallery of Art; and so forth.

The public service aspects of the Institution derive directly from Henry’s admonition. It is not so important, he said, what we accumulate within these walls as what we send out from within these walls to the world. This is essentially our public service objective, focusing on getting what we are doing into the hands of the public.

The academic programs signify the original purpose of the Institution. The word “knowledge” represents the Smithsonian. Thus, in furtherance of knowledge, we have educational programs.

The supporting units are rather conventional—personnel, buildings management, treasurer, administrative services, and general counsel, all in support of the programmatic organizations.

(The chart follows:)
Mr. Thompson. First of all, I would like to thank you, Dr. Ripley, for a very comprehensive and enlightening statement. As you know, we discussed this matter in my office, and you certainly did exactly what I had in mind, which I feel will be of great benefit not only to the members of this committee, but the full committee and eventually, I hope, in the form of a report to the Members of the House.

I have learned a great deal here this morning. This is the first time in a long time that there has been any comprehensive history in chronological order of the establishment of the Institution. It will be extremely valuable to us.

Next week and following, we will have a number of interesting witnesses, and by the time we have finished, it is my hope, using this splendid statement as the base, we will have an extremely comprehensive view of the Institution in sufficient detail that we can proceed.

You referred to the fact that there is some legislation already pending. It is my understanding that the other body is now ready to accept the enlargement of the Board of Regents which passed the House some time ago. I hope we shall be ready soon to take up the bill to extend the Museum Act, because we consider that to be extremely important.

I think I will defer to my colleagues at this time, and then come back later for any questions which I might have.

Mr. Brademas?

Mr. Brademas. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Ripley, I want to join the chairman in expressing appreciation to you for a really first-class statement detailing the origins and development of the Smithsonian Institution. I have great admiration and respect for you and the splendid members of your staff, as I think you are aware, but that admiration in no way diminishes my desire to put some questions to you.

In looking at the July 1 GAO Report to Congress on the Smithsonian Institution, I notice that there is a breakdown of the sources of financial support for the Smithsonian. Those sources are not so broken down as to make possible an exact judgment, as I read the chart, on Federal as distinguished from non-Federal financial support.

However, I roughly calculate—if you have an annual budget in the area of $50 million—that approximately $35 million of that can be ascribed to Federal sources.

Mr. Bradley, perhaps you will straighten me out if I am not accurate in that judgment.

Mr. Bradley. Sir, that is approximately correct. We could tighten up on it, but the essential facts are correct there, recognizing that this report is based on the years 1968 and 1969. We have now moved into 1970 and 1971 fiscal years and those figures sometimes get into the discussion, also. For 1969, that is approximately correct. I will supply for the record a list of the amounts involved.

[List follows:]
The Basic Sources of Funds for the Smithsonian Institution

For operating purposes:

Fiscal year 1976

Federal appropriations:
- Salaries and expenses—operating funds: $29,965,000
- Special foreign currency program: 2,316,000
- District of Columbia—operations of the National Zoo: 2,802,000
- Research grants and contracts (Federal and private): 10,600,000

Private Funds:
- Gifts—excluding gifts to endowment funds (entire amount restricted to specific projects and hence unavailable for general operating expenses): 2,000,000
- Income from endowments and current fund investments: 1,400,000

Total support for operations: 49,083,000

For construction:
- National Zoological Park: 600,000
- Restoration and renovation of buildings: 525,000
- Toward construction of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden: 3,500,000

Total construction: 4,625,000

This information appears on pages 1 and 2 of the statement entitled “Smithsonian Finances and Financial Management,” prepared by Mr. T. Ames Wheeler, Treasurer of the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. Brademas: As I understand the recommendations of the General Accounting Office, one of them goes to the question of the internal audit on activities that are funded with Federal funds. Is that correct?

Mr. Bradley: It does.

Mr. Brademas: So, what the GAO has really raised questions about concerns the great bulk of the Smithsonian’s funds.

Mr. Bradley: I would interpret it really to run to both sides, but certainly to include the Federal side.

Mr. Brademas: I am just looking at page 26 of the GAO report, which concludes that “we believe that expansion of internal audit effort by the Smithsonian on activities financed from Federal funds would result in a more effective audit of its operations,” and then goes on to say that “the policies and practices discussed demonstrate the need for increased internal audit of activities financed with Federal funds.”

I take it the point made by the GAO report is that you have had pretty good auditing with respect to private money, but that the GAO has not been too pleased with the auditing and its effectiveness with respect to Federal funds. Is that accurate?

Mr. Bradley: That is accurate.

Mr. Brademas: The point I am trying to get at is that most of the money that you spend is Federal money.

Mr. Bradley: That is right.

Mr. Brademas: Therefore, it takes on a rather different cast than if most of the money you were spending were private money.

Mr. Bradley: Of course.

Mr. Brademas: I also understand, as I read through this report, that you have responded, as it were, affirmatively to the recommendations of the GAO. There does not seem to be any disagreement between
you at the Smithsonian and the General Accounting Office with respect to your following through on the recommendations they have made; is that correct?

Mr. Bradley. That is correct as to internal audit; yes, sir.

Mr. Brademas. Is there any difference in opinion between the Smithsonian and the GAO with respect to any recommendations they may have made to you?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir. The principal recommendation, as we see it, that the GAO suggested be considered by the Congress, related to the use of $336,000 appropriated for the reconstruction of the central part and the addition of monumental wings to the Natural History Building, which happened some years ago but the final expenditures were made in this later fiscal year and so came under their purview. Their point was that the funds normally appropriated for construction shall not be used for anything that is not attached to the building. We have consistently—and so have other agencies—sought to produce a turn-key building complete with everything in it, including furniture, furnishings, book stacks, storage cases, and so on, all ready to go as necessary parts of a new structure. It would have made no difference to us whatsoever if we had not used construction funds for such things as these furnishings and equipment but, rather, had reduced that from the construction appropriation and then gone over to the "Salaries and expenses" operating account and obtained the same money.

So, we justified to our two appropriations committees, in the House and Senate, in some detail that we would like to have as a part of the construction appropriation, which totaled $13,500,000, an amount for furnishings and equipment along with a lot of other things—light bulbs, landscaping, diversion of a sewer, air conditioning, and so forth. We detailed and outlined it in the budgetary justifications, and we showed that justification to the General Accounting Office. We are at a loss to understand why there is any question about the expenditure of funds justified for furniture and furnishings and equipment when we expended it for the very purposes for which we justified it to the Congress and for which it was so appropriated, without dissent.

Mr. Brademas. I do not mean to pursue this particular question in great detail. It seems to me obvious that one ought always to be on the side of expending funds for the purpose for which they were intended. But I must say as I look at the first page of the GAO report and read the sentence under "Findings and Conclusions" observing that the Smithsonian misused $40,095 and that the Smithsonian also misused another $3,835, and GAO is upset about that—when I think of what goes on over in the Department of Defense, my blood does not boil very much about the Smithsonian’s shortcomings.

That is, of course, not to say I am endorsing inappropriate expenditures of public funds. Obviously not, but I do hope that some of the zeal which is displayed in the GAO report on the Smithsonian can also be pointed in other directions where the payoff might be far richer, from the taxpayer’s viewpoint.

Mr. Thomson. If the gentleman will yield, later in the hearings, as a matter of fact next week, we will hear from representatives of Peat, Marwick & Mitchell, the auditors of private funds of the Smithsonian and, as indicated, we will hear from the GAO as well. We will get a comprehensive picture of this.
Mr. Brademas. Dr. Ripley, I wonder if you could comment on the present status of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

Dr. Ripley. The present status of the Center is that after the legislation incorporating it in 1968, and the setting up of the Board of Trustees, the Trustees proceeded to meet and discovered that they had no particular funds to operate with. However, they were anxious to continue and develop the momentum which had appeared in the hearings and discussions in which Secretary Rusk and a number of proponents of a memorial to Woodrow Wilson had taken part, and in which I had proffered the services of the Smithsonian to attempt to coordinate the efforts to find a setting and a site for the Center, feeling it was within the traditional purview of the Institution.

Funds became available in the form of $100,000 the first year, and a subsequent grant from the Ford Foundation of $40,000 gave us a budget of $140,000. With this we were able to secure a director, who was an acting director, Benjamin H. Read, and to attempt to set up a program.

There were no physical facilities except those that existed within the Smithsonian. Fortunately, some 2 or 3 years before, we had asked for reconstruction funds for the Smithsonian parent building, the castle, in order to set up additional facilities for research scholars. This program had been continuing during this period of time and had been the direct result of the moveout of some of the staff into the Museum of History and Technology and some into the newly constructed wings of the Natural History Museum. Under the circumstances, it seemed only appropriate for us to make some of the newly constituted research quarters available to the Nation's Woodrow Wilson Center so their program could get underway.

We have done so. With the concurrence of the Board of Trustees, we have participated in trying to set aside some research space for visiting scholars if and when they come.

The deliberations of the Trustees have produced a program for fellows, schematically organized to concern itself not only with the interests of Woodrow Wilson himself, which were broad and which we can only assume that, were he alive today, would be still broader, but also with the siting of the Center in Washington, D.C., where facilities and resources already exist in the Library of Congress, in adjacent Government bureaus, in the Archives and in the libraries, collections, and centers already here—they exist but are not, as it were, being capitalized as forming a core group of advanced scholars.

The Trustees have set up two schematic approaches. One is in the area of the law of the sea: International studies which have a direct relation not only to law itself, to the Nation's laws and to international law, but also to the uses of the sea in connection with marine ecological, developmental, environmental studies, and the programs of the National Council on Marine Resources. The other program is in what I have termed social biology; that is, the interface where sociology comes up against the biological components of the environment. These two areas seem to be seminal ones, and ones which are concerned largely with the current thrust of thinking in certain parts of Washington and could be therefore captured.
We have advertised, as it were, through the academic fraternity, for possible scholars, people who might be willing to be fellows, and we have asked for a budget. In fiscal 1971, the Congress has allocated funds approximately equal to the proposed budget, and it remains to be seen whether this will be accepted within the President's program.

Mr. Brademas. Thank you.

Let me put a couple of other questions to you, and let me express the hope that you will give me rather briefer replies, because I want to be sure my colleagues have a chance to put questions to you. We are children of the House here, not of the Senate, and we impose time limits on ourselves.

I understand, Mr. Secretary, that you have characterized some of the recent publicity concerning the proposed Hirshhorn collection as a smear, if I do not misrepresent you. I am sure you will straighten me out if I have.

Could you comment on the role of the Smithsonian in obtaining that collection, give us your judgment on its significance, and perhaps comment on the naming of the building? I am sure you are aware that this matter has been the subject of some discussion in the press and I raise the question also in view of the experience of the Smithsonian with the National Gallery of Art and the relationship between the Gallery and Mr. Mellon.

Dr. Ripley, Mr. Brademas, I did not characterize the particular publicity incident to the discussion of the Hirshhorn affair as a smear. In our house publication, I characterized some of the general spate of publicity which has come out in the past year as a smear, which included other things.

However, the role of the Smithsonian has been to encourage the acceptance of the gift of the Hirshhorn collection by the Nation, and in connection with that I am very happy to accede to the concept that the building should be named the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

We have many examples of equivalent buildings on the Mall and in other parts of the Nation which have been named after a donor. There is constant discussion and argument in the press and among aficionados of this sort of thing as to whether or not this is noble or ignoble in any instance, whether or not it will add to the collection or depreciate the collection, whether or not it will serve the general purposes of the public.

James Smithson is memorialized in the form of the Smithsonian Institution Building. We have the Freer Gallery and the Freer collection, which was accepted by the Regents of the Smithsonian for the United States on a far more narrow and restrictive basis than anything in the present legislation regarding Hirshhorn. Except for the sole surviving member of the friends of Mr. Freer who were thought to have his esthetic tastes in mind—namely, Mrs. Eugene Meyer—it is impossible for any other person to give anything to the Freer collection. It is not impossible for people to give things to the Hirshhorn collection, and they already have been doing so, and I will sumbit a list of such gifts.

[List follows:]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of gift and donor</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Title, date</th>
<th>Medium, dimensions</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 1967, George Rickey</td>
<td>Rickey</td>
<td>3 Red Lines, 1966</td>
<td>Stainless steel, 37 feet Height</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1968, Rose Fried</td>
<td>Baerling, Olie</td>
<td>Sculpture in Steel, XYH, 1967</td>
<td>Steel, 110 1/2 inches Height</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Baerling</td>
<td>Lelu, 1950</td>
<td>Oil on canvas, 23 1/2 by 36</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Baerling</td>
<td>Rebanuki, 1965</td>
<td>Oil on canvas, 39 1/4 by 30</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1968, John Streep</td>
<td>Torres-Garcia, Joaquin</td>
<td>Construction in Wood (daylight experiment), 1968</td>
<td>Oil on canvas, 28 1/2 by 23 1/2</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1968, John Ferren</td>
<td>Ferren</td>
<td>Magnificent, 1966</td>
<td>Painted wood, 72 by 50 inches</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Ferren</td>
<td>Untitled (Mandala on olive green), 1965</td>
<td>Oil on canvas, 76 by 72 inches</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1968, Raphael Soyer</td>
<td>Nakian, Reuben</td>
<td>Portrait head of Raphael Soyer, 1932</td>
<td>Original plaster, 20 1/4 inches Height</td>
<td>63,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1968, Norman Granz</td>
<td>Picasso, Pablo</td>
<td>50 graphics 1963-66</td>
<td>Stainless steel, 22 feet by 40 inches</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 1969, Jose De Rivera</td>
<td>de Rivera</td>
<td>Construction No. 107, 1969</td>
<td>Steel, 23 1/2 inch Length</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1969, Grace Borgenicht Gallery</td>
<td>Chirino, Martin</td>
<td>Homage to Julio Gonzalez</td>
<td>11 sculptures, 15 works on paper.</td>
<td>99,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1969, Claim Gross</td>
<td>Gross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1969, Willem De Kooning</td>
<td>de Kooning</td>
<td>Seated Man c. 1939</td>
<td>Oil on canvas, 38 by 34 inches</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1969, Albert Loev and Krugier Gallery</td>
<td>Poupousteguy, Jean</td>
<td>Untitled Drawing, 1963</td>
<td>Pen and ink, 19 1/2 by 25 1/2</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1939, Roland, Kenneth</td>
<td>Noland</td>
<td>Daybreak, 1963</td>
<td>Acrylic, 68 1/2 by 68 1/2</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1969, Still, Clyfford</td>
<td>Still</td>
<td>No. 34, 1960</td>
<td>Oil on canvas, 111 1/4 by 74 1/2</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Still</td>
<td>No. 36, 1960</td>
<td>Oil on canvas, 108 by 92</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Still</td>
<td>No. 39, 1962-D</td>
<td>Oil on canvas, 113 1/4 by 146 1/2</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1969, Mrs. G. David Thompson</td>
<td>Ternbach, Joseph</td>
<td>Replica of Brancusi Bird in Space</td>
<td>Marble 82 inches Height</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Partial gift.

Note: There were 27 Paintings, 18 Sculptures, 50 Graphics. Total No. of items: 95. Total value $586,450.
Dr. Ripley. We have also the tradition within the Nation that other buildings, let us say the Guggenheim Museum in New York, memorialize the name of a donor and are built or not built with funds provided by that donor, because both cases occur. After a period of time the museum stands as an entity by itself. It encourages, or not, collections. I would say the relative merits or demerits of naming a building after a particular person are secondary to the question of the acquisition of the collection.

Mr. Brademas. Thank you.

Let me ask you a question of a different kind. Could you give us any comment on the relationship between the Smithsonian and other museums in the United States? I raise this question in light, for example, of some of the findings of the Belmont report, which indicated that museums in America generally are in great trouble because of the enormous increase in numbers of persons who are visiting them and using them, and the consequent increase in costs and financial pressures, and also in light of the National Museum Act of 1966, which, as I understand it, is aimed at encouraging a leadership role for the Smithsonian in the museum field in the United States. I am interested really in getting some judgment from you on how you see the future so far as the Smithsonian and museums in the United States are concerned.

Dr. Ripley. I intend to speak to this shortly, Mr. Brademas, but I realize you want me to be brief. Therefore, sir, I will make just a very brief statement at this point.

The National Museum Act, as I understand it, was not contemplated as a large-scale granting act, because that is done by Government bureaus—the Health, Education, and Welfare Department or similar enormous Government bureaus. It was, rather, a method of expressing in language the implicit fact that for many years the Smithsonian had been looked to for help and assistance by other museums, not necessarily physical or financial help or assistance, although by the 1890's I believe the Smithsonian had given away more collections than it then held. We have continually changed, loaned, or given away collections, particularly in the natural history field, over the years.

Rather, the idea was that in any one year there may be 15 to 100 requests from small museums, large museums, museums all over the United States and abroad, for everything ranging from a personal request to me from the Government of Canada, for example, to give them a prototype model of what a museum complex should be and consist of, to a request from a museum in Terre Haute saying they would like to have some advice about how to hire a technician, and what they should look for in qualities that he should possess to perform his work.

You see the variety of kinds of things that simply exist here within our elaborate complex of museum-like activities, quite aside from the basic research and publication activities we have inherited.

Therefore, it seems incumbent on the Smithsonian to return as part of its service to the American people such knowledge and skills and facilities as we can without any great assumption of financial burden. That is the essential purpose of the act.
I may say that it also recognizes the dire straits that museums are in today and which, Mr. Brademas, have pointed out both at meetings of museum groups and associations, and also in articles that you have published.

It is true that museums are in dire straits because they are constantly being asked by schools and colleges to perform services for which their buildings were not designed, for which their initial complex of curators and staff were not fitted out. In every way, from cloakrooms and restroom facilities for children and children’s classes, all the way through to the needs for educational assistance, and so on, the museums are in dire straits for support to meet what is a recognition by the schools and colleges of a real educational service that they can perform.

Mr. Brademas. Thank you very much, Dr. Ripley. I hope that we shall have an opportunity to have you for another day of testimony, because I would like to hear you at greater length on the whole question of what the Smithsonian has in mind for the next three decades. I hope somebody there is thinking in terms of the next three decades.

I am also interested in hearing from you at greater length on the last point to which you made reference; namely, the relationship between the Smithsonian Institution and elementary and secondary schools and colleges and universities in the United States, because I am aware that you have programs in this area, but I do not feel that I am well enough informed on exactly what you are doing. I hope we will have a chance to put to you and your associates questions on that subject.

I want to express my appreciation to you for your testimony and again say I think the country is very fortunate in having a man of your caliber at the head of so vital a national resource as the Smithsonian Institution.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Thomsen. Mr. Bingham.

Mr. Bingham. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to join in welcoming Dr. Ripley and his associates. It is a pleasure to have you before this committee. I would like to say in a general way I am impressed once again, from your statement, at the extraordinary scope of the Smithsonian’s activities.

I have the impression, not so much from your statement as from what I have read and heard in the last few years, that during your tenure the Smithsonian has been an extraordinarily lively and provocative and dynamic institution as contrasted with the somewhat stuffy atmosphere that pervaded its activities in earlier years. I would not expect you to comment on that because I am sure you would not want to reflect on your predecessors, but that is my impression. I have received from time to time the bulletins of your activities, and again the range and scope are extraordinary. Also, I think you have shown quite clearly in your administration a remarkable degree of energy and imagination.

Mr. Brademas has covered some of the points I had wanted to ask about. I have one or two others that I would like to take up at this time.

I do hope we will have further opportunity, Mr. Chairman, because there are a number of matters we will want to go into.
Mr. Thompson. If the gentleman will yield, I think I have already indicated that we would like more of Dr. Ripley's time. I think it might be best following today, after the development of the hearings, for him to come back at a later date for a wrapup.

Mr. Bingham. I do think that would be appropriate.

I would like to know a little more at this time of your relationship with the John F. Kennedy Center. I did not realize that this was a part of the Smithsonian. I wonder what degree of supervision you have, and specifically I would like to know to what extent you were involved in the plans for the building. Were they submitted for your approval?

Dr. Ripley. Thank you very much, Mr. Bingham, for that question. I am able to say that the month I arrived on the scene, January, prior to my assuming office in February—January 24, 1964, I think the date was—the Regents had a meeting at the Smithsonian, and at that meeting they reported that two or three of them had just come from a meeting in the White House at which the bill had been signed renaming the National Cultural Center the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

During the ensuing months, I discovered that, except for the question of the size of the auditorium, the building itself was planned in detail. So, I was able to take no personal part in any redesign or in the question of the design of the building. My hope, expressed to the chairman, who was also the cultural adviser to the President, Mr. Stevens, was that a strong educational component be introduced into the activities of the building, and a strong contact with the people be introduced into the activities of the building, because I felt this was consonant with the purposes of the Smithsonian Institution, and that it would behoove the Secretary of the Institution to be able to speak to these issues.

However, the construction of the building presupposes that it will essentially be for performing arts and performances, and except for the small theater on the roof which could house not only film showings but other kinds of demonstrations and talks, and except for guided tours and the possibility of certain gallery-like facilities in the building in the great halls, there is at the moment relatively less opportunity for direct educational involvement than one might expect.

The fact that it is a bureau of the Smithsonian is essentially nominal. It is under its own board. I merely sit as a member of the trustees and on some of the select committees. Therefore, I take part in the deliberations. The only constituent legislative requirement to the setting up of the incorporation was that the Regents of the Smithsonian should find at a certain date that there were funds in hand to complete the building. They found these funds were in hand. I may add parenthetically, before it was discovered that the bids, and so on, required additional funds. The Regents were not involved in the subsequent testimony and hearings held on the need for more funds. By that time they had satisfied their legislative requirement.

Mr. Bingham. Would you tell us a little bit about the publication that you inaugurated this year, and what the status of that publication is?

Dr. Ripley. This is a magazine which has been developed as an effort to reach associates more than 50 miles from Washington. We have developed an organization called the Smithsonian Associates. This
organization already encompasses some 30,000 people in the immediate environs of Washington, with some 11,000 paid individual or family memberships. The programs of the associates in the Washington area are essentially only visible to those who are within motoring or walking distance of the buildings.

It had been the intention from the beginning to attempt to set up a national organization of associates. So we started this fall, after 2 years of study, a National Associates magazine by soliciting memberships in the National Associates. At the present time we have something over 180,000 members of this National Associates organization. We have a beginning board for the National Associates. The chairman is one of our Regents, Mr. Marvin Watson.

The magazine has gotten off to an interesting and, I think, very successful start. The purpose of the magazine is to create a first link between someone living more than 50 miles from Washington and the Smithsonian itself.

Mr. Thompson. Is there any significance in the fact that that early issue has two elephants on the cover?

Dr. Ripley. I have been asked that before, Mr. Chairman. It seemed like a fortuitous accident.

Mr. Thompson. It is very attractive. I like it.

Mr. Bingham. Is this the publication that was advertised at one time in the New York Times, I believe, in a full-page advertisement?

Dr. Ripley. We had a full-page ad in the New York Times, last autumn I believe it was, about the formation of the National Associates and about the fact that this would be the first direct benefit to the National Associates. We plan subsequently, as the organization of the National Associates develops, not only to offer the magazine, and trips, and facilities when a person visits Washington, but also special publications of the Institution including, I hope, eventually educational kits which will be related to the basic activities of the Institution, ranging from minerals to American history.

Mr. Bingham. Have there been other advertisements in other publications? Have you had an advertising program, or just the one ad?

Dr. Ripley. As far as I know, that was the only case.

Mr. Bingham. Would you say the results from that advertisement have brought more than reimbursement for its expense?

Dr. Ripley. Yes; at present our funds in hand have covered the investment in setting up the magazine.

Mr. Bingham. Do you find that the response to this effort indicates that there is a demand for such a publication in light of the fact that there are so many publications of various kinds?

Dr. Ripley. We have done one or two test mailings on the kinds of people who become national associates. The magazine was started as the first link on the basis of a hunch that there were many people at a sort of professional level in the country who would be interested in a monthly account of this sort which embraces art, history, science, and so on, the manifold interests of the Institution. The response from these test mailings show that over 60 percent of the people who have become national associates are people at a high professional level or capacity. This is expressed in the answers concerning their careers and the kinds of income they have, and so on. This is an astonishing response so far as the magazine is concerned.
Mr. Bingham. Do you consider this primarily an educational activity, with a secondary purpose being to raise funds?

Dr. Ripley. We consider it, as I say, the first goal to develop a national associates group. The national associates group will be offered educational and cultural facilities because they are national associates and because of their interest expressed by having become so.

At the same time, as I pointed out in my little editorial in the June issue, the Society of Friends that was envisaged by the Regents and Secretary Charles Walcott in 1827, was to spin off, as a side effect, knowledge of the Smithsonian, and inferentially perhaps some private support. One of the things that worried the committee of the Regents and the development committee that was set up in 1927 was the very fact pointed out by Mr. Brademas and Mr. Thompson. In 1927, congressional appropriations to the Smithsonian had grown to 63 percent of its small budget. Federal support has since grown faster than income from endowment funds. But as a private establishment we have had more research contracts, Government and private. In 1969 our support was about 68 percent Federal and 25 percent grants and contracts, and only 7 percent endowment funds.

It seemed to us that the original concept of the Smithsonian embodied the thought that we would not only come to the Federal Government annually for appropriations for the support of the museum-like facilities, but we would also seek to interest the American public in supporting this valuable Institution.

Mr. Bingham. One final question. Do you have a program today of encouraging bequests and legacies in a systematic way?

Dr. Ripley. Yes, but not in a systematic way as yet. We have a small program. I write letters. I have been encouraged to do so by the Regents, I may say. Senator Saltonstall was particularly concerned during his tenure as a Regent about the fact that the resources of the U.S. Government were finite and that the programs of the U.S. Government were so varied and multifarious that the share that could potentially be allotted to support of Smithsonian activities would continue to be very limited, and that the support of the buildings and the public services involved required that we attempt somehow or other to interest the public in supporting it.

Mr. Bingham. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thompson. Dr. Ripley, how often do the Regents meet?

Dr. Ripley. The Regents meet regularly three times a year as a body, and they may meet inbetween for exceptional circumstances, but under the Organic Act the possibilities of inbetween meetings has been taken care of by the setting up of an executive committee.

Mr. Thompson. How many members are on the executive committee?

Dr. Ripley. The executive committee consists of the Chief Justice ex officio as Chancellor, and three other members and myself as a member of the permanent or fiduciary committee.

Mr. Thompson. Is the executive committee empowered to act for the Regents in interim periods?

Dr. Ripley. With appropriate information.

Mr. Thompson. Do they have a set of bylaws under which they operate?

Dr. Ripley. Yes, they do.
Mr. Thompson. Will you make that part of the record?
Dr. Ripley. Yes, I will.
(The document follows:)

**Functions of the Executive Committee**

Neither the Board of Regents nor the Executive Committee thereof have ever adopted by-laws as such. Instead, they have exercised their authority in accordance with the procedural provisions of the original Act of August 10, 1846, and resolutions adopted or amended from time to time by the Board. In addition, certain practices and traditions, such as the election of the Chief Justice as Chancellor of the Board, have grown up and are now accepted as customary.

The Act of August 10, 1846, provides that the Board of Regents shall elect three of their own body as an Executive Committee; and also that the Executive Committee may act for the Board of Regents in the certification of payments for debts or the certification of claims on contracts. Joseph Henry identified the duties of the Executive Committee to consist of executing the acts of the Board generally and examining and certifying appropriations necessary to operations of the Institution. In 1903, a study committee defined the duties of the Executive Committee as including: auditing the accounts of the Institution and its branches; advising the Secretary upon matters of new policy; and reporting to the Board upon all matters referred to it. Essentially these have continued to be the duties of the Executive Committee.

On January 24, 1894, the Board of Regents passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Executive Committee and the Secretary are hereby constituted a permanent committee, with authority to accept for the Institution any property, real, personal, or mixed, that may be given to it for its purposes, "the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men," with power to sell or convert such property, and to invest the proceeds in such manner as may appear to them for the interests of the Institution: Provided, That no deposit be made of such proceeds with the permanent fund in the United States Treasury other than by special resolution of the Regents.

Resolved, That the income derived from the property administered by the committee constituted by the preceding resolution be appropriated for the service of the Institution, to be expended by the Secretary under the conditions of the resolution relative to income and expenditure adopted by the Board of Regents.

Thereafter the Permanent Committee has been responsible for the financial oversight of gifts, bequests, and investments. On December 14, 1916, the Board of Regents:

Resolved, That the American Security and Trust Company of Washington, D.C., and the firm of Spencer Trask and Company of New York City, are hereby appointed the fiscal advisers of the Smithsonian Institution; Provided, that no expense is incurred thereby.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution is requested to notify the members of the Permanent Committee when funds are available for investment, or it appears desirable to make changes in securities already in the possession of the Institution, and to make such recommendations to the Committee, after consultation with the fiscal advisers, as may in his judgment be desirable.

Resolved, That the Permanent Committee adopt the policy of a consolidated fund for the various funds of the Smithsonian Institution now or hereafter in its charge, other than the one million dollars deposited in the United States Treasury as authorized by law, or where the conditions of the gift are such that it must be invested as a separate fund.

Resolved further, That the percentage of income paid on each fund entering into the consolidated fund shall be the same.

On December 11, 1919, the Board of Regents:

Resolved, That the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution hereby authorizes and directs its Permanent Committee to represent the Board in all matters pertaining to the receipt and installation of all gifts from the late Charles Lang Freer, and in carrying out the provisions of his will, dated May 13, 1918, and of the codicil thereto, dated May 4, 1919, so far as they relate to the Smithsonian Institution.
On December 8, 1921, the Board of Regents:

Resolved, That the Permanent Committee is hereby authorized and empowered to accept, provided such acceptance, in its judgment, be advantageous to the Institution, gifts or bequests of property, real, personal, or mixed, the income from which shall not be available for the use of the Institution until after the termination of a certain period defined in the gift or bequest, during which period said income shall be paid to some beneficiary named therein; Provided, further, that such acceptance shall not involve the Institution in the possibility of financial loss of any kind.

On January 5, 1925, the Board of Regents:

Resolved, That the matter of securing an endowment of One Million Dollars for the Smithsonian Institution through the plan proposed by Messrs. Tamblyn & Brown be approved, and referred to the Permanent Committee Of the Board of Regents with power to act.

On December 8, 1927, the Board of Regents:

Resolved, That the membership of the Permanent Committee be increased to six, to consist of the Executive Committee, the Secretary, and two other members of the Board.

In practice, since 1954, the Permanent Committee (consisting of the Executive Committee, the Chancellor, and the Secretary) has participated in the deliberations of the Executive Committee in the examination of the assets of the Institution. It has served also as an interim steering committee on matters of policy between meetings of the Board of Regents, and it has served to review the agenda and the policy issues to be laid before the Board of Regents.

At the Board of Regents meeting in May 1965, the following resolutions were amended:

Resolution adopted January 24, 1894, as amended May 19, 1965:

Resolved, That the Executive Committee and the Secretary or Acting Secretary are hereby constituted a Permanent Committee, with authority to accept for the Institution any property, real, personal, or mixed, that may be given to it for its purposes—the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men—with power to sell or convert such property, and to invest the proceeds in such manner as may appear to them for the interests of the Institution;

Resolution adopted December 12, 1918, as amended May 19, 1965:

Resolved, That the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution hereby grants authority to the Secretary or Acting Secretary of the Institution to transfer any property, and to execute deeds conveying title to any real estate, which may hereafter be disposed of, with approval of the Permanent Committee on behalf of the Smithsonian Institution.

Dr. Ripley. In this connection, the body of activities of the Smithsonian is so great that we instituted in 1966 a regular newsletter to the Regents which attempts not only to amplify the regular correspondence, but also to keep them informed of all public and private activities of the Institution.

Mr. Thompson. How frequently do you send that to the Regents?

Dr. Ripley. The newsletter comes out, I would say, eight times a year; and in addition, of course, I can give you an example of the last 3 months' correspondence with the chairman of the executive committee. Each letter sent by me to the chairman on any matter, an average of one or two a week, is replied to by the chairman of the executive committee.

Mr. Thompson. Who is the current chairman?

Dr. Ripley. Dr. Caryl P. Haskins.

Mr. Thompson. The Smithsonian Institution answers for appropriations to the Subcommittee on Interior.

Dr. Ripley. That is right.

Mr. Thompson. The chairman is our colleague, Mrs. Julia Hansen. In the Senate, which subcommittee?

Dr. Ripley. The Subcommittee on the Interior under Senator Bible. Interior and Related Agencies, it is called.
Mr. Thompson. As you know, the subcommittee hearings are invariably closed hearings.

Dr. Ripley. The Senate hearing is open.

Mr. Thompson. The House hearings are invariably closed for a variety of reasons which we hope to correct in the next day or so. Not even Members of Congress, except if they are to testify, are allowed in those hearings. Therefore, to a very large extent we have to rely upon our colleagues on those committees, and we have to listen very carefully to them when they bring their bills to the floor, but we do not have available to us complete copies of their hearings.

I refer to this, not to grind an ax, but simply to explain in the event of any duplication before these open hearings, it is inadvertent on our part because we are not privy to all the information that they have.

Dr. Ripley. The hearings are published, are they not, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Thompson. Long after the enactment or the passage of the bills. They are not generally available. The hearings of the Subcommittee on the Interior were available, however, 14 days before the bill came up. Representative Julia Butler Hansen is chairman. Of course, the three House Members on the Regents—Mr. Bow, Mr. Kirwan, and Chairman Mahon—are all members of the Committee on Appropriations. Historically, have the House Regents been members of the Appropriations Committee?

Dr. Ripley. Not in every case. I would say that is coincidental.

Mr. Brademas. I would express the hope—it is only a hope because I am sure there is little we can do about it—that the Regents would be drawn, so far as Regents from the House of Representatives are concerned, from a somewhat broader spectrum than the Committee on Appropriations. I know Mr. Kirwan has announced that he will not seek reelection, thereby creating a vacancy. Who appoints the Regents?

Dr. Ripley. Under the act, the Speaker appoints them.

Mr. Brademas. We do not know who the new Speaker will be, but educated guesses can be made in that respect. I would express the hope that a Member of the House—I say this with no disrespect, obviously, to any of the three distinguished members of the Committee on Appropriations who presently sit as Regents—that someone not of that committee might be named as the member to fill Mr. Kirwan's vacancy, for reasons that I think need not be elaborated on.

Mr. Thompson. In connection with the appropriations process, of course, although the hearings are printed, a great deal of the testimony before the subcommittees on appropriations is off the record and is not printed. In some instances it is because of classified military material. In other instances it is just that there has developed a pattern of tolerance by the subcommittee chairmen on appropriations to truncate their record. They are very conscious, of course, of the expenditure of Federal money, and they like to save printing costs in a great many instances, thereby leaving the rest of us in the dark.

The House is in session now. So I shall defer a number of questions which I have, Dr. Ripley, since we must adjourn. I do again want to thank you for your splendid cooperation in connection with the setting up of these hearings, and again for your statement.
There are really a great many questions which we will want to ask. Of course, a number of them will be asked, I would assume, of your fellow professors and your counsel with respect to personnel practices and, as Mr. Brademas pointed out, with respect to the next three decades of planning in which we have a great interest because it happens that both Mr. Brademas and I sit as members of the Committee on Education and Labor and have a vital interest in educational matters. Mr. Brademas chairs the subcommittee which handled spectacularly, a few days ago, the arts and humanities legislation and all other matters relating to Federal activity in the arts in the United States.

The next hearing date is Tuesday, July 21, at 10 a.m., in this room. We hope then to cover the Air and Space Museum on which Senator Barry Goldwater has asked to appear before us, and the Smithsonian's administrative structure and operation. We hope on that date to begin looking into some of the detail of the management of the Smithsonian public and private funds.

Mr. Powers. It was our understanding we might continue this afternoon. I gather that is not the case.

Mr. Thompson. I am afraid not.

Mr. Powers. Would you have any objection to our submitting additional statements about the present and future plans of the Smithsonian at the end of today's hearing?

Mr. Thompson. Without objection, they will be made a part of the record. We will look it over. I am sure Mr. Brademas and I will have questions about it.

With that we will adjourn, to meet on Tuesday.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Tuesday, July 21, 1970.)
Statement by the Secretary

In an age of fragmentation, when there seem to be more nations and nationalities than ever before, when scientists and artists alike are concerned with myriad specialties and subsects, how may the Smithsonian live up to its mandate? There are curious countervailing currents at large in the world today. On the one hand the knowledge of things—technological and scientific—is growing exponentially and forcing all of us apparently to live more and more in an homogenized state as we become universally more dependent on our crutches, industrial and private power, communications and transportation. On the other hand the spirit of independence, of "doing your own thing" at all levels from individuals to communes, tribes and on to nations, is having a strong revival. Beyond producing discontent and tension, will these antagonistic currents finally clash, or will they seek out an integrative middle course? Can man live with himself and still be part of a world community?

At the Smithsonian we seek to study and hope to explain areas which can increase man's knowledge of his environment as well as his knowledge of himself. From the point of view of environment the single most important need of humans today is a grasp of the patterns, the functioning of ecosystems, the total environmental milieu in any one of our major climatic zones. On this understanding our physical future depends.

The nature of man continues to evade definition, although we seem to come closer each year. It is worth pointing out in this regard, as Caryl Haskins, the President of the Carnegie Institution, did recently, that man's innate mental equipment is still superior to any known computer and that no one has been able to invent a single interlocking system with as many as ten billion discrete units, or the equivalent of the neural potential of a single human brain.

In many ways this Institution's history of research and study has been helping to set the stage for some of the most engrossing and enthralling achievements of the present. Let us at least as Americans take credit for some triumphs in this age of questioning and confusion. We can single out one supreme feat of the past year, the flight around the moon—the dawn of a new age—followed in July by a very tangible
triumph indeed. That prescient moment this past year was the one during which perhaps half the world’s human population watched, in apparently full realization of what was happening, while a foot in a clumsy shoe and then a leg encased in wrappings, but obviously a human leg, emerged from the bulky shadows in the television screen, and edged its way downward into bright light toward what—moonground, grayish-white and staring as if in some deathly lamplight. The light—twenty times brighter than that we see at the time of the full moon—was earthlight. And so man touched the lunar surface and the rest of us saw it and felt it palpably. Through the astronauts all of us have now somehow touched the moon.

There was a new truth in all this besides the touch, the contact. That was the screen. It was more real to watch it than to read about it. We are perhaps in the beginning of an age when the printed word will suddenly be less like holy writ. All of us have been brought up to believe printed words. From the Bible, or religious writing of some sort right on, we are educated to believe what we read. In the welter of ignorance in which we exist, we still feel that to obtain facts one only need use his training, and so we read history as written by historians, and we read newspapers for instant facts. We use words in the same way, words like “war,” “love,” and “country.” We use words like “environment,” “race,” and “enemy,” and we think they have a meaning even though they are incapable of providing one to our senses. When we use such words—even though they are mere ideas or generalities—and when we believe exactly what we read we are proving a rather sad point about education and textbooks today, namely that, as Jules Henry puts it, much of education serves to confirm us in a state of legitimate social stupidity. It is hard to conceive of this as a goal of education, even though Henry appears to believe this is all some sort of plot. At the same time, constant repetition of slogan phrases—like so many sieg heils—as well as the numbing belief that what we read is true even if our senses tell us otherwise, does tend to create a penumbra, a twilight zone in which the reassurances of conformity can dwell.

When they turned homeward the astronauts affirmed that our planet earth had a warm and receptive look. Not only was it this earth of ours, “this precious stone set in a silver sea,” but it was the only planet around which looked colorful and homey. Home is the hunter, home from outer space. Neil Armstrong reminded us in a moving phrase that the effect of that noble adventure for him had been to generate the hope that as man sets out to know more about space, he may come in the process to learn somewhat more about himself.

In this moment of shared pride and renewed dedication, we of the Smithsonian have our own small part. We can identify ourselves as
concerned with the origins of this whole vast achievement. Charles D. Walcott, fourth Secretary of the Smithsonian, worked for the passage of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics enabling act of 1915, served as Chairman of its first executive committee until 1917, and as a member of the committee until his death in 1927. The National Advisory Committee was transformed into the National Air and Space Administration in 1958. From such small beginnings, organized by Walcott as a mark of scientific respect to his predecessor, former Secretary Samuel P. Langley, have sprung the whole vast panoply of NASA—this creator of the “Spirit of Appollo” as President Nixon has termed it.

We live in a biological universe, that of the earth, and so far as we know it is the only one we will ever live in. Our own age of enlightenment, our own mastery of facts as distinct from ideals or slogans, has shown us that everything in the cosmos—from heavenly bodies to human beings—has developed and continues to develop through evolutionary processes. Thus theoretical biology now pervades all of western culture indirectly through the concept of progressive historical change. Man and his culture have evolved simultaneously, certainly after some finite point, if not before. Increases in brain size must have occurred simultaneously with the unfolding of patterns of social behavior. Primitive forms of art, of religion and even forms of scientific discovery also must have played their part in affecting the development of neural processes and capacity, and their integration. New reaction patterns provide physiological adaptations to man’s own evolving culture. What would seem to be almost certain is that the various components of human culture are now required, not only for the survival of man but also for his existential realization. In our biological universe, man’s continuing evolution helps create his evolving culture, and thereby the two become interdependent, even as they continue to evolve.

A truism in evolutionary studies is the presence of diversity at all levels of systems. In this past year, the Smithsonian opened the first National Portrait Gallery, a long-awaited event, achieved only with the willing cooperation of some of the Nation’s great art galleries, and friendly private collectors, for famous portrait paintings have long since been gathered up largely into state and local historical collections or private institutions. The successful opening exhibition of the Gallery was centered around the theme—what is the American, this man evolved in a New Land? What is this new creation, this “promiscuous breed,” as Oscar Handlin called Americans in his introduction to the catalogue of the exhibition? Only a few were left out in this rich brew of portraits. There were few poor men, no beggarmen to speak of, and perhaps only a thief or two.
But the exhibition did give a clue to the student of populations. A variety of disparate types of populations, set down in a variety of heterogeneously diverse environments, has demonstrated another truism in evolution theory. Even though the original individuals may have separate origins, there is a tendency for a continuing interplay both within and without, so that segregated, small groups tend to develop small cultural as well as physical resemblances. These resemblances aggregate into regional resemblances. These last may eventually aggregate into traits of culture, or character, which do in fact produce recognizable characteristics. So subspecies are born, of geographical isolation, and resulting cultural and physical resemblances in spite of a wide diversity of original genetic combinations. At the same time other changing influences may be at work to break down and recombine these combinations, and so the melting pot continually forms and reforms, blending and blurring the evolving differences.

Looking at this splendid panorama of Americans, one does receive an impression that at least in past years our people had developed a certain series of recognizable types with regional overtones. The New Englander has some shared resemblances with northeasterners. The southeastern mountains have their types, and the Texans are characteristic with shared resemblances to the southwest in general. The differing nationalities have preserved many of their customs as well as certain morphological minor differences. Racial differences seem to have been on a submerging course. Indian tribes have been slowly and steadily losing their distinctness, sometimes stampeding themselves in the race to be like everyone else. Negroes, following the predictions of Raymond Pearl, have been gradually integrating and assimilating themselves into the rest of the general population, especially in cities as they migrated from the farms until recently. Now it remains to be seen if this gradual evolutionary process can be arrested by a conscious effort of will by racists among the blacks. Our great new National Portrait Gallery, so ably started under the direction of Charles Nagel, and now to be continued under his talented successor, Marvin Sadik, is thus a scholarly resource for the other branches of the Smithsonian in history and anthropology as well as in portraiture. Its exhibits and its collections extend in cross currents throughout the Institution.

In the meantime it would seem as if a portrait gallery or any art museum is in some ways more closely akin to what people accept nowadays as the new inculcation by television, than it is to the previous learning by reading and writing. Perhaps TV and museums are more closely allied than we think. The new generation's familiarity with ingestion by TV may serve to habituate them to museum-like education. If this be so, let us hope that museums realize it before someone else takes them over.
The two basic themes which can be demonstrated in a museum setting are perhaps central to our survival on our homely planet. On the one hand there is man's evolving culture, so closely tied in with man's own physical evolution. That culture can be demonstrated more effectively by the use of objects than in almost any other way. And it is that very culture which plays such a fundamental role in our second great theme, man's relation to his environment and the biosphere—that small existing envelope of available land, water, and air within which we can survive. For the present phenomenon is that our culture and our environment are no more at war with each other on terms of rough equality, but that rather our material culture is in danger of destroying our old presumed enemy, nature.

Americans especially have been brought up to be at war with nature, beginning with a European heritage in which it was assumed that nature itself was an enemy against whose onslaughts one built houses and walls, made fires, hunted wild animals, and ate whatever could be wrenched out of the soil. Having hacked and burned our way across the frontier, having been prompted to do this by everything from poetry and English literature (whose word pictures constantly remind us to fear nature) to our new technological culture, we have at last turned the scales. As Ian McHarg and others have recently reminded us, we are about to dominate and subjugate nature and in the process destroy it. Can we demonstrate these facts through visual means, so long as people are more or less unimpressed by reading about them? Can we teach people to care about their future enough to stop the present relentless progression into war, starvation, or suffocation? How can we learn enough about ourselves to stop in time?

During this past winter, the Smithsonian celebrated the third of its annual symposia, this one on recent advances in the understanding of social behavior of higher animals. The implications to be drawn from the symposium, titled “Man and Beast,” were fairly clear, even though no one assumed that primate behavior research can tell us all we need to know about man's behavior. Quite obviously it cannot, and yet the conference was a fine escape from anthropocentrism. There are many things that other creatures from ants to birds to baboons can tell us, which can serve as guides along the way to knowing ourselves. The event was a splendid one, well attended, and the speakers were greeted with enthusiasm not always reserved for such occasions. Much of the credit for all of this must go to Wilton Dillon who took over the complex organization of seminars for us during the past year.

This seminar revealed a characteristic of the Smithsonian. A meeting such as this, assaying relations between human social behavior and principles drawn from the scientific study of animal behavior, seems instantly
to knit together so many common concerns from within the Institution's disparate bureaux. The field is one in which the Smithsonian's Tropical Research Institute in Panama has done leading work for many years. In addition the Office of Ecology, the National Zoological Park, and the Primate Biology Program of the Museum of Natural History have all been involved creatively.

From 13 through 16 May the eleven speakers, several hundred invited participants, and staff members widely drawn from the Smithsonian explored the extent to which aggression, cooperation, competition, and territoriality were common to man and other species. The symposium yielded a rich perspective on the emergence of cultural factors whose operation attenuates the influence of our biological heritage, correcting an overemphasis attributed to innate behavior by a number of popular writers. The opening academic procession represented symbolically the fulfillment of the ideal of a scholarly community which the succeeding days of seminars, colloquia, formal papers, and social events realized in strikingly tangible manner. We are most grateful to the Russell Sage Foundation, The Grant Foundation, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, The Commonwealth Fund, and other contributing sponsors, and also to the inspiring chairmanship of Dr. Alex A. Kwapong, Vice Chancellor of the University of Ghana, who so ably presided. The proceedings of the symposium will shortly appear from the Smithsonian Institution Press under the title Man and Beast: Comparative Social Behavior.

An aspect of the Smithsonian's ideal of functioning as a community of scholars consists of improving communication among the complex of universities and research establishments in the Washington area. In July 1968 we inaugurated a regular bulletin, The Washington Academic Calendar, listing seminars and lectures being given throughout the metropolitan area. This bulletin is mailed as a service to university and independent laboratory staff members. The mailing list for the Calendar, which now contains more than 6,000 names, will serve as the nucleus of a continuing file of Washington area academic interests, listing recipients by discipline and institutional affiliation. We hope eventually to be able to correlate the pattern of academic events with the array of interests in the city and its institutional patterns—a study, as it were, of the academic ecology of an urban area.

As a visible manifestation of our function as a community I can think of no better indication than the award, in a pleasant ceremony before the Joseph Henry statue, on 5 June 1969, of Certificates of Academic Achievement to postdoctoral associates and graduate students on appointments from the Office of Academic Programs. Not a degree, and awarded with advance approval of each student's university, the Cer-
tificate attests to the satisfactory completion of an assignment chosen by the student himself in consultation with a supervisor. Professor Henry understood the Smithsonian to be a "College of discoverers," with students participating intensively in its work. To the extent that we have helped to perpetuate his concept of the Institution as an auxiliary academic establishment we have helped to underscore one very important objective of the Institution. Despite the monolithic tendency of our federal government to wish to centralize and combine efforts and funds continually in the name of efficiency, the administration of pure research tends to elude such neat solutions. In connection with work on the President's Marine Sciences Council, all the members were asked to comment on the council report at the end of 1968. I was struck by the reference to the importance of small independent institutions such as the Marine Biological Station at Woods Hole, Massachusetts. Like the MBS, as it is called, the Smithsonian operates independently on its own small budget, but serves as part of an interlocking network of a national community of scholars. Dr. Leland Haworth, then Director of the National Science Foundation, when writing to Vice President Agnew on 10 March 1969 in regard to oceanographic research, said (speaking of Woods Hole); "we can see merit in having such independent research organizations." The same seems to apply to the Smithsonian.

Our symposia can thus serve as points of focus for a wide range of associated Institution activities, from seminar series to exhibits, from productions for the media to special publications. The coming year will be devoted in large measure to studies of cultural change and displays bearing upon this theme. In the year following we hope to conduct an intensive examination of the impact of technology upon society, including a major exhibition on technology and art, the preparation of curriculum materials for educational institutions, and a large number of scholarly sessions devoted to detailed aspects of this general theme. In this way we begin to bind together the different parts of the assemblage and orchestrate a theme uniting their efforts toward a given end.

A second major goal is to achieve reinforcement within our arrays of reference resources. A curator's expertise and personal knowledge, built up over a lifetime of study, represent an information resource, as do the books and reprints he has gathered around himself; then, as in an outer concentric circle, come the ordered materials of a collection. We are purposefully seeking ways to conduct these activities so that each reinforces the others to the maximum practical extent. Not books separate from objects; not specialized information services separate from either, but rather integrated reference systems which can unite all three. The Smithsonian's uniqueness and value depends upon our success in being a different kind of marshalling center where recorded knowledge gives
wide access to pertinent inquiry and is not regarded as a burdensome encumbrance or permitted to weigh down our ventures into ideas.

Out of this springs a kind of neo-economy. Our collections in biological and geological materials—often gathered at random—may by their very size and multiplicity end up being our single most important asset. Our data bank of specimens, even though we may not today be able to extract the ideal information we need, may turn out in a hundred years to represent four or five times the genetic diversity then available to us, for by that time seventy-five to eighty percent of the species of living animals or plants may be extinct.

The very variety of resources of the Institution may have begun to work against effectiveness in our exhibits. Too many aspects of a given subject may be out of sight in other buildings where they are excluded from consideration in preparing exhibits. This year I have appointed a special commission to reappraise the exhibits function within the Institution and seek ways to unify our presentations, to make them more responsive to visitors' interests and more appealing to all of our citizens. Exhibits that merely display objects from the collections, individually labeled and placed behind glass, reinforce the fragmentation of the Smithsonian, while those whose aim is to interpret a wider domain of knowledge help to realize its converging interests.

Cohesive programs must be given concerted management. This year an enormously important step was taken in re-establishing the position of Treasurer of the Institution as a central office to oversee budgeting, control, planning, development, and fiscal management. The Office of Programming and Budget has begun an intensive analysis of the use of Institution resources—both public and private—in the context of a statement of objectives and the analysis of functions: We have been fortunate indeed that T. Ames Wheeler, formerly of the Allegheny-Ludlum Steel Corporation, joined the Smithsonian staff as Treasurer in September 1968. Under his care both public and private funds can be marshalled to achieve true effectiveness.

This has been a year of continued questioning in America—insistent, sometimes shrill, penetrating, skeptical, above all, iconoclastic. Critics charge the entire educational system with grave deficiencies, doubt the wisdom of our acceptance of technology, and find all too small a return from massive social investments in government programs. The Smithsonian has not been invaded by angry protesters or disrupted by dissidents but it cannot escape the need, which is becoming so general in our time, to subject its activities to the most searching review and to reappraise its objectives in the light of the more rigorous expectations of the day. No institution is too venerable or too valuable to be exempted from such scrutiny. In government jargon the phrase is, "let us get back
to the base.” An “open” university such as ours should thrive on self-examination.

The first thing we must expect from any institution is that it frame socially valuable objectives and conduct its affairs in accord with them. Yet charitable and governmental establishments are shaped in large measure by past legacies. Once-plausible aims may shrink with time into nostalgic obsolescence. Bureaux, divisions, working groups, committees, and a host of other administrative entities are set up within institutions, given separate charters, and thereafter pursue independent and conflicting courses until what was meant to be an orderly flotilla comes to resemble a park basin cluttered with children’s toy boats of every conceivable description in total disarray. The word institution comes from the Latin verb *status*, to set up, implying an end in view. Only as ends are served can an institution be maintained as a viable whole whose parts, like those of any functioning organism, must be interdependent.

To many people the Smithsonian Institution must seem improbably heterogeneous, built up over the years like a midden heap of collected objects, many priceless and all interesting. As I have suggested, the collections may be priceless but they are not the institution any more than buildings are a university. It is the scholars who for one reason or another have been attracted to us, full time or part time, as permanent or transient workers, who can perhaps learn to grasp the meaning of the collections. By being in touch with real objects and by being attentive to the real situations in which these objects were placed or developed, perhaps our scholars can develop what Kant, speaking of the spontaneous interplay of our own intellectual powers, called the “synthetic unity of aperception.” This is learning, and curators are capable of this even if teachers are not always so. But if a curator understands such a situation in nature or in a culture coherently and wholly, then he is better as a teacher than most teachers.

The whole problem of teaching today revolves around whether teaching really teaches people how to learn, or whether it comes down to getting people out of schools fast, having coerced them through fear and competitive pressure into getting meaningless diplomas. Recently graduate students in a survey conducted by the American Political Science Association have been complaining about college work performed under a climate of “threat and fear.” Learning to learn must certainly be a failure if it merely means aping the teacher, becoming an “apple-polisher,” or picking up the innate structure of a teacher’s behavior. Or is that really what we all should do in order to get on in life? I am inclined to think not, as I doubt that we can survive this way.

Museums teach us about real things, which is one reason why young
people like them. They also tend to put things in perspective, in a historical context, which young people tend not to learn in other ways. One failure of teaching in the social sciences has been to eliminate dates as having any contextual value. Thus the steppingstones which an earlier generation memorized, from the defeat of the Persian fleet at Salamis right onward, tend to be left out. The Persian fleet might have been defeated at the Battle of the Coral Sea for all young people today know. One of the failures of TV is also in the scale of time. Everything is instant. It is happening now in an existential manner, which fails to convey reality.

Museums offer an opportunity for training in reality which few pedagogues suspect or know. Museums are open universities. Only examples really count, especially when they can be grasped in the round. How then can young people plan for the future without tenable examples and a historical context? Planning is probably the most important aspect of the future, along with the understanding of ecosystems. It would seem that we may be heading into a form of civil war as far as planning is concerned. Education today being reductionist in emphasis, technology being dominant and reductionist in principle, there can perhaps be no solution so long as our economics persists as it does. The quiet voices of rational and studious students of the environment will probably not suffice. We may well be swept aside by the groundswell of opinion of those—from militant students on through the middle-aged middle class living in quiet desperation—who, mindful of the futility of growing old, finally reject our social and economic goals based on subjective private initiative.

One major task of this Institution should be to experiment with learning techniques. If this research could ever produce a method to create a sense of reality, and to awaken interests in people, then the Smithsonian would indeed have lived up to its mandate.

HISTORY AND ART

Another notable event of this year besides the opening of the Portrait Gallery has been the ground-breaking ceremony for the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. Authorized under the 90th Congress, the building with its sculpture garden should be completed in another two years. The ceremony was performed 8 January 1969 by President Johnson, the Smithsonian's Chancellor, Chief Justice Earl Warren, and the Secretary before a distinguished audience of members of Congress, the Administration and the world of art.
To the superlative collection of fine art he has donated to the United States for the benefit of the people, in 1969 Mr. Hirshhorn’s continued generosity resulted in the addition of more than five hundred new paintings and sculptures—an average of over ten new works each week received, cataloged, and stationed by Abram Lerner and his staff of three. Since November 1966, the date of Mr. Hirshhorn’s gift, his generosity has led to the acquisition of outstanding new paintings and sculptures valued at over one million dollars each year, in addition to the one million dollars he has agreed to donate for future purchases upon the opening of the Hirshhorn Museum.

In this first year since its opening, exhibitions have been a major part of the activity of the National Collection of Fine Arts in trying out its new space. The first of these areas to be developed has been the low-vaulted, crypt-like spaces of the Granite Gallery, which proved admirably suited to the bronze sculpture of an exhibition of the works of Alexander Archipenko.

A major achievement of the year was the retrospective exhibition of paintings, drawings, and photographs by Charles Sheeler organized by the NCFA staff, with its full and richly documented catalog as a permanent reminder of the exhibition and as a scholarly reference. The Sheeler exhibition continued with showings at the Philadelphia Museum of Art and at the Whitney Museum of American Art in New York.

During the year David Scott—who had done so much to help in the installation of the National Collection in its new quarters and who had, with the NCFA staff done a great deal to attract interest to the collections—resigned. Robert Tyler Davis, a new member of the staff as assistant director, took over as acting director, until late summer 1969, when the appointment of Joshua Taylor, Professor of the History of Art at the University of Chicago and a specialist in the history of American Art, was announced.

During the year negotiations have proceeded to bring the Archives of American Art to a new headquarters within the Smithsonian in Washington, part of a proposed network of art historical reference centers to be planned across the nation. This enormous resource, when added to the holdings in the Smithsonian, will go far toward making the National Collection what it should be, the heart of a documentation and research center in the history of our own indigenous art.

Efforts of the Museum of History and Technology to expand the scope of our activities beyond those traditional to museums have been reflected in a number of directions. Under contract the Museum has undertaken the collection of data on Afro-American history, and has made a small beginning in the collection of materials for exhibition in this field. A 19th-century sharecropper’s cabin has been acquired and
is presently being installed as part of an exhibit of the history of American Negro culture. In other areas of ethnic cultural history our staff has conducted research on the church of San Xavier del Bac (circa 1783) near Tucson, Arizona, and on early pottery making in California. A shopfront from a gold-rush period community near San Francisco is presently being put on exhibit. The Museum has undertaken a program of research and recording in the folk music of an eastern mountain community at Galax, Virginia.

The Computer History Project, supported by the American Federation of Information Processing Societies, is now in its second year, under the direction of Dr. Uta Merzbach. This project comprehends the collection of documents and tape-recorded interviews with persons important in the development of the computer. Another major project in its second year is the New England Textile Mill survey. A report of the first summer's work, chiefly at Manchester, New Hampshire, was published this year.

This year our National Museum of History and Technology welcomes a new Director, Professor Daniel Boorstin, Preston and Sterling Morton Distinguished Service Professor of Ancient History, of the University of Chicago, and one of our most eminent living American historians. The pleasant coincidence that Professor Boorstin has also been reappointed to President Nixon's Commission on the American Revolution Bicentennial, affords us additional opportunity to cooperate closely with the Commission on plans for the Nation's observance of renewed dedication to our founding principles of liberty and equality before all men.

This has been a year of program formulation for the Cooper-Hewitt Museum of Design in New York. A lease has been arranged with the Carnegie Corporation, owner of the Andrew Carnegie mansion on Fifth Avenue at Ninety-first Street, and it is hoped that the Museum will be installed there in its own quarters by 1971.

The kinds of programs and services offered by the Cooper-Hewitt Museum bring to the Smithsonian new educational opportunities in the world of design. In today's ever-rapidly evolving concept of fashion and beauty, the need for a museum showcase, in which an endlessly rich variety of historical decorative arts material can be drawn upon, utilized, and enjoyed, provides a springboard which the Smithsonian can be influential in offering guidelines to more beautiful design in everyday life. The Museum's future move to upper Fifth Avenue will place us on New York's "Museum Row." Thus we hope the Cooper-Hewitt Museum will be able eventually to assume its proper place as a showcase of international reputation in the world of design. Particular thanks are owing to the newly formed Advisory Board under Mrs. Alice M.
Kaplan, in recognition of the hard work, enthusiasm, and generous contributions, both in time and money, that it has made in reestablishing the Cooper-Hewitt Museum as a new, visible entity in New York.

One of the ways in which the Smithsonian increases knowledge is by stimulating those not on its staff to work on intellectual problems that need solving. The Smithsonian is able to do this not only by offering visiting appointments to outside scholars but by training graduate students from universities with whom it maintains a relationship. The Smithsonian has for many years guided small numbers of graduate students in the sciences. More recently it has provided advanced training for graduate students in the humanities, most notably through its American Studies Program, now in its fourth year of operation. Graduate students in American history and American studies from four universities are this year pursuing courses of study under Smithsonian advisors. Most of them are not receiving fellowships or scholarships from the Smithsonian. Some are writing dissertations which when completed will enlarge important areas of human knowledge and, in many cases, interpret Smithsonian collections to the scholarly world for the first time. By such means the Smithsonian with a minimum expenditure can obtain a maximum effect in carrying out its historic mission.

Under the direction of our discerning editor, Nathan Reingold, the Joseph Henry Papers staff has come nearly to the end of its extensive search, in domestic and foreign archives, for documents on the life and work of the first Secretary. Some 16,000 documents are in hand. The staff is now beginning to edit material for the first volume (of an anticipated twenty on Henry's years in Albany, New York (1797-1832), where he educated himself, began his teaching career, and carried out some of his most important work in electromagnetism.

In April 1969 Congressional Regent Frank T. Bow introduced House bill H.R. 10001 incorporating the Smithsonian's legislative proposal to provide for the establishment of a National Armed Forces Historical Museum Park and study center to be designated the Dwight D. Eisenhower Center for Historical Research. The proposal also includes authority for the Board of Regents and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement for the joint use of lands now under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior as the site for the museum park. This legislation seeks to fulfill the goals of three presidially appointed panels of distinguished Americans, including the current National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board, dedicated to the conviction that an armed forces museum can be, as the late President Eisenhower put it, "a dynamic educational venture...[making]...substantial contribution to our citizens' knowledge and understanding of American life."
The choice of President Eisenhower's name for the proposed study center is most appropriate in that it was he who in 1958 convened the President's Committee on the Armed Forces Museum under the chairmanship of former Chief Justice Earl Warren. The recommendations of this Committee led to enactment of Public Law 87-186, establishing a permanent Advisory Board and providing the concept on which the pending legislation is based. Indeed, only a few weeks before his death, President Eisenhower in a letter to our Chancellor reiterated his commitment to a national armed forces historical museum and study center.

Our hopes for the Eisenhower Center received a most substantial boost during the year, when the American Military Institute placed on long-term deposit with the Smithsonian its large and valuable library. The collection contains more than 15,000 volumes concentrated on military history and other areas of social sciences having relevance to military affairs. The AMI collection will serve most admirably as the nucleus around which to build the sort of reference library which will be indispensable to the Center.

Two major events in the areas of air and space during the year focused public attention on the National Air and Space Museum. The first was the celebration—in collaboration with the United States Navy—of the fiftieth anniversary of the first transatlantic flight by the NC-4, in May of 1919. The second was the build-up of activity throughout the year of the Apollo Program in preparation for the moon landing, including the successful circum-lunar flights of Apollo 8, 9, and 10.

Although the NC-4 had been in the Smithsonians' custody for many years, it has recently been in protective storage, pending the availability of a new building large enough to house it. The Navy's request for its public display during the month of May 1969 necessitated an accelerated restoration program. The job was completed, and the aircraft was ready for public display on the Washington Mall for the entire month. Many thousands of visitors were thus reminded of its famous flight across the Atlantic, now fifty years ago.

With the accelerating interest in the Apollo program as it approached its great objective of a manned lunar landing our 1967 Agreement with NASA began to pay significant dividends. The opportunity to see full-scale Saturn and Apollo artifacts—including Apollo 4 (with the related F-1 and J-2 engines), plus "Surveyor" and the Lunar Orbiter—all of which would have been impossible without our close cooperation with NASA—attracted thousands of visitors to the South Hall of the Arts and Industries Building. These large hardware items were exhibited in a setting of space-oriented TV display, photography, paintings and sculpture which were continuously updated to keep visitors informed of significant events as they occurred.
In addition the operation of the NASA agreement has brought into the Air and Space Museum's inventory a large amount of material for future use, from which can be drawn display material for loans to other museums. During the year such Smithsonian artifacts were on display in London, Lucerne, Barcelona, Munich, Tokyo, and Brisbane, as well as in a number of cities of the United States.

**SCIENCE**

Scientific activities of the Smithsonian commence locally with the National Museum of Natural History and spread out widely in fields as superficially diverse as astrophysics and ecology. In this past year, the Natural History Museum has acquired a Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM) a major step in the planned research activities of our staff. This marvelous new instrument is able to magnify the images of tiny objects from 20 to 140,000 times and with several hundred times greater resolution than the conventional light-optical system. For the first time, the basic architecture of thousands of species of organisms, can be seen and studied as whole individuals, whereas formerly elaborate sectioning and replication techniques were required.

The SEM which was developed at Cambridge University in England represents a major breakthrough in the field of microscopy. In only four years since it became commercially available, it has become a dominant research tool in such diverse fields in biology as pollen analysis, microfossil identification, and textile fiber-wear studies. In one area of basic research being done at the Smithsonian, Dr. R. H. Benson is using the SEM for the study of the history of a minute fossil crustacean, the ostracode, which has lived on the floor of the deep ocean basins. His recent discovery of these microfossils in the rocks of the Alps suggests new dimensions to the ocean that once separated Europe from Africa during the time when dinosaurs dominated the landscape. The SEM allows for much greater precision in the identification and analysis of the living as well as fossil deep-sea ostracodes. Through their study it is hoped that massive movements of the ocean floor, which took place during the formation of mountain systems, can be discovered. This instrument will be available for use, when needed, by scientists in all departments of the Museum, many of whom have already made plans to use it in their research.

One does not ordinarily imagine collaboration between researchers in volcanology and archeology but a joint field effort of the Departments of Anthropology and Mineral Sciences is underway to establish the historical background for the eruption of Mt. Arenal in Costa
Rica last year, as well as to study the volcanic phenomena it presented. Similarly, the sedimentologists in the Department of Paleobiology have collaborated with Mineral Sciences to contribute to a rapidly growing accumulation of evidence favoring the theory of continental drift. The spatial relationships between sedimentary rocks and the crustal ones along the mid-Atlantic Ridge have clearly indicated the phenomenon of sea-floor spreading.

Meanwhile two teams of Smithsonian investigators, one at Cambridge in the Astrophysical Observatory, the other at the Natural History building in Washington are preparing for interdisciplinary research on lunar samples, one of soil, the other of rock, jointly to be studied by geochemists, meteorists, petrologists, and physicists.

A signal triumph this year has been that of G. Arthur Cooper who has successfully devised means of sampling the entire brachiopod fauna of the Glass Mountain beds of the Permian era. His work will have significant consequences for all students of population biology as well as for paleontologists.

**ECOLOGY**

The Smithsonian's concern with ecology spreads across a number of scientific disciplines as well as organizations and finally comes home to rest in the social sciences, within the purview of our new concern in post-doctoral research. The Office of Ecology participates directly in research, sponsors other research, and is related to other departments and offices through interdisciplinary programs. On its own, the Office has participated in investigations of the ecology and ethology of wild elephants in Ceylon.

In the past year emphasis was placed on studies of the population dynamics, inter- and intra-specific competition, food habits, patterns of movement and land use, reproduction state, and the density of habitat usage. Also in Ceylon, the basic structure of the domestic elephant reproductive cycle was worked out for the first time.

As Smithsonian participants in the International Biological Program (IBP), Lee Talbot and Raymond Fosberg assisted with an inventory of Pacific islands and parts of islands as preserves of rare scientific resources. Areas are being listed for conservation where they have been relatively uninfluenced by human activity and contain unique flora and fauna. As a result of the IBP conservation section meetings on Palau and Guam, data have been assembled and will be published.

Requests for advice and consultation on ecological problems were answered from the National Park Service and the United States Fish
and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior; the Pacific Science Board, the Environmental Sciences Board, and the Division of Behavioral Sciences of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council; the Office of Science and Technology, the Department of Defense, the Department of Agriculture, the Congress, and such international organizations as the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, the International Council for Bird Preservation, the World Wildlife Fund, the United Nations, and the Pacific Science Association.

The Chesapeake Bay Center for Field Biology completed one level of its laboratory building and operated as a research arm of the Smithsonian through a consortium with the Johns Hopkins University and the University of Maryland. Studies of the physical conditions and the populations of organisms in the estuary continued. Dr. Charles Southwick of the Johns Hopkins University found that the Rhode River estuary apparently was heavily enriched in September. Drs. William D. McElroy (on leave as Director of the National Science Foundation), Howard H. Seliger and William G. Fastie, also of Johns Hopkins University, began measurements of the night and day patterns of bioluminescence as an index of primary productivity. In the past year a further effort to raise funds for land acquisition for this most valuable field station has met with remarkable success. Nearly fifty percent of our goal of $800,000, to increase our holdings on the western shore of Chesapeake Bay to some 2000 acres, has been met. We are deeply grateful to the farsighted foundations; the Ford Foundation, The Research Corporation, the Scaife Foundation, the Old Dominion Foundation, the Fleischmann Foundation, and the Prospect Hill Foundation; all of whom have helped us in our project to create a national resource in ecological research, not only near Washington but also as part of a network of comparative study areas, an environmental consortium of universities and private and public institutions from Massachusetts to the Caribbean and Panama. Dr. George Watson completed a three-year study of the productivity of breeding ospreys at Poplar Island, a Chesapeake Bay Center property near the eastern shore of the Chesapeake Bay. The osprey population is believed to be holding its own in the Bay despite its susceptibility to pesticides. Whistling swans meanwhile are being studied by Dr. William J. L. Sladen of Johns Hopkins. More than half of the North American population of these birds winters in the bay. Studies of their local and long distance movements, feeding ecology, social behavior, and diseases are being achieved by observation of unmarked, conspicuously dyed, and radio-tagged birds.
HYDROBIOLOGY

In oceanography and limnology, direct observations of plants and animals living on the bottom of the shallow ocean and in the upper pelagic areas received considerable attention during the year. A wide spectrum of activities ranged from sponsorship of a special Edwin A. Link lecture on underwater man by Jon Lindberg and Dr. Joseph B. MacInnis and the offering of diver-training courses to field investigations using scuba apparatus, submersible diving chambers, and small research submersibles. A multidisciplinary study of sharks and the coral reef environments was undertaken under the sponsorship of Edwin A. Link, Seward Johnson, William Mote, Ocean Systems Inc., and the Smithsonian Institution in February and March of 1969. Five small vessels and a submersible diving chamber were assembled off British Honduras for the project known as SHARK 1969.

Sponsorship through working group 23 of the Scientific Committee on Ocean Research of the International Council of Scientific Unions resulted in a definitive study of plankton preservation being undertaken at the Smithsonian. Dr. Hugh Steedman of the University of Bath spent the months of July, October, November, March, and June planning and conducting experiments at the Smithsonian Oceanographic Sorting Center. Plankton preservation has sometimes been excellent and sometimes unsatisfactory using the traditional preservatives under differing field conditions. Histochromic and other work on carefully preserved collections will provide information on the causes of the variable results. Tests will be made to attempt to find better preservatives.

An "Ocean Acre" research program has been initiated by Drs. William Aron, Robert Gibbs, and Clyde Roper in cooperation with the Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory, the University of Rhode Island, and the Naval Oceanographic Office. Four cruises, using navy ships Gilliss, Sands, and Trident of the University of Rhode Island, were undertaken during this fiscal year. The area selected for achieving a fuller understanding of its total biology is southeast of Bermuda in water depths greater than 2000 meters. Preliminary analyses of the distributions of cephalopods and fishes reveals variations in their migratory behavior patterns which may be associated with sound-scattering layers.

This year was one of great progress in converting the older manual records of the Smithsonian Oceanographic Sorting Center into an automatic data-processing system. Specimen labels are prepared in an automatic typewriter system which simultaneously produces duplicate labels and punches the data on paper tape. This tape is converted to magnetic tape automatically and goes into storage with a minimum of error.
Nearly all of the several years production of Antarctic data covering thirteen million specimens has been entered in the machine system.

Installation of basic petrographic laboratory equipment was completed in the Sorting Center. A specimen inventory has been prepared to meet the needs of specialists interested in specific mineralogic, textural, or lithologic features of oceanic rocks. As a backup for the specimens being distributed, a major catalog of oceanic rocks has been produced to include all that have been described in the scientific literature. Specific mineral groups and lab information in the literature may be found through the catalog.

**RADIATION BIOLOGY AND ASTROPHYSICS**

The Radiation Biology Laboratory of the Institution has participated actively in interdisciplinary ecology during the year. Under the Laboratory, the third seminar series sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution and the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area was introduced on 6 February by Dr. Sidney Galler, Assistant Secretary for Science. The Seminar in Environmental Biology was presented for graduate credit and attracted large audiences of students and other interested people from the community. Thirteen lectures were presented by authorities in ecology and environmental biology from all over the United States, with topics ranging from arid-land to arctic ecology and from fresh-water productivity to aspects of controlled environments for space biology.

For the past year the Smithsonian Radiation Biology Laboratory has recorded continuous daily measurements from sunrise to sunset of several color components of the white-light spectrum in those wavebands that control growth and development of plant and animal organisms. This is the only complete set of data of this kind obtained for biologists to use in studying photobiological responses. Under the joint sponsorship of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Physical Laboratory of Israel, a station in Jerusalem has begun operation to obtain similar information for that latitude. The measurements from the two stations will provide comparative records on ratios of color bands present in natural incident daylight and resultant cycles of growth and reproduction, leading to new interpretations of the effects of light stimuli as a factor in the environment controlling physiological development.

In the course of recording measurements of normal incident solar radiation at the Smithsonian, it was discovered that the amount of the sun's energy falling on Washington, D.C., now is approximately fifteen
percent less than that measured and recorded here by Dr. C. G. Abbot in 1907 at the same time of the year. Measurements are continuing to be taken and efforts are in progress to confirm the preliminary data. The results should be of the greatest interest to those ecologists concerned with the energy-exchange phenomena between biological systems and the atmosphere, as well, indeed, to urban planners concerned with human health.

During the past year the Center for Short-Lived Phenomena, an organization set up by the Astrophysical Observatory, participated in 127 geological, astrophysical, and biological events including 21 major earthquakes, 18 volcanic eruptions (one involving the birth and disappearance of an island), 21 fireballs, 11 major oil spills, 9 fish kills, 4 rare-animal migrations, 3 freshly fallen meteorite recoveries, the discovery of a stone-axe tribe, and several dozen other land and marine ecological events.

The Center assisted in the coordination of activities for reconnaissance missions and scientific field expeditions to the Fernandina Caldera collapse in the Galapagos Islands, the Mt. Arenal volcanic eruption in Costa Rica, the Cerro Negro volcanic eruption in Nicaragua, the Appalachian squirrel migration in the eastern United States, the Mt. Merapi volcanic eruption in Indonesia, and the Pueblito de Allende meteorite shower in Mexico.

During the Apollo 11 Manned Lunar Mission, the Center arranged communications between 207 astronomical observers in thirty countries and maintained daily contact with the Manned Spacecraft Center, NASA, at Houston, Texas. Reports from ground-based observers were relayed to the MSC for transmittal to the astronauts en route to and orbiting the moon; this mission provided an opportunity for astronauts to confirm (by observation and photography) ground-based observations of transient lunar events.

The Center has established an effective global reporting network of 1510 scientists in many disciplines and from 118 countries.

During the past year the Center issued 127 event notification reports, 764 event information reports, 16 final event publications, and 11 preprints of scientific papers on the preliminary results of field investigations.

By all odds it would seem the Center for Short-Lived Phenomena (a Gilbertian title if ever there was one) is here to stay. In addition to its brainchild, the Smithsonian’s Astrophysical Observatory has had a notable year. On 23 October 1968, the Observatory opened its Mount Hopkins, Arizona, facility, a celebration presided over by Representative Morris K. Udall of Arizona. The station will have a tracking camera, a pulsed ruby-laser ranging system, a 12-inch telescope already installed
preparatory to a 60-inch telescope for investigation of stellar and planetary atmospheres, and a 10-meter light collector designed for the detection of gamma rays from celestial sources. In conjunction with NASA, experiments have been started at Mount Hopkins to establish criteria for the selection of sites for future ground-based astronomy research.

On 7 December 1968, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration launched the second Orbiting Astronomical Observatory (OAO-2) from Cape Kennedy, Florida. The two-ton satellite contained two major scientific experiments, including Project Celescope, a Smithsonian-designed, television-telescope system for observing stars in ultraviolet light.

One week later, at 2:49 a.m., 14 December, the Celescope cameras made the first ultraviolet photographs of the heavens, showing three 6th-magnitude stars in the constellation Draco.

Between launch and the end of June 1969, the Celescope experiment obtained nearly 2500 photographs of stars. Although one camera has stopped operating and the three remaining systems are experiencing some loss of sensitivity owing to prolonged exposure to space radiation, the Celescope experiment is expected to continue to return valuable scientific data for several more months.

An early evaluation of the photographic data indicates that very few of the stars measured by Celescope are appreciably brighter than expected. Also, about twenty percent of the objects found by Celescope near the plane of the Galaxy do not appear in identification atlases, whereas nearly every object more than ten degrees from the plane does. Presumably, the extra stars are mostly faint O and B stars; but, additional ground-based observations may be necessary to confirm this theory.

The optical tracking network of the SAO participated in all the Apollo manned-spacecraft missions during this period.

The most spectacular result of this participation occurred on 21 December 1968, when the SAO camera station at Maui, Hawaii, photographed the burn of the booster rockets that injected the Apollo 8 spacecraft into the translunar phase of its flight to the moon. The same day, the SAO tracking station at San Fernando, Spain, photographed the cloud of excess fuel dumped by the Apollo 8 spacecraft some 30,000 miles from earth.

On 4 March 1969, the SAO stations at Hawaii and Mount Hopkins again photographed an Apollo 9 fuel-release cloud at a distance of approximately 70,000 miles from earth. The photographs of these fuel dumps proved highly valuable to NASA engineers and scientists attempting to understand the behavior of liquids in space.
Environmental studies continued at an increased rate at the Tropical Research Institute in Panama. The nation's unique tropically based laboratory has been working on interspecific and intraspecific competition in terrestrial and marine organisms. An event of the past year, tragic yet perhaps fortuitous was the grounding of oil tanker *Witwater* off the Galeta Station of the Institute on the Atlantic coast of the Canal Zone. Research on recovery rates of marine organisms subjected to oil, may prove to be beneficial in the long run to studies of oil spills, bound to become more frequent round the world as time goes on. Meanwhile comparative base-line studies in tropical ecosystems remain our primary goal for this Institute.

For many years a large but rather scarce impressive looking, spiny, poisonous, multi-armed starfish has been observed from the coral reefs of the Indian and Pacific Oceans, and from the Red Sea to Hawaii. Little was known of its habits, life history, or ecology. It is commonly known as the Crown of Thorns Starfish, zoologically as *Acanthaster planci*.

In 1960, near Green Island on Australia's Great Barrier Reef, a sudden population explosion occurred. *Acanthaster* began to swarm in large numbers over the reefs, and was seen to feed on the living coral animals, leaving nothing but the bare limestone skeletons. Under the stress of hunger, as their food supply diminished, the starfish changed from nocturnal habits to venturing out in broad daylight in their search for food.

Large areas of the famous Great Barrier Reef were changed from living animal communities to masses of bare dead limestone skeletons. All of the multitudes of animals that depend directly or indirectly on the corals for food were starved out of the affected areas. These include large numbers of fish, lobsters, crabs, and other economically important reef animals.

Two years ago a similar outbreak occurred on the reefs that line the coast of Guam in the western Pacific. Here it spread rapidly until at last report, an area twenty-six miles off the Guam coast was practically stripped of living corals. More recently outbreaks have been reported from a number of other areas in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands administered by the United States.

The citizens of Guam, fearing the loss of the reefs, brought the catastrophe to the attention of an International Biological Program meeting on island conservation problems (November 1968), which included two Smithsonian biologists. Subsequently the Interior Department undertook a crash survey of the situation in Micronesia to develop a synoptic
picture of the phenomenon and try to isolate the causal factors. This investigation now being conducted by Westinghouse Ocean Research Laboratory, includes three Smithsonian marine scientists, Dr. Porter Kier, Dennis M. Devaney, and Thomas F. Phelan, as well as other United States and foreign experts. These men are specialists, some of the very few in the nation, and the Smithsonian is proud to be able to participate in such an important study. Potentially a starfish explosion could undermine and destroy fringing reefs throughout the Pacific threatening the entire economy of the area. Fortunately present evidence indicates that the starfish can conquer coral reef animals only in areas that have been disturbed by dynamiting. Controls can presumably be worked out to prevent man’s wreaking further hardship upon himself and his environment for short-term gains.

Interdisciplinary research continues to develop effectively within the Natural History and Anthropology disciplines. Not only has primate biology proved a useful bridge between these broad areas of science, but also geology and paleoclimatology are closely related to archeological research in Central and South America.

Of great interest in this connection is the work of Drs. Evans and Meggers of the Anthropology staff, with Dr. Melson of the Mineral Sciences division, in dating volcanic ash falls and determining special characteristics and age of volcanic activity at El Arenal, Costa Rica, and Quijos Valley, eastern Ecuador, with the archeological specimens from levels in the sites that had been covered by volcanic materials.

Similarly petrographic studies have been made, especially by electron microprobe analysis, of obsidian artifacts that had been used in obsidian dating of the archeological cultures from sites in the Quijos Valley to determine unique features of composition that might be affecting the hydration rates. Through this technique new information on dating for archeology and volcanology has been obtained.

NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

One of the aims of the National Zoological Park is to have a truly professional staff. The addition of a pathologist, Robert M. Sauer VMD, has been a step toward achieving this goal. We now have a trained zoologist at the head of the department of living vertebrates, another in charge of the bird collection, another heads the reptile division, and still another has been appointed as assistant to Dr. John F. Eisenberg in the scientific research department.

The National Zoo has continued its efforts to protect and conserve wildlife and natural resources. In addition to cooperating with national
and international organizations devoted to wildlife protection, the Zoo has made its special contribution. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature publishes a list of rare and endangered species throughout the world. The list mentions golden marmoset, orangutan, scimitar-horned oryx, Père David’s deer, Laysan duck, Hawaiian duck, and Swinhoe’s pheasant. Each of these has been born or hatched at the National Zoological Park during the past year.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Through the impetus established several years ago by the Institution’s undertaking to direct and coordinate research for United States anthropology and biology programs overseas, using dollar equivalents of stated excess currencies, the Smithsonian has been able to help more than forty-four American learned institutions and universities in the conduct of original research.

The initial implementation of the Smithsonian’s role as executive agent for the Iran-United States science cooperation agreement occurred this year with the exchange of visits between Dr. Faryar, Underminister of Science and Education in Iran, and the Director of the Office of International Activities. Methods of disseminating research plans of scientists from each country interested in cooperative work have been established and efforts are now underway to locate funding sources.

The Smithsonian’s expertise in assessing the environmental consequences of an isthmian sea-level canal was recognized by the appointment of Dr. David Challinor of our Office of International Activities to the National Academy of Sciences special Committee on Ecological Research for the Interoceanic Canal.

During the past year Morocco was added to the list of “excess” currency countries and already several projects have been initiated by Smithsonian scientists for work there. The addition of Morocco has been particularly welcome because of the pending removal of Tunisia and Ceylon from the list of countries in which the Smithsonian’s Foreign Currency Program operates.

The Smithsonian Associates membership now stands at 9,200 compared with 6,500 a year ago. This includes individuals, double and family membership, meaning that our memberships serve approximately 20,000 people. Our renewal average stands at a phenomenal 89 percent.

Some of the Associates activities have included luncheon talks on collecting (painting, sculpture, prints, drawings, ceramics, glass, and furniture) now in its third year. Once again this has proved extremely
popular with 375 members attending the talks each month over a period of six months.

The Ancient Crafts Revived series was oversubscribed. Our workshops included batik, weaving, mosaic, stained glass, bookbinding, paste paper, marble-and-paste, cloisonné, enamel, plique-à-jour, decoupage and tôle. For the first time this series was offered to young people (ten to thirteen years). The classes included enameling, puppet making, papier maché, wire sculpture, Egyptian paste, and paper weaving.

A particularly memorable event was that of the New York Chamber Soloists' performance of music from the Court of the Sun King, Louis XIV, with recitations from Molière, Racine, and La Fontaine given by Jean Louis Barrault and Madeleine Renaud.

This year marks the signing of an official agreement between Mrs. Merriweather Post, to whom the Institution owes so much, and the Smithsonian on the maintenance of her wonderful house, "Hillwood." The tours to Hillwood have had a continuous waiting list and are repeated as often as possible.

One of the most popular activities in which the Smithsonian has engaged continues to be its division of Performing Arts. To bring the instruments out of glass cases, to evolve the magic of folk crafts and music, all this is to communicate directly to all people. How better can our Institution demonstrate the worth of collecting things.

Our highlight of the year was the Festival of American Folklife which was enhanced this past year by the addition of several continuing programs. To the half million people who attended the four-day festival of craft demonstrations and concerts we added five programs conceived for the National Park Service's "Summer in the Parks." These mobile art demonstrations, jazz concerts, folk concerts, puppet theater, and film theater, traveled to twenty different city parks over a period of ten weeks.

The Smithsonian libraries continue to command a high priority in our efforts to increase the Institution's research and education capability. Many times throughout the year various departments of the Institution assisted in financing the purchase of library materials vital to the support of their research programs. The professional staffs of the museums and the librarians displayed their mutual concern for maintaining the high quality of the libraries' collections by working diligently together to use their limited funds for the purchase of only those titles that were of immediate and long-term importance to research. The same cooperation, along with strong policy guidance and management by the office of the Director of Libraries was applied to the negotiations and acquisitions of five gift collections of research materials that contribute directly to current bureau programs. This ability to attract donors remains one
of the most essential characteristics of the libraries. Even without a full-time team of specialists, the libraries have been able to continue the inevitable introduction of automation of library processing routines, albeit rather slowly.

The libraries' training program concentrated on improving the data-processing skills of their staff members at various organizational levels. With the assistance of the Information Systems Division, the libraries attained a design for an automated serials purchase system and have begun data input for the creation of machine-readable records. Still ahead, but very much in the libraries future, is work on a system for the integration of files of information in the literature with those pertaining to specimens and artifacts in the museums, to create a totally responsive and integrated computerized information storage and retrieval system.

Computers comprise one of the most important frontiers of science today. The science of computer technology offers a means whereby the storage of data accumulating throughout the museum complex may be reduced to useful information. In recognition of this fact, the Information Systems Division has continued to develop computerized systems and techniques to make information more available. The expanding volume of information, the increasing complexity of concepts, and the demands for rapid application of knowledge to useful ends require an increasing coordination of effort in the management of information.

Efforts this year revolved around enlarging the area in which the Information Systems Division's technology could be put to use. In a cooperative effort with historians, researchers, and scientists our computers and the technical expertise of our staff are joined to solve problems. Like all technical contributions thus far invented by man, computers represent an extension of man's physical and mental capabilities. Calculations, comparisons, and in-depth analysis that would ordinarily cost many man hours, or even years of toil, can now be accomplished in seconds with the help of a computer programmed to the particular need. A few examples of this may be seen in the systems developed this year for research in the fields of biology, paleobiology, anthropology, botany, and the fine arts where time consuming tasks of sorting, analyzing, and coordinating have been conducted by the computer, freeing scientists and researchers to pursue more intellectual activities based upon the information supplied by the automated processing of data.

This was a year of major progress, for the Institution as a public communicator. It began with establishment of the sr motion picture unit through a contract with Eli Productions. At the end of the year we were engaged in discussions with the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to support a number of productions, including our long-sought
The definitive visitor's orientation film. This obviously flowering relationship with the CPB is built upon a foundation with three primary components: intellectual resources, the national collections, and a demonstrated film-making capability.

Another aspect of film and television programs was represented by the continuing conversations in which the Institution has been involved over a period of months with regard to increasing our contribution to public television in Washington and throughout the nation. Public television, which itself is in an early stage of development in most parts of the United States, appears to be moving toward a real accomplishment with the support of the new Corporation for Public Broadcasting, as well as from foundations and private companies. The Smithsonian, with a continuing concern for the diffusion of knowledge dating to its very origin, looks with great interest on future developments in this area.

In the closely related field of educational radio, the Smithsonian moved energetically during this year, once again combining an enhancement of its own in-house capabilities and a most gratifying relationship with the public broadcasting community. An educational radio service designated "Radio Smithsonian" was established and began the continuing process of producing and making available recorded material covering the full range of the Smithsonian's enlightening and exciting activities.

Coupled with development of the Smithsonian magazine, this evolution of our radio, television, and film programs helps to bring a new dimension to the Institution in its ability to create channels from its vast academic-cultural reservoir to people in their homes throughout the nation.

Turning to another aspect of our public affairs, I believe it is clear that the Smithsonian has during the past several years once again assumed the central status within the Washington community, and indeed the national community, that it occupied at least until the end of the 19th century. There is a broad body of evidence that this is the case. The Inaugural Ball for President Nixon in January, for example, echoed the earlier inaugural festivities for President Garfield at the A & I Building. Not only was the Museum of History and Technology the scene of one of this year's Inaugural Balls and other such celebrations marking the start of a new administration, but the Institution was also the scene of a number of farewell events for top officials in the outgoing administration, including several members of the Cabinet, and an unofficial farewell for President and Mrs. Johnson themselves.

Every department in the Cabinet held at least one, and in most cases several, conferences, meetings or other events at the Smithsonian this
year, as did fourteen other governmental agencies ranging from the FBI to the Weather Bureau to the Peace Corps. Fourteen foreign nations—geographically ranging from Ceylon to Brazil to the Netherlands—sponsored or played a principal role in exhibitions or other events. A considerable number of major national corporations, particularly in the areas of advanced technological and communication fields, sponsored events in relation to Smithsonian exhibits or other activities.

Can it be that the Smithsonian has a mission to make a real contribution toward public understanding through a union of exhibits and TV, as I have suggested earlier? Once television can be related to everyday learning, once open education is understood for what it is, I suspect that pedagogues will realize that like a mystical third eye—the Buddhist concept of the survival of the pineal neural apparatus—we may be able to translate aperceptive techniques into reality.

At present TV is merely floating on the edge of aperception, and making money. But perhaps, that pale cyclopean staring eye, possessed subjectively by everyone, in kitchen, bedroom, or parlor can be realized to be merely in its infancy, the tin lizzie of what it could be for the future, wedded to a continuing series of object-oriented exercises in a neighborhood museum.

It is the mission of the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service (SITES) to make the museum experience a living one to millions who do not come to the central setting.

A recent check of contracts with educational institutions in the United States revealed that SITES had sent exhibitions to 240 schools, universities, or junior colleges in all of the fifty states in the last eighteen months. It is becoming increasingly clear that SITES could render much greater service all over the country if some subsidy could be found to finance exhibitions for very small communities which cannot secure the prorated costs of the most modest exhibitions. As a conservative estimate, however, more than three and a half million people saw Smithsonian traveling exhibits in the United States and Canada in 1969. These exhibits were of painting, sculpture, architecture, photography, history, science, decorative arts, and children’s art.

An extension of the Mall institutions has been the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, described in detail in last year’s report.

This concept of neighborhood museums located in large urban centers where massive social, economic, and political problems abound, gives direction and purpose to every division previously situated in the central museum complex. The natural scientist, historian, anthropologist, and ethnologist can make their research and exhibits relevant
to current human situations. The neighborhood museum must meet the practical needs of its community; indeed, its existence is predicated upon the proposition that there are close-up, person-to-person techniques to meet critical neighborhood needs. The neighborhood museum must attract a significant number of neighborhood people at all levels to insure its involvement and strengths. It should also make every effort to analyze and interpret the history of its community.

This past year the educational programs, directed by Miss Zora Martin, covered a broad spectrum from guiding children and adults through exhibits and workshops for Community Reading Assistants of the Anacostia Model School Project to special science units led by a part-time teacher on loan from the District of Columbia Board of Education. In February of this year, the educational staff provided a well-organized series of lectures, discussions, films, and dramatic performances for our celebration of Negro History Week. In addition to this, the staff provided guided tours for the exhibit “The Sage of Anacostia,” a graphic history of the Afro-American featuring the life of Frederick Douglass. This was the most successful exhibit executed by the Anacostia Museum and, undoubtedly, one of the most informative. It was attended by approximately twenty-seven thousand metropolitan area school children.

This year also saw the establishment of the museum’s Research Center and Library for the purpose of furthering the development of the neighborhood museum concept. The center will serve not only the needs of Anacostia but a wider area as well. The Research Center and Library is directed by Larry Erskine Thomas, the museum’s research and design coordinator. The development of this research facility will enable the community, the general public, and all who make use of its services to understand the true significance of the black man’s social and cultural environment and his influence on the progress of a great nation. The Center has already consulted with and provided services to a wide variety of museums and organizations as they seek to reshape their programs and exhibits.

ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES

The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars was established by Act of Congress (P.L. 90–637) on 24 October 1968, to be “a living institution expressing the ideals and concerns of Woodrow Wilson. . . . symbolizing and strengthening the fruitful relation
between the world of learning and the world of public affairs." Congress placed the Center in the Smithsonian Institution under the administration of its own fifteen-man Board of Trustees, subsequently appointed by President Johnson and President Nixon.

The Trustees met at the Museum of History and Technology on 6 March 1969, and created an executive committee consisting of Messrs. Humphrey, McPherson, Moynihan, Ripley, and Rogers. In addition, they approved the selection of Mr. Benjamin H. Read, formerly Executive Secretary of the Department of State, as acting director, and accepted with thanks temporary quarters in the Smithsonian Institution Building.

Concurrently, a contract has been let with Smithsonian Institution planning funds under which the Urban Design and Development Corporation, a new District of Columbia nonprofit corporation established by the American Institute of Architects and headed by Mr. Ralph G. Schwartz, will explore the feasibility of the recommended site for the Center on the future Market Square at 8th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. The feasibility study is due on 1 September 1969.

The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars has obtained a $45,000 grant from the Ford Foundation to permit it to get started, and an initial appropriation request of $100,000 for fiscal year 1970 has been submitted to the Congress.

A milestone in the life of our affiliated Institution, the National Gallery of Art, has been the retirement, after thirty years of devoted service of John Walker, the Gallery’s second Director. The Smithsonian through its Secretary has served on the Gallery’s guiding Board since its inception, and has watched with marvelling eyes, sometimes tinged with human envy, the remarkable development of the collections under his able hands. Would that other art collections in this city had been able so to increase their holdings!

To his ability, must be added Mr. Walker’s prescience in the guidance of the Gallery’s assistant director, Carter Brown, who now succeeds him. We salute Carter Brown as a brilliant successor to the indefatigable John Walker.

The “topping out” of the Kennedy Center’s massive steel framework in September launched a year of continuing tangible progress for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. As the steel contract was completed, the contract for the erection of hundreds of tons of the marble from Italy for the building’s facing began, and the Center took on a new look.

Although construction proceeded at a good pace, the Kennedy Center has not been immune to the meteoric rise in construction costs. In
October, Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, announced that an additional $15 million was needed in order to complete the building. In the spring, after a private fund-raising campaign was well along, Representative Kenneth Gray introduced H.R. 11249 in the House of Representative providing for an increased matching federal grant to the Kennedy Center and an increased loan from the United States Treasury.

Plans for the Center’s opening early in 1971 progressed as George London assumed his position as Artistic Administrator last September. In December it was announced that the American Ballet Theatre, one of world’s foremost dance groups, would be the Center’s resident ballet company.

Perhaps the most historic moment of the year was the announcement last October that the Center’s Theater would be named in honor of General and Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower. It was President Eisenhower, of course, who initiated the Center in 1958.

More than a score of ancillary activities will be reported on in later pages, not least of which is the development of the museum shops program, the continued planning for a conservation-analytical laboratory of major national proportions and our traditional program of exchange of information through the publication of books and research reports, the shipping of documents, and the maintenance of a conference center at Belmont.

To the vital participation of the Regents this past year should be added the special news of the reappointment for a six-year term of Mr. John Nicholas Brown, citizen of Rhode Island, and the new appointment of Mr. Thomas J. Watson Jr., citizen of Connecticut.

These multifarious extensions of a central theme to “increase and diffuse knowledge” are part of the Smithsonian. They form a core of the knowledge industry which we attempt to generate. It will be imperative in years to come that young people keep up with the changing world of technocracy. But this cannot be done by slave driving pedagogical means. It must be done by waves of ambient illumination. I do not know that this principle has been grasped as yet by sociologists or economists. It has been intuitively grasped by the so-called “media” professionals, but without a strong sense of commitment, except the laws of individual enterprise. These are to some extent outmoded, however, hence the conflict and the tension of everyday life. It is our hope in the Smithsonian to bridge this intelligence gap, for this surely we owe, as a consequence of our original creation.
THE BOARD OF REGENTS

The annual meeting of the Board of Regents was held on 15 January 1969 at Hillwood, the home of Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post. Hillwood has been deeded to the Smithsonian Institution and the transfer of the property and collections was formally accepted on this date by Secretary Ripley on behalf of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The spring meeting of the Board of Regents was held on 21 May 1969 in the Fine Arts and Portrait Galleries Building. This meeting was the last one to be attended by Earl Warren, retiring as Chief Justice of the United States and Chancellor of the Board of Regents. The Regents unanimously voted the following resolution, a copy of which was presented to Mr. Warren:

Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States and Chancellor of the Smithsonian Institution: Your fellow regents wish to express their deepest appreciation for your devoted friendship and extend to you their warmest good wishes for the years ahead.

/s/ S. Dillon Ripley
Secretary
MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED BY S. DILLON RIPLEY

I would encourage you, Mr. Chairman, and other members of the Committee, in the course of these hearings and in future, to request information from the directors of our bureaus, heads of programs, and other officers of the Institution. I have encouraged them to make themselves available to Members of the Congress in the public interest. Dr. Whipple is a member of the advisory panel of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, for example. Dr. Boorstin testified very eloquently before that Committee earlier this year. Last year Dr. Cowan provided an insightful summary of biological aspects of endangered species for a Senate Subcommittee. At this time I may offer to you and to the Committee a list of the directors of the bureaus of the Smithsonian, members of the Secretariat, and the heads of a number of other programs, with an express invitation to call upon them or others for information about the Smithsonian?

OFFICERS AND STAFF MEMBERS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION WHO MIGHT BE CONSULTED FOR INFORMATION ABOUT THE HISTORY, PROGRAMS, AND CHARACTER OF THE INSTITUTION AND ITS BUREAUS

I. BUREAU DIRECTORS AND YEAR OF APPOINTMENT


National Air and Space Museum (Acting Director, 1969): Frank A. Taylor, Director, United States National Museum since 1953. Graduate of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Georgetown University. Member of the staff of the Smithsonian Institution since 1922. Author of numerous articles on the history of technology, biography, museum planning.


National Collection of Fine Arts, Director (1970): Joshua Taylor, Graduate of Reed College and Princeton University. Served as William Rainey Harper Professor of Humanities and Professor of Art, University of Chicago. Received Quattrrell Award for excellence in undergraduate teaching. Extensive writing in art.

Freer Gallery of Art, Director (1962): John A. Pope, graduate of Yale and Harvard Universities. Member of Freer Gallery of Art staff since 1943. Authority on Chinese and Japanese art, including museum and private collections in Europe and the East; excavations in Borneo. Author: Chinese Porcelains from the Ardebil Shrine and numerous other works.


Science Information Exchange, Director (1961): Monroe E. Freeman, graduate of the University of Minnesota. Wide experience in university and governmental organizations. Extensive writing in chemistry and biochemistry.


Radiation Biology Laboratory, Director (1954): William H. Klein, graduate of Miami University and Purdue University. Specialties: photomorphogenesis, solar radiation, photobiology; current research on variation in the spectral quality of solar radiation and biological responses.
Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Director (1957) : Martin H. Moynihan, graduate of Princeton University and University of Oxford. Biologist specializing in behavior of New World primates. Fieldwork throughout South America. Author of numerous articles on comparative behavior and evolution.

Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, Director (1955) : Fred L. Whipple, graduate of Harvard University and University of California (Los Angeles and Berkeley). Specialties: cosmology, lunar studies, comets, meteors and meteorites, interplanetary dust. Special Presidential Citation June 12, 1963, for optical tracking system. Extensive publications in astronomy.

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, Director (1967) : John Kinard, graduate of Livingshine College. Active in community affairs for many years and a leader in the current urban improvement program and related projects.

Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars Director (1969) : Benjamin H. Read, graduate of Williams College and University of Pennsylvania Law School. Former associate in private law firm. Formerly Executive Secretary of the Department of State and Special Assistant to the Secretary of State.

II. MEMBERS OF THE SECRETARIAT


Assistant Secretary for Science (1965) : Sidney R. Galler. Graduate of University of Maryland. Former Director of Biology, Office of Naval Research. Biologist and administrator widely versed in public policies for research.

Executive Assistant to the Secretary (1968) : John Dobkin. Graduate of Yale University, the New York University Law School, and Institut d'Etudes politiques, Paris. Admitted to the Bar, State of Connecticut.

Assistant Secretary for History and Art (1968) : Charles Blitzer. Graduate of Williams College and Harvard University. Former faculty member, Yale University, New School for Social Research, and the City University of New York. Formerly Executive Associate, American Council of Learned Societies. Specialty: history of political thought, intellectual history. Author: The Age of Kings, The Age of Power, and An Immortal Commonwealth.

Assistant Secretary for Public Service (1968) : William W. Warner. Graduate of Princeton University and Columbia Teachers College. Served as Officer at U.S. Embassies in Latin America and administrator of other Governmental hemisphere organizations. Accomplished in international cultural affairs.


Smithsonian Libraries Director (1967): Russell Shank. Graduate of Washington University and University of Wisconsin. Formerly Assistant Librarian and lecturer in librarianship at the University of California at Berkeley. Author: Current Bibliography of the History of Technology and other research papers.

Office of Public Affairs, Director (1967): Frederic M. Phillips. Graduate of Columbia College and Graduate School of Journalism. Former writer and editor. Served as Special Assistant, Office of the Secretary, Department of Commerce.


III. PROGRAM STAFF AND HEADS OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF ORGANIZATIONS

President, Senate of Scientists, National Museum of Natural History. Clifford Evans, Curator of South American Archeology. Graduate of University of Southern California and Columbia University. Specialty: South American archeology; current research on archeology of Ecuador, Amazon, Orinoco, Ponape, and Brazil, including special studies in ancient metal technology of pre-Columbian cultures of the Andean region. Extensive fieldwork in South America.


Chief, Exhibits Programs (1942). John E. Anglim. Studied at Chicago Academy of Art and Corcoran School of Art. Specialties: exhibit design, administration, and planning.

Information Systems Division, Acting Director (1970). Stanley A. Kovtv. Graduate of University of Scranton, with graduate study in management information systems. Background in military and technological systems engineering in management, especially automatic data processing. Author of computerized systems for automated placement system and other activities.

Office of Environmental Programs, Director (1966). J. Eugene Wallen. Graduate of Oklahoma State University and University of Michigan. Formerly Aquatic Biologist, Atomic Energy Commission. Specialty: snail taxonomy, limnology, biological oceanography; fieldwork in Pakistan and Taiwan. Author numerous articles on oceanography, limnology, and ecology. (Member of Smithsonian staff since 1962.)


SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

General Background—Policies, Purposes, and Goals From 1846 to Present

TUESDAY, JULY 21, 1970

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND MEMORIALS,
OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 2257, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Frank Thompson, Jr. (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Thompson, Brademas, Bingham, Schwen-gel, and Harvey.

Staff member present: John d'Amecourt, staff director.

Mr. Thompson. The subcommittee will be in order.

This morning we have the honor of having one of our colleagues from the other body, as we so commonly call it here, the very distinguished Senator from Arizona, whom Mr. Brademas and I have known for a number of years.

Senator Goldwater, you are more than welcome this morning. Please feel free to proceed as you wish.

STATEMENT OF HON. BARRY GOLDWATER, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Senator Goldwater. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I understand I have been allotted a half hour. I hope I don't take it all.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee:

Please allow me to say at the outset that I think the committee is doing a significant public service by holding the present series of hearings. By allowing the true character of the Smithsonian to be discussed and examined openly at this forum, in a reasonable and decent way, you and your colleagues are contributing to the advancement of public knowledge about the Smithsonian, as well as providing the opportunity to identify areas where the Institution might better fulfill its national responsibilities.

For, indeed, it has a heavy debt to the American taxpayer. The direct federal moneys which Congress will appropriate for the Smithsonian's operations, for the 1971 fiscal year, is over $40 million. This includes an increase of $7.6 million for salaries and expenses alone—a rise of 25 percent in 1 year.
Since 1964 when the current Smithsonian Secretary took office, the total Federal budget for the Institution has doubled. The number of permanent employees authorized by Congress has jumped from 1,348 to 2,077, a growth of more than 700 positions in 6 years. What is more, the number of part-time employees has gone up from 18 to 240. On top of this, the Smithsonian employs over 1,100 people who are paid from private funds.

The question is, what is the Smithsonian doing with its approximately 3,400 employees? Where have the increases in positions and appropriations gone? Have any units of the Institution been overlooked during this period of amazing growth?

Mr. Chairman, the facts must be faced. The Smithsonian has seriously neglected two of its major components. Both the National Air and Space Museum and the National Museum of Natural History are the victims of a shocking lack of attention by the Smithsonian’s “top brass.”

This is not a conclusion that I could have reached as late as a few weeks ago. But recently my aides held a meeting with Dr. Ripley’s top assistants. The discussions at this conference revealed that the Smithsonian management has little comprehension of the pressing needs of the Nation’s Flight Museum or the Natural History Museum.

They simply do not understand that each of these museums is going through a time of crisis. Neither the funding nor the personnel of either museum is anywhere near where it should be for these important branches to live up to the role which the American public and their respective professional fields demand of them. In fact, as far as personnel is concerned, these museums are going downhill.

Mr. Chairman, these charges can be documented. First, I will discuss the National Air and Space Museum. The cogent facts are as follows:

1. The National Air and Space Museum receives an extremely meager share of the Smithsonian’s Federal Budget—about 1.7 percent.

2. The professional and support departments of the Flight Museum are seriously undermanned. It has only 31 people on board.

3. The museum attracts at least one-third of the visitors to the Smithsonian Park. In fact, an in-house survey by the Smithsonian reveals that 9 out of every 10 visitors interviewed at the Mall had been to see the Air and Space Museum—a shocking contrast with the miniscule share of funds and employees which the museum receives.

4. The museum has no director. It has had no director for nearly a year, even though it has been 24 months since the last director gave notice of his planned retirement.

5. For many years the Air and Space Museum was not considered to be one of the Institution’s science and technology components. Rather, it was put into the arts and humanities wing of the Institution.

6. It can be proven that in 1969 the Smithsonian management threatened the Flight Museum and its exhibits with expulsion from the Mall. The Assistant Secretary for History and Art proposed to “get rid of the tin shed” and “get the missiles out of our view.”
7. Most Flight Museum exhibits are badly housed, and deteriorating rapidly. The building labeled "National Air and Space Museum" is actually a World War I temporary hangar erected in 1917. The other building used for air and space exhibits is 90 years old.

8. The program for construction of a permanent air and space building is at dead center. In the words of Paul Johnston the last director of the museum, the project "may never get off the ground."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to review these facts and to document each of them.

There is no question that the Air and Space Museum is given less than a 2-percent slice of the Smithsonian's Federal budget. According to the end of the year figures, the museum's budget was cut by the Smithsonian to under $500,000 for the 1970 fiscal year. This is all that the museum received out of $28.1 million which Congress appropriated for Smithsonian salaries and expenses.

In terms of the Smithsonian's employment picture, the Flight Museum's share is even smaller.

At the April hearings Under Secretary Bradley stated that the actual number of permanent employees on the Federal payroll was 1,889. At this time the number of employees at the National Air and Space Museum was 30, counting curators, administrators, secretaries, and the support team at Silver Hill. This amounts to 1.6 percent of the overall Smithsonian staff.

Mr. Chairman, the Smithsonian claims that the Flight Museum had the equivalent of 39 positions filled in 1970 because the Office of Exhibits performed work on some air and space projects, but this completely overlooks the fact that the Office of Exhibits has its own appropriations. This work has been justified before Congress as a separate item in the Smithsonian's budget.

When Congress appropriated money for 41 positions at the Flight Museum, it didn't think it was paying for the salaries of people in the Office of Exhibits. To turn around now and claim that the museum had the equivalent of 39 employees muddies the waters. The next thing I know the Institution will be charging janitorial help and guard services against the museum as well.

Mr. Chairman, the employment picture looks incredible when it is viewed in comparison with the responsibilities of the museum.

The Historical Research Center of the museum, which supports the curatorial and exhibits staff by documenting the authenticity of artifact acquisitions, by answering 6,000 public inquiries annually, and by running a reference library, has three employees. In 1967 it had five.

The Preservation and Restoration Division at Silver Hill, which handles the assemblage and retrieval of aircraft and aeronautical specimens, the maintenance of museum collections, and the inventory and cataloging of these collections, had 15 employees several years ago. It was down to 14 early this year. The curators' professional staff has decreased 50 percent in the aero section, from four employees to two.

And on it goes. While the museum could easily justify the need for 50 or more positions at present, the actual number of hands on board is less now than it was in 1966.
If the Smithsonian management intends more than lip service when it calls for the Flight Museum to be the "Nation's center for exhibition, education, and research in the history and principles of air and space flight" and the home of the "world's greatest collection of objects related to flight," then I believe the management should release to the museum the positions that Congress has authorized.

Turning to the visitor statistics, the Smithsonian Information Office reports that 12.4 million visitors came to see the Smithsonian Park in calendar year 1969 and that at least 4.1 million of these persons went through Air and Space Museum exhibits.

Unfortunately, this word does not seem to have gotten through to the secretariat. At page 894 of the recent House appropriation hearings, Dr. Ripley spoke of only 2 million visitors a year seeing "our air and space displays." But in truth, there were more than 4 million visitors to these displays in 1969. Approximately 2.3 million persons came to see the exhibits at the Arts and Industries Building, and another 1.8 million visitors went through the Air and Space Building.

The most striking evidence of the popularity of the Air and Space Museum is found in a "visitor survey" conducted by the Smithsonian itself. I can disclose today that the Smithsonian collected over 700 questionnaires from visitors to the Museum of Natural History and the Museum of History and Technology during the winter of 1968. No interviews were taken at the Air and Space Museum.

And yet this survey turned up the following finding:

In responding to the question on points of interest in Washington, 87.2 percent had been to the Air and Space Building as compared to 54.4 percent who had visited the Museum of History and Technology, and 47.1 percent who had visited the Museum of Natural History.

Here we have a study that was openly biased in favor of visitors to the two museums where persons were being interviewed. Even so, almost nine out of every 10 persons questioned said they had been to the Air and Space displays. In other words, the Flight Museum had drawn more visitors than either of the two museums where the questions were asked.

All in all, I think the Air and Space Museum has played a remarkable role in drawing visitors to the Smithsonian park. It does not have a puppet show or other unrelated attraction to bring in an audience, but it is demonstrating a unique capacity to hold public interest on its own merits. The fact that Britain's royal visitors, Prince Charles and Princess Anne, chose to tour the Air and Space collections during their first visit to the Smithsonian is further proof of the remarkable popularity of these exhibits.

Mr. Chairman, one fact that disturbs me greatly is that the Flight Museum does not have a fulltime Director. Nor has the Smithsonian ever said what requirements have been set for the position. The last Director, S. Paul Johnston, was a distinguished foresighted individual. A graduate of MIT, he had held a number of prominent positions both in industry and Government as an aeronautical engineer and adviser before joining the Flight Museum team.

Anticipating his retirement, he furnished the Secretary with notice of his planned retirement 13 months in advance of his target date. By letter, dated July 30, 1968, Mr. Johnston informed Dr. Ripley of his decision to retire "as of September 1, 1969."
Uppermost in Mr. Johnston’s mind was his wish to pave the way for a successful transition for his successor. His letter specifically asked “that a successor be brought aboard as my deputy not later than May 1, 1969, to allow for at least 4 months of overlap.” And yet, as of today the Museum is still without a Director. This fact alone can be interpreted as a lack of interest by the Smithsonian in its Air and Space Museum.

Another fact that offers a clue as to the status of the Flight Museum is that until a few months ago it reported to the Assistant Secretary for History and Art. How in the world flight ever got mixed up with the “arts” at the Institution is beyond me. Aeronautics and astronautics derive from, and incorporate, several of the sciences, including mathematics, physics, fuel chemistry, metallurgy, physiology, psychology, biology, astronomy, astrophysics, geology, and geophysics.

The Air and Space Museum should have been put in the Smithsonian’s Science and Technology wing from the start. It is to the credit of the present Acting Director that he at last succeeded in having the Museum transferred to the Science branch of the Institution.

There is one more incident that causes me grave concern about the attitudes of the Smithsonian toward the Air and Space Museum. The management has denied this to my staff, but I can document the fact that the Assistant Secretary for History and Art wanted to expel the Flight Museum and its exhibits from the Mall. This proposal was made in a memorandum sent by the Assistant Secretary to Dr. Ripley on March 20, 1969.

Please remember that this is the officer who then held the power of supervision over the Flight Museum. His plan expressly called for “using the middle of the Pension Office Building as the next temporary location for Air and Space exhibits, in place of the tin shed, the driveway, and the A. & I. Building.”

The idea was to send the Museum to the dilapidated Pension Building where it would be separated from the Mall. Once away, it may never have come back.

Another indication of the rank of the Air and Space Museum within the Smithsonian is the condition of its public exhibits. These displays have not been brought up to modern Smithsonian standards as applied to its other components.

On January 3, 1968, an official report was submitted to Dr. Ripley, which reads: “All NASM exhibits are badly housed and deteriorating rapidly under heavy visitor wear and tear.”

On July 30, 1968, Dr. Ripley was given the following museum report:

Most present exhibit areas are a hodge-podge of hardware with little rational relationship, are largely out-of-date and are so shopworn that they constitute a public embarrassment to the Smithsonian.

Things finally got so bad that the Smithsonian broke the problem at the 1970 fiscal year hearings. The justification sheets of the institution, dated March 12, 1969, warn that:

The Smithsonian’s Air and Space exhibits have not received a major refurbishing since 1958. They are outdated and shabby and a source of disappointment to many of a million visitors interested in air and space exploration.
Mr. Chairman, there are some positive steps now being taken by the Smithsonian to revitalize these exhibits and I will be watching closely to see that they continue.

The next matter is the most difficult problem confronting the Museum. It is not one that can be solved overnight by a change in priorities, as I believe the others can be. This is the problem of getting funds for the construction of a permanent building to house the Air and Space Museum.

The problem boils down to money. If Congress had allowed the project to get started in 1966, when it authorized construction of the building, the total cost would have been in the neighborhood of $40 million. This compares favorably with the $34 million which Congress allowed 10 years earlier for construction of the Museum of History and Technology.

But Congress did not permit the building to go forward. 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 Commission 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.

That is it. That is the only legislative holdup on the project. It was written in June of 1966, before the first manned lunar landing.

Now that this landmark in the history of mankind has occurred and public excitement about space achievements had catapulted, I believe that there are new and persuasive reasons for moving ahead with the new facility.

In particular, I believe the time is at hand when the American people want to have a decent home for the national Museum where their country's exciting story in air and space can be told. America's accomplishments in the field of aerospace are monumental. The true value of the inspirational feeling which the story of these achievements can give is beyond any dollar estimate.

Who can place a value on the meaning of the Wright Brothers' flight at Kitty Hawk? Who can say the true worth of preserving for future Americans the opportunity to behold the actual aircraft in which Lindbergh crossed the Atlantic or the Apollo 11 spacecraft in which man reached the moon? Is the display of our accomplishments and future in air and space worth $40 million? Or $60 million in inflation-swollen dollars?

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is. I believe the American people will agree with me. And I am hopeful that friends of the Flight Museum can get this story across to Congress. After all, no one is suggesting there is a connection between events in Vietnam and the construction of the Hirshhorn Museum. There was no tie to Vietnam holding up the $2.6 million which Congress appropriated to refurbish the Smithsonian administrative quarters to look as they did in 1855. No one proposed a relationship between Vietnam and the $2.6 million which Congress is appropriating for the renovation of the Renwick Gallery and no one is suggesting that we wait until the Vietnam conflict settles down before Congress authorizes $6 million that the Smithsonian management is seeking to build two bicentennial pavilions.
In short, it is my contention that the Flight Museum should not be singled out from all other Smithsonian projects and told that its new building must be deferred until Vietnam expenditures ease off.

Furthermore, it is my belief that since Congress imposed this restriction, it is Congress who should bear the moral obligation to provide the additional funds that are required because of the delay. This is important because I believe strongly that the new facility should be constructed exactly as it was planned.

It is a beautiful design. It has been approved by the necessary planning and art commissions. And architects generally believe it would be a valuable asset to the Nation’s Capital.

But if the building were to be redesigned, all the questions of its size, its relationship to other structures on the Mall, and perhaps even its very location at the Smithsonian Park would be reopened. The critics of technological museums would be given a fresh opportunity to tie the project down in a web of new hearings and proceedings. This is why I disagree with the Smithsonian management and the Regents on this important matter.

What I am proposing will not be easy. It will require the participation of the aerospace industry. It will require encouraging Congress to recognize that $60 million is not too large an investment for our Government to make in preserving the heritage of our people in the mainstream of aviation, rocketry and space history.

But I am convinced that this is a cause that is right. It is a cause that deserves a fight to be made for it. It is a cause that I believe will prevail once Congress is shown how reasonable and worthwhile it is. Above all else, it is a cause that will require the most energetic, whole-hearted efforts that the Smithsonian itself is capable of mustering. The Smithsonian must convince the American people and Congress that the Flight Museum enjoys a top-priority status within its organization.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I wish to 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.

The art field is one in which I am deeply committed. For example, I enthusiastically support the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. In fact, this year I spoke out three times on the Senate floor to endorse the extension of the Foundation’s life and to urge substantial increases in the funds appropriated to it.

My interest in art dates back as far as I can remember. The Kachina Doll Collection of Indian art which Rink Kibbey and I gave to the Heard Museum in Phoenix is only one instance of my personal participation in the arts. This is the world’s largest and most complete collection of Kachina dolls.

My true aim today is limited to inquiring whether the Smithsonian’s list of priorities has slipped off course. I ask whether the same level of attention should be given to the National Air and Space Museum that the Institution gives to so many other of its projects?

This question may also be asked in behalf of the National Museum of Natural History. For the evidence is too clear that this museum, as well, is suffering from a decline in support. The principal facts are these:
1. The present Director of the Museum of Natural History claims that our museum has its back up against the wall. In fact, he warns that our survival is at stake.

2. The Smithsonian Council, which is a grassroots body of advisers appointed by Dr. Ripley, has informed the Secretary in writing that "the Council is deeply concerned with the present trend relating to systematic biology as it affects the Museum of Natural History and strongly urges the allocation of additional resources to the Museum to promote this field."

3. The Council of the Senate of Scientists, which represents the professional staff at the Museum of Natural History, has confronted Dr. Ripley with sharp complaints about the decline of support to that museum.

4. The Smithsonian has severely restricted the services provided to the museum by the Smithsonian’s Buildings Management Department. This unit provides indispensable help, such as moving equipment, installing shelves, or dividing an office or work area.

5. The scientific staff of the Museum of Natural History has fallen below the level it was at 3 years ago.

6. The number of laboratory technicians available to assist the museum’s research scientists has also declined since the 1967 fiscal year, forcing individual scientists to lose a heavy part of their time doing manuscript typing, slide preparations and other work that should be done for them by a support staff.

7. The Institution’s foreign currency program request for first priority research projects of the Museum of Natural History is down by 53 percent from last year—from $336,000 to $220,000.

8. The museum’s research departments are being deprived of several hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in overhead moneys which are brought into the Institution through research grants and contracts performed by the museum’s scientific staff, but are spooned off for the benefit of some other Smithsonian components.

9. The Smithsonian’s press office is unable to provide adequate support help to researchers in natural history because editors who are paid from Federal funds are directed to spend much of their time working on books sold by the Smithsonian to make money for its private funds.

10. The condition of exhibit animals on display at the Natural History Building is deplorable.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer the following evidence in support of my remarks.

First and foremost, I am impressed with the strong plea that has been made on behalf of the Museum of Natural History by its present Director, Dr. Richard Cowan.

Dr. Cowan was the one shining star at a meeting that my staff held with representatives of the Smithsonian. The fervor with which he promoted the cause of his museum, and his willingness to bare its problems in front of top officials of the Institution, showed me how very important it is to have a strong force at the head of the Smithsonian’s museums.

He made no bones about it. As I have mentioned, he announced to all those assembled that the Museum of Natural History “has its back up against the wall.”
Mr. Chairman, with a director who is willing to push for the cause of his museum and fight for his men inside the upper echelons of the Smithsonian the way Dr. Cowan does, I do not think it will be long before the Museum of Natural History sees some improvements in its picture. His leadership points up better than anything else the need for a strong director to head the National Air and Space Museum as well.

Mr. Chairman, there is little to add to the recommendation which the Smithsonian Council has made except to say that its action demonstrates a growing sense of concern by the Council. Indeed, this may have been the first time they have ever adopted any resolutions. The fact that the Council felt it had to urge the Secretary to allocate additional resources to the Museum of Natural History is by itself a good reason for Congress to examine the situation.

As Paul Oehser points out in his new book, "The Smithsonian Institution": "Nearly all the professional staff of the Museum of Natural History engage in systematic research in one form or another." Thus, increased support for the field of systematic biology, as urged by the Council, would pretty well overlap into every department of the museum.

Mr. Chairman, with your consent, I will offer a copy of the Council’s report for your files with the request that it appear in the record.

Mr. Thompson. Without objection, it will appear following your statement, Senator.

Senator Goldwater. Next I would like to send to the desk a copy of the letter which the Council of the Senate of Scientists presented to Dr. Ripley on May 15. I also ask that it may be printed in the record.

Mr. Thompson. Without objection, it will also be made a part of the record.

Senator Goldwater. Mr. Chairman, you will see that the grassroots scientists are extremely concerned about the trend of events at the museum.

The scientists mention many of the specific conditions which cause their distress. These include:

Sharp reductions in services and supplies provided by other Smithsonian units, such as the Supply Division and the Library, the continued attrition of supporting personnel, and the failure of our operating budgets to keep pace with overall inflation.

They add:

We respectfully submit that growth in staff has not been taking place within the National Museum of Natural History during the past three years. We therefore see no reason why the already minimal budgetary allowances for collection care should be endangered because of the phenomenal growth in personnel we have witnessed in other Smithsonian offices and bureaus during the same three years. It is unfortunate enough that we have lost many staff positions to other parts of the Smithsonian in this way over the years, but it could be catastrophic to allow the funds allocated for collection maintenance to be cannibalized in the same fashion.

Mr. Chairman, these criticisms can be substantiated.

As to the drop in support services, we can examine the situation at the Buildings Management Department, which provides craftsmen’s services, such as carpenters, electricians and movers. To understand the problems here, I suggest that the committee ask the Smithsonian to discuss a reported $1.5 million budget overrun in that department,
meaning that this amount of BMD resources went out unbudgeted for certain projects. If this report is accurate, the money had to be taken out of the hide of other projects for which the money had been planned.

As to the decline in positions at the museum, I would like to quote from the hearings on Smithsonian funds for the 1967 fiscal year. At page 163 Dr. Ripley states:

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 aides should be assigned to each scientist.

And yet, as of today the number of scientists has dropped to 103. The number of technicians has fallen to 87.

Dr. Ripley has admitted this decline. On page 757 of the April hearings by the House Appropriations Committee, Dr. Ripley’s statement reads:

[8] Scientific 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.

The drop in foreign currency research funds is easy to document. My figures are calculated from the Smithsonian’s own list of research projects which are identified at pages 954 through 976 of the recent House hearings on Smithsonian funds.

Another interesting question that the committee may wish to explore is what happens to the overhead moneys that flow into the Smithsonian as a result of research grants and contracts awarded to scientists at the Museum of Natural History.

According to a recent GAO report, the total amount of money derived by the Smithsonian from research grants and contracts runs in excess of $11 million. The question is, Where does the overhead portion of these funds go? Is any sizable amount plowed back into the departments and museum whose reputation attracts the grants and contracts in the first place and whose labors accomplish the assigned research?

Serious doubt has been raised from many different quarters as to whether these overhead moneys—which amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars annually in the case of Natural History—are used for the support of the Natural History Museum or are transferred into other projects more popular with the Smithsonian management. I think it would be helpful to the morale of the museum’s staff if the committee could discover the true answer to this question.

Mr. Chairman, the next problem may be one which can best be examined by the Comptroller General. This is the issue of when it is proper to use federally appropriated funds to support programs that are intended to make money for the Smithsonian’s private funds.

The situation is this. All the editors at the Smithsonian Press are on the Federal rolls. Yet the same people are required to divert a portion of their time to working on books that are for sale by the private side of the Smithsonian. These books are intended to generate revenues for the private funds of the Institution. But there is a serious question whether it is proper for the Smithsonian to use Federal funds to finance its own revenue-producing activities. The thing that makes
this situation curious is that lines had been carefully drawn between Federal editors and private editors under the previous administration. When Dr. Carmichael was Secretary and Paul Oehser was in charge of the Smithsonian publications arm, the editors were clearly identified as being either private or Federal. However, the publications office has been reorganized by the present Secretary and there are no more privately funded editors left at the office.

Mr. Chairman, the final problem which I hope the committee will examine relates to the condition of exhibits at the Museum’s Hall of Mammals. Many collectors have asked me to protest about the sad shape that these displays are in. We should remember that a great many of these specimens have been donated to the Smithsonian together with the money to mount them. Also, I believe several of these animals were acquired from Teddy Roosevelt’s African safari.

With this important historical tie, and with the knowledge that the exhibits represent the visible side of the Smithsonian to many visitors, I feel this matter is worthy of being reviewed by the committee.

Again, the answer may lie in a shortage of personnel. As a result of another reorganization done by the current management, I am informed that there is no longer any taxidermic unit attached to Natural History. There used to be one, but it was first moved out of the museum and then abolished.

Mr. Chairman, I want to close my remarks on a positive note because of my high admiration for the Smithsonian. It is an important force for public awareness, enjoyment and service. It is a great and honored institution, whose reputation opens doors worldwide.

My purpose is not to condemn the Institution or its management. I am merely asking that a fresh look be given to its operations to see if it has steered off course a few degrees. If Congress or the Smithsonian finds that there is some truth in the questions I have raised, then I am confident that responsible and fair men will be ready to take whatever steps are needed to restore a balance to the Smithsonian’s list of priorities.

(The documents follow:)

May 15, 1970.

Mr. S. Dillon Ripley,
Secretary, Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Ripley: The Council of the Senate of Scientists, National Museum of Natural History, is distressed by the recent announcement that the deficit in Smithsonian funding would be made from reductions in the operating budgets of the various bureaus, with a considerable amount representing the share of the National Museum of Natural History.

Those members of the professional staff at the divisional and departmental levels, charged with the immediate, day to day maintenance and care of the national collections of natural history and anthropological specimens, have felt, perhaps more strongly than any other employee of the Smithsonian, the effects of increased stringency in budget allocations for equipment and supplies, sharp reductions in services and supplies provided by other Smithsonian units such as the Supply Division and the Library, the continued attrition of supporting personnel, and the failure of our operating budgets to keep pace with overall inflation. We feel strongly that our budgetary allocations are currently at an absolute minimum and, therefore, must not be reduced further. The collections are too important a part of our national and scientific heritage, and scientific research and publication are too important a part of the Smithsonian’s mission, for us to stand by and witness their derogation in favor of other activities more highly emphasized by the Smithsonian administrators.
We respectfully submit that growth in staff has not been taking place within the National Museum of Natural History during the past three years. We therefore see no reason why the already minimal budgetary allowances for collection care should be endangered because of the phenomenal growth in personnel we have witnessed in other Smithsonian offices and bureaus during the same three years. It is unfortunate enough that we have lost many staff positions to other parts of the Smithsonian in this way over the years, but it could be catastrophic to allow the funds allocated for collection maintenance to be cannibalized in the same fashion. We strongly recommend that deficiencies because of over-staffing in recent years be remedied by reduction of staff in those same areas which have shown extraordinary growth during that time.

Smithsonian Council, Meeting of April 25–27, 1970

Resolution One: That the Council continue its examinations of the pattern of objectives and the inter-relations of programs of the Smithsonian so as to advise the principal officers of the Institution and to foster the development of a critical dialogue regarding basic policies in scholarship, education, and national service.

Resolution Two: That the Council should have a Chairman selected from its membership and a secretary chosen from the staff of the Institution.

Resolution Three: In view of the present need to protect and appreciate the diversity of the environment the Council is deeply concerned with the present trend relating to systematic biology as it affects the Museum of Natural History and strongly urges the allocation of additional resources to the Museum to promote this field.

Questions which exemplify the interest and concern of the Council are the following:

1. May the Council receive information on a regular basis about trends in resource allocation and also an analytic digest of the recently concluded visitor survey?
2. Might the Council be brought into a defined relationship with other Smithsonian advisory boards and also the Board of Regents?
3. How does the Smithsonian coordinate its museum activities (in art, for example and with regard to acquisitions especially) with other Washington museums?
4. What shall be the prerogatives and responsibilities and curators regarding exhibits? How can maximum participation be achieved in advance planning of exhibits?
5. How may the Institution guarantee that the objectives announced when new projects are established are not later frustrated through lack of support?
6. How can basic concepts of science (molecular biology, differing cosmologies, puzzling astrophysical objects, continental drift) be communicated to museum visitors?
7. How may the Institution improve communication among its principal officers and professional staff members?

Members of the Council again expressed their appreciation to the staff of the Belmont Conference Center and to the members of the Smithsonian staff who participated in discussions at this meeting.

Submitted by:

Philip C. Ritterbush,
Acting Secretary to the Council.

Senator Goldwater. In closing, I would ask that two letters which Dr. Ripley has written to me on the general subject might appear in the record at this point.

Mr. Thompson. Without objection, they will.

(The documents follow:)
Hon. Barry M. Goldwater,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Goldwater: I have read your long statement about the Smithsonian, and in particular about the National Air and Space Museum, with very great interest. I regret that I did not have an opportunity to discuss with you your concerns before you delivered your speech. I would have been able to tell you of our continuing efforts in seeking to move forward on this front, and of some of the concrete steps we have taken.

The ultimate construction of a suitable building to house the Nation's air and space collections will be the successful culmination of 24 years of Congressional encouragement and legislative action in the interest of air and space science and history.

Starting with the Act of August 12, 1946, the Congress established the National Air Museum as a part of the Smithsonian Institution. The Congress included provisions for selecting a site for a National Air Museum building to be located in the Nation's Capital. By the Act of September 6, 1958, the Congress designated a site for a building to be on the Mall from Fourth Street to Seventh Street, Independence Avenue to Jefferson Drive. Planning appropriations in the amount of $511,000 and $1,364,000 have been made available to the Smithsonian by the Congress for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965, respectively. One of my first official acts as Secretary was to testify before the Congressional Committees in support of the planning appropriation for the fiscal year 1965.

I recall with pleasure that at the time of my letter of May 25, 1964, on S. 2602, 88th Congress, addressed to Senator Pell, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on the Smithsonian Institution, it appeared that the building might soon be approved for construction. It was so recommended but the bill was not passed by the House after it had been approved by the Senate.

The Congress subsequently enacted legislation approved on July 19, 1966, authorizing the construction of the National Air and Space Museum.

In connection with this authorization, P.L. 89-505, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration in its report to the Senate stated: "In reporting favorably on H.R. 6125, the Committee on Rules and Administration noted with satisfaction the letter of May 13, 1966, from Secretary Ripley, giving assurances that funds would not be requested in this session of Congress pursuant to the authorization in H.R. 6125. The committee expressly recommends that funding for the National Air and Space Museum should be deferred even further, if need be, and 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."

Rather than assume the responsibility for interpreting the wording, "substantial reductions in military expenditures in Vietnam," the Smithsonian Institution continued to seek appropriations for the Air and Space Museum. Funds for construction were then requested in the fiscal year 1966 and fiscal year 1967 budget submissions to the Bureau of the Budget in the amount of $40,045,000 and $40,331,000 respectively, as estimated by the General Services Administration.

Both requests were deleted by the Administration prior to submittal of the budget to the Congress. During preparation of the fiscal year 1968 budget, it was decided that an incremental request for construction funds for the foundation and underground parking garage might be more acceptable, following the precedent used by the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration to start the FBI Building and the new Labor Department Building. Funds in the amount of $9,500,000 were therefore requested for this purpose in both the fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1969 budget submittals to the Bureau of the Budget and each time the item was deleted and not submitted to the Congress.

With the passage of time and unusually sharp increases in construction costs, the GSA was requested to update the construction cost estimate. In January 1968 we were advised by GSA that the building would now cost nearly $56,000,000 and in the next few years would increase to $65 million, if the then planned planetarium were added to the project. This substantial increase in cost led to consideration of reducing the cost by reducing the size of the building and even completely redesigning if necessary.
The Chancellor of the Smithsonian Institution then wrote to the President on November 19, 1969, to inform him of the resolution approved by the Board of Regents on November 5, 1969, as follows:

Voted that the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution recognizes the intense interest of the American people in the national air and space programs and in the historic flight of Apollo 11 to the Moon and return. The Regents recognize that by Public Law 89-509 the Nation's Air and Space Museum is authorized to be constructed on the Mall on a site designated by Act of Congress. The Regents further recognize that because of substantial increases in construction costs, the building as now designed should be scaled down from its present level of $85 million to a cost level not to exceed $40 million. The Regents, therefore, most respectively and most urgently request that the President include in his budget for the fiscal year 1971 an amount of $2 million to finance the necessary redesign of this great educational and exhibition center for our air and space exploration.

The Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs responded to the Chancellor's letter on December 10, 1969, and stated that funds for redesign had not been included in the 1971 budget by the Bureau of the Budget because of budgetary constraints, but that it would be included in a list of appealed items to be presented to the President during his review.

After a discussion of these efforts with me, Regent William A. M. Burden wrote to the President, urging that redesign funds be inserted as an amendment to the Presidential Budget. He stated that his concern "arises from our intense desire to complete the National Air and Space Museum within the years of your incumbency as President. In order to complete such an historic structure in time for 1976 at the earliest, it will be necessary to commence planning for a rescaling downwards in cost of the present approved structure. The nation can save perhaps more than $20 million in completed costs by spending $2 million for replanning now."

"Mindful of the vital need which the Administration faces in cutting costs, it seems to us that this planning item, which could be inserted as an amendment to the Presidential Budget, would be viewed as a prudent investment for the future."

In the interim, the architect has been authorized to prepare a feasibility study to show in outline form the maximum size and arrangement for a building estimated to cost $40 million. This study will be completed in June 1970.

The Smithsonian was subsequently advised that the Senate had requested in 1966 that appropriations for this purpose not be sought "unless and until there is a substantial redirection in our military expenditures in Vietnam." While the military effort in Vietnam is certainly redirected, we were advised, unfortunately the military expenditure level has not lessened appreciably. We were further advised that the President has directed very drastic cuts in all budgets for FY 1971 and that there is no possibility of reinstating this request under the circumstances.

In our submission of the fiscal year 1972 budget to the Bureau of the Budget, we will again request an appropriation of $2,000,000 for planning. We believe that the investment of redesign costs will result in a substantial decrease in ultimate construction costs and thereby increase the prospect of starting construction at the earliest possible date. We consider that an appropriation for redesign would not be in conflict with the previously stated position of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. We base this statement on the fact that the reference to the then pending legislation, H.R. 6125, was related to an authorization for construction of the building. Planning had been authorized earlier by the Act of September 6, 1958. Accordingly, I am writing to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, asking his concurrence in this interpretation and for his support of our proposed request for planning funds.

In order to provide additional exhibition space for the National Air and Space Museum, pending the construction of a proper museum building for this purpose, a substantial part of the Arts and Industries Building has been assigned to the Air and Space Museum. The exhibitions in this area are of great interest to our visiting public and serve admirably to complement the exhibitions in the adjoining Air and Space Museum hangar.

A number of potential candidates for the position of Director of the National Air and Space Museum have been interviewed. The search continues and we have called upon several of the Regents to assist in suggesting names and in
evaluating applicants. The recent appointment of Mr. James E. Webb as a member of the Board of Regents by the Act of May 18, 1970, will provide another Regent with a strong interest in the Air and Space Museum and in the selection of a Director.

In the meantime, Mr. Frank A. Taylor, the senior museum director in the Institution, is serving as Acting Director.

In regard to the proposed Museum of Man, let me say that it was my hope that we could re-establish the Institution's primacy in the field of anthropology that prevailed from the late nineteenth century through the 1930's. I undertook, therefore, to consolidate the Bureau of American Ethnology and the Department of Anthropology to form an intellectual critical mass. In late 1968, sufficient progress had been made in evolving our anthropological programs to warrant the conversion of the transitional Office of Anthropology to the Center for the Study of Man. The Center reinforces and supports the more traditional, collection-based, scholarly activities that go on in the Department of Anthropology with an infusion of scholarship by distinguished ethnologists, social biologists and the like from outside the Smithsonian, including scholars from abroad.

A National Museum of Man would further strengthen the Smithsonian's contributions in the broad area of anthropology, a field that is rapidly undergoing a fundamental change both in the attitudes of its practitioners and in their sightings of new scholarly objectives.

Concerning the personnel of the National Museum of Natural History, I should say that when I came to the Smithsonian I was concerned with our inability to compete with other institutions for highly qualified scientists because of salary levels. Now we have succeeded in attracting a number of highly competent, indeed distinguished scientists to the professional staff in the National Museum of Natural History.

In 1965 we were able to convince both the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress of the merit of providing the Smithsonian with a direct appropriation for research. The appropriation was designed to offset the decline in support that we had been receiving from the National Science Foundation. Since that time, Congress has continued to appropriate funds for scientific research, but unfortunately the level of support has remained static. Nonetheless, the largest percentage of funds from that appropriation has been awarded to scientists in the National Museum of Natural History. In addition, our scientists have been the principal beneficiaries of funds brought into the Institution through our Office of Environmental Sciences, including the units in ecology and oceanography. Also, they have benefited from the Institution's Foreign Currency Program. Finally, there has been the support for research and curation that I have been able to provide from the Institution's limited private resources.

With gratitude, I recall that the Congress provided $18,636,000 for the addition of 512,000 square feet of laboratory space to the National Museum of Natural History. These additions, completed in 1963–65, provided a major expansion in the facilities for scientific research in this museum.

I am most grateful for your interest in the National Air and Space Museum and I would indeed welcome an opportunity to discuss with you the development of a new museum at the earliest possible time.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary.

P.S.—A copy of my letter of October 10, 1969, to Senator Jordan on this subject is enclosed.

OCTOBER 10, 1969.

Hon. Claiborne Pell,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Smithsonian Institution, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Hon. B. Everett Jordan,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Widespread public interest in our Air and Space program has been further enhanced by the historic flight of Apollo 11 to the Moon and its return to Earth.

It appears to be appropriate therefore to recall that Public Law 89–509 which was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration
on June 28, 1966, authorizes construction of the National Air and Space Museum. Funds for construction have not been appropriated. In its report to the Senate, the Committee included the following provision:

"In reporting favorably on H.R. 6125, the Committee on Rules and Administration noted with satisfaction the letter of May 13, 1966, from Secretary Ripley, giving assurances that funds would not be requested in this session of Congress pursuant to the authorization in H.R. 6125. The committee expressly recommends that funding for the National Air and Space Museum should be deferred even further, if need be, and 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."

Current actions to reduce the scale of military operations by the United States in Vietnam now being reported in the press, together with evidence of the strong public interest in the air and space program, lead me to ask for your further consideration of the possibility of initiating construction of the National Air and Space Museum in the fiscal year 1971 or 1972.

The President's deferment of certain Federal construction in the fiscal year 1970 is recognized as a present barrier to Federal construction in general. Nevertheless, the message from the Bureau of the Budget on this subject does not at this time project the deferment beyond the fiscal year 1970.

Construction when started will require four or more years, so that the budgetary effect of the estimated cost of about $60 million will be spread over a time span of five years. The development could be achieved also through successive physical and funding stages, thereby avoiding budgetary peaking. Under this plan of development, there would be undertaken first the substructure, largely occupied by a garage, which could be utilized for public parking as soon as completed, on a fee basis. As a second stage, the central bays of the superstructure of the building could be erected and utilized by the public as a major exhibition and educational hall for air and space achievements. As a third stage, the end bays of the superstructure could be undertaken to complete the building as now designed.

Another possibility would be a total redesign to produce plans for a different building of smaller proportions costing less than $40 million.

We are convinced that this great exhibition and educational center will be visited by more than five million of our citizens each year. When constructed, it will serve admirably to record for our people, especially the young, the history of the air and space age as it is being made.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary.

P.S.—The visitation to the specimen of Moon Rock now in our old exhibition building amply confirms the vast public awareness and excitement of our space accomplishments.

Smithsonian Institution,

Hon. Barry Goldwater,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Goldwater: Thank you for your letter of June 17, 1970, to which I would like to respond in the same spirit of constructive and helpful criticism you have presented.

I, too, am deeply interested and committed to the goal of achieving a balanced program for the Smithsonian.

I have been concerned since joining the Smithsonian with the need to strike a balance by reasserting the Institution's leadership in a number of fields of scholarship and public service in which I believe we have strong historical responsibilities and potential for the future. I believe that in the long term we will be able to achieve the level of recognition and support from both the private and public sectors for our research and curatorial activities that are so badly needed and so well deserved. It has been difficult to win essential budget increases for our fundamental scientific research. It is this fact, I believe, that led the Smithsonian Council to formulate a supporting resolution that was touched on in your letter; we welcome this resolution.
At the same time that we have been trying earnestly to make progress in the sciences, as well as in history and art, the Congress during the last decade has enacted some 20 pieces of major legislation which place additional responsibilities on us. For all of these we are grateful and intend to strive ever harder to support.

In addition to supporting the National Museum of Natural History and the National Air and Space Museum, we have had to stretch our resources to help alleviate some of the very serious problems confronting other scientific units of the Smithsonian, including the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, the Smithsonian Radiation Biology Laboratory, and the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory. In fact, the portion of available funds applied to our scientific programs is very substantially greater than the amounts made available for programs in history and art.

In any event, I heartily concur in your estimation that the Museum of Natural History needs a sizable increase in the number of professional and technical aides and for associated expenses.

With regard to the Institution's relationship with the National Science Foundation, let me state clearly that the Smithsonian did not initiate any plan to discontinue the National Science Foundation's grant support for the scientists in the National Museum of Natural History or any other unit of the Institution. On the contrary, this action was initiated in the National Science Foundation, with the consent of the Bureau of the Budget, as a direct consequence of NSF's interpretation of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for the Fiscal Year 1964. I am enclosing copies of several letters and memoranda to document this fact, including a copy of a personal letter that I sent to a representative of the National Science Foundation while I was still the Director of the Peabody Museum at Yale. That letter was but the first of many efforts on my part to re-establish a full financial relationship between the National Science Foundation and the Smithsonian Institution. In all fairness to the NSF, I need to point out that the Institution has been the recipient of substantial sums annually from the Foundation, despite the restrictive interpretation that has persisted in regard to individual research projects. Currently, we are preparing several additional, carefully conceived programs for consideration by NSF.

Concerning employment at the National Air and Space Museum, I offer the following table and explanation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Allowed by Congress</th>
<th>Apportioned by the Smithsonian</th>
<th>Service provided by Office of Exhibits (equivalent to man-years)</th>
<th>End of the year employment (exclusive of summer temps)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45, including 6 on private roll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8, including 5 on private roll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8½, including 5 on private roll</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) On July 1, 1968 (start of FY 1969) the National Air and Space Museum (NASM) had a staff (exclusive of temporary summer employees) of 39 full-time Federal employees and 6 private roll employees.

The private roll employees were engaged on the program to select, assemble, and circulate historical spacecraft and related NASA materiel. This was supported by a grant from NASA.

The staff included 10 persons engaged on the design, production, and maintenance of exhibits. During FY 1969, it was decided to transfer the NASM exhibits personnel to the Smithsonian Office of Exhibits (OE) with the understanding that the OE would perform exhibits work for NASM in volume equivalent to or greater than the capability of the section transferred. It was also agreed that in FY 1970 the OE would assume the payment of the salaries of these employees out of the OE budget. The salaries and benefits funds remaining in the NASM as the result of this transfer would be used to convert the private roll employees of the space program to Federal employment at the planned termination of the NASA's support of the program in 1969.
The transfer of the NASM exhibits personnel was made in the interest of efficiency. The immediate supervision of the OE supervisory personnel and the closer scheduling of the services of the central OE shops and supporting units are estimated to have resulted in more work produced.

A museum education specialist in NASM was also transferred to the Office of Academic Programs with the understanding that he would work on educational projects of the NASM.

At the end of FY 1969, the employment of the NASM was down 11 positions from the start of the year as the result of these transfers.

(2) The apportionment of positions to the NASM by the Smithsonian at the start of FY 1970 was 33 positions which included 28 former Federal positions and 5 new positions funded from savings to the NASM from salaries and benefits formerly paid the transferred exhibits workers.

During FY 1970, the personnel of the Office of Exhibits worked on 12 exhibition projects of the National Air and Space Museum including the continuing replacement of units in the Air and Space Building, counted as one project. These projects absorbed 8½ man years of effort and cost $112,000. It should be mentioned that two men on the payroll of the Office of Exhibits are now assigned full time to the maintenance of NASM exhibits which are the best maintained exhibits in the Mall museums.

(3) Through most of FY 1970, the NASM had 31 employees at work and 2 vacancies (the Director and the Director's Administrative Officer). However, as shown, the exhibits work performed at no cost to the NASM means that in 1970 the NASM had the equivalent of 39 positions filled and 2 vacancies.

I fully expect that a new director of the National Air and Space Museum will be selected in the near future. He should begin immediately to plan research and educational programs which can be placed high on the Institution's list of priorities and for which we plan to request appropriations beginning with fiscal year 1972.

Your interest is most welcome and we hope sincerely that you will help us in our efforts to provide adequate support for both the National Air and Space Museum and other scientific bureaus of the Institution.

Sincerely yours,

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary.

Mr. Thompson, Senator, thank you very much for an extremely comprehensive statement.

You have raised a great many questions which we shall put to the Secretary and the Under Secretary and the others from whom we will hear later.

With respect to the Air and Space Museum, I might point out that the prohibitive language tying the matter in with the war in Vietnam was added on the Senate side.

Senator Goldwater, I wasn't here at that time. I was taking my sabbatical at that time.

Mr. Thompson. If indeed it constitutes a continuing restriction, it would have to be lifted over there. Is my recollection correct that some years ago Senator Clinton Anderson introduced the legislation which set aside space on the Mall for the construction of the Air Museum?

Senator Goldwater. Yes; I believe that is correct.

Mr. Thompson. And then subsequently the Congress approved of the design?

Senator Goldwater. That is correct.

Mr. Thompson. The situation now is that because of this restriction and perhaps other matters, the design hasn't gone forward; that is, the construction hasn't gone forward.

Senator Goldwater. I think the only reason is that the restrictions still stand which were placed on by the Senate. It is not Dr. Ripley's
fault. There is no way of determining when expenditures in Vietnam decrease or to what level do they decrease before they become acceptable.

What I would hope would come out of these hearings would be an indication of the need to try again in the Senate—and I will certainly lead the pack in trying to get that done, because I don’t like to see us extend the time with inflation growing the way it is. We think it will take $60 million now to build this building. I have a hunch that is short.

Mr. Thompson. I hardly think that this body is bound by any such language as that. The proponents of the museum perhaps should take some action on this side. Certainly they would receive a hearing early, if it were in our jurisdiction, which I believe it to be. And I don’t think that it would receive the same fate here.

I don’t know whether it would pass in view of President Nixon’s statements with respect to the amount of spending we are doing, nor do I know whether the President would sign such a bill. But that would be his problem, if it reached him, rather than ours. I don’t think that we should be inhibited by such statements, do you?

Senator Goldwater. I don’t think so. I would be very happy to see what I could do in that respect, with what meager influence I have.

Mr. Thompson. I had just one or two comments with respect to storage of the Air Museum’s artifacts and other things at Silver Hill. It has come to our attention that some of these items are in a state of disintegration, some are deteriorating and others are actually disintegrating.

It would seem to me that either those in charge of the Air Museum, the temporary director and so on, ought to properly preserve these exhibits or they should be properly disposed of. Dr. Ripley said the other day that the institution is in a continuous process of disposing of things no longer needed, because they do get such a fantastic number of items.

For instance, the aircraft, the Enola Gay is out there. She was the one used in the atomic attack on Hiroshima. I am not sure that she shouldn’t belong to the Air Force rather than to the Air Museum.

Senator Goldwater. We have visited Silver Hill. I have been interested in it for many years. I would say that the aircraft that the Smithsonian will ultimately want are under cover. They are very few in number.

I would agree with you that in the case of the Enola Gay and many others that they probably should go to the Air Force Museum that has not been started in Dayton, where we have a duplication of models. They can be made available to museums that we find all across America, devoted only to aircraft.

What we are interested in here are the truly historic aircraft. I wouldn’t consider the one that dropped the bomb on Japan as belonging to that category.

Mr. Thompson. No, neither would I.

The facts that you have given us with respect to increase in personnel in some areas of the Smithsonian and the decrease in other areas, are somewhat startling. We are going to ask the Smithsonian personnel people to explain those to us very carefully.
It seems to me obvious that the Air Museum situation in particular needs a most careful review. It is tragic to have things which may have historical value, either at Dayton or elsewhere, or be wanted by State or local museums to be allowed to disintegrate at Silver Hill when ultimately they won't be used here.

Senator Goldwater, I agree with you.

Mr. Thompson. I was also fascinated by the attempt to move the air and space exhibits out of the tin shed over to the Pension Building. I suppose the purpose was to get rid of that ancient tin shed, but had that happened. I don't know whether, as you raised the question, those things would ever have come back on the Mall where so many visitors see them.

Senator Goldwater. I might comment there. I think there is an overwhelming attendance at the Air and Space Museum. I think if you took a census count by age, you would find the explanation immediately. Young people are more than ever in this country air and space-minded.

I call this generation, like my grandchildren, the space generation. I have more intelligent questions asked me about space from fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth graders than I have from some college students or their fathers and mothers.

I think if you walk through the Air and Space Museum at any time, the overwhelming number in there would be younger people. That is the great reason why I think this is so important. When we boil it all down, America's real contribution in the material fields has been technology, and aviation and space represent the peak of that and it will be the magnet that will pull young people along and the steam that will drive the older people with them.

Mr. Thompson. I can hardly imagine, Senator, having a young boy in Washington go through the Smithsonian and not insist upon going through the air part. Everyone that I have ever known does.

I am not going to take any more time except to thank you again for your statement and especially to thank you for your tremendous assistance in supporting the continuation and enlargement of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, something that is rather dear to me as its original author. As a matter of fact, I might comment that many years ago I lost a battle with my friend, Senator Anderson, when he wanted the Air Museum on the Mall and I wanted the National Cultural Center on the Mall.

I learned the meaning of senatorial power in that. But I am satisfied now, extremely so, because we are going forward with the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, which is to be our national showplace.

Mr. Schwengel?
Mr. Schwengel. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator, it is good to see you again and greet you. Welcome to this side.

I am impressed with your statement. It is very well done, very inclusive and you touch on something that is very close to my heart, the Air Museum. I think this is so important for us to give serious consideration to now. It involves one of the great freedoms, maybe
in many respects and more importantly for any one of the other four that we speak of, freedom of movement of men and goods.

As an air enthusiast you know, of course, that the United States of America has led the way and is continuing to lead the way in public and private contributions in explorations, research, studies and so forth.

We at this level have cooperated very well in its development, as Congress has in the development of all other transportation facilities.

So I appreciate your coming here and testifying in behalf of the Air Museum. I think it is a must as far as involvement and development is concerned.

I was impressed also with your statement on arts and humanities. I am interested in this area. I think if there is an area that we ought to stress more in America today, it is this area, to help our people to understand where we came from. I think it was Sandberg who said that whenever you forget the early hard beginnings, there is beginning of decay. There is evidence of decay in America.

You mentioned about youth being interested in the air. I have a grandson who doesn’t have a mother now that lives with us. He can tell me about the names of all the planes. Before I rode in the brandnew 747, he told me all about what to see, what to look for and what I would find and so on. He wanted me to check on it and tell him, which I did.

Mr. Thompson. You mean you didn’t take him with you?

Mr. Schwengel. No, I wasjourneying to the Far East at that time. It was his suggestion that I do that, though.

So I am glad to join you in this objective. I think your testimony was very well done, and presented very well. I have one question on this air museum. I think somebody with your depth of thinking and understanding maybe ought to help us.

I have not seen what I would call a Gettysburg-like statement on the kind of story you would have this museum tell.

Senator Goldwater. I think it would be the continuing story of America, the fact that America has been built by hard work, by young men not afraid to try. If it hadn’t been the Wright Brothers, it would have been the Jones Brothers or the Smith Brothers. Somebody was going to fly.

We can see the story as we look at man walking on the moon and re-member the day that President Kennedy suggested this as our goal and many Members of the Congress said, “It can’t be done.” I don’t think there is anything that can’t be done if we provide encouragement to the development of ambition, intelligence, and education.

I think of the men that I have known through the 40 years I have been in aviation, men who never had a formal education and yet have made tremendous contributions to the technology of aviation just because of that drive of being in an endeavor that requires drive.

And I think all American endeavors do this. I don’t think anybody could ever write a Gettysburg speech for the museum. I think it has already been written by the Wright brothers and the Lindberghs, the Doolittles, Jackie Cochran, Amelia Earhart. Those are the stories that are going to inspire my grandchildren and my great-grandchildren into doing things that I will admit can be done, but I don’t know how the devil to do it.
Mr. Schwengel. My question was prompted by your testimony certainly now, but earlier by a book I read by a Frenchman. He was a great political scientist and recently elected to the Assembly over there. If there is a man to the left of you anywhere, this guy is it.

But in this book there are some magnificent observations about America. You touched on this, and that is technology. This book is a warning to Europeans that unless they get on the ball, American management is going to take over Europe and is doing it now to the tune of billions of dollars a year. It states the reason that America believes in education and in technology and is willing to adjust itself to take advantage of it.

So the question was prompted because I think here is a way and a place where more than any other area we can point to where we have taken advantage of technology. The story I would like to see told is not the military story, but the story of service to humanity.

That is a magnificent story told through transportation. Without the facilities for transportation we have, this magnificent thing we call free enterprise in America wouldn't work.

Senator Goldwater. You are right.

Mr. Schwengel. I am impressed with your statement and I am impressed also with the observation you have made on the operation of the Smithsonian. It is a great institution. It has made magnificent contributions in many ways and still is great today, but we are here in this setting to be sort of a custodian, the guide, the buffer or the communication or the feeler for the public and it is up to us. Until now we have done a pretty good job in Congress of responding to the objective of the original $400,000 given to us by Mr. Smithsonian. The English wouldn't take it, then in this act we outsmarted the brilliant English.

We took and built on it and have done a great job. A better job may be can be done. With the help and guidance and influence of people like you and from others, in the hearings we have had here, with the cooperation of Dr. Ripley, we can do a better job.

I want to thank you for the help you have given us for the S. Capitol Historical Society. Without your help and others on the Senate side, it would be impossible to make the contribution we are making today.

Senator Goldwater. That is the major reason I am a conservative. What is past is prologue. We can learn by a study of the past.

Mr. Thompson. Mr. Bingham?

Mr. Bingham. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator, I would like to join in welcoming you before this committee and we certainly appreciate the great degree of time, effort and interest that you have devoted to this matter and have shown in your statement.

I am impressed with the fact that at several points in your statement it does come out that the Secretary of the Smithsonian and the top staff there have been trying to rectify some of the points you mention. However, they have not succeeded in persuading the respective bodies of the Congress to that point of view.

There are some points by which you indicate specific disagreement or criticism of the regents and of the management. I would like to ask you about one or two. One is just a point of fact.
At the bottom of page 2 of your statement, and then at the top of page 3, you refer to the numbers of visitors to these various buildings. You state that approximately 2.3 million persons came to see the exhibits at the Arts and Industries Building and another 1.8 million went through the Air and Space Building.

Your implication is that those are all different people, but I wonder if that is a fair conclusion. In other words, is it proper to total those and say that 4 million people came to the exhibits or is there probably quite a lot of duplication in the figures for those two buildings?

Senator Goldwater. I would have to assume that there is duplication. I don’t know of any way that you could accurately count the different persons actually going through. I know from my own experience, whenever I visit the museum, it is usually for a whole day and it takes in more than just one exhibit.

Mr. Bingham. It would seem to me, then, that Dr. Ripley’s statement that about 2 million people a year visit those displays would be a fair guess and that I would say that in general administrators of institutions don’t understate the number of people that come to see their exhibits.

Senator Goldwater. I also based the figures on a poll. Again, you can’t tell much about these polls. I doubt that they were taken by accepted polling standards, but in the next paragraph or two I point out surveys that were made and questionnaires that were collected that would indicate some discrepancy between the two sets of figures.

I wouldn’t want to base a courtroom argument on it.

Mr. Bingham. In the middle of page 5, you do refer to a disagreement with the Smithsonian management and the Regents, I take it, in regard to the flight museum, but I don’t understand the nature of this disagreement. Does this have to do with a proposal for redesign?

Senator Goldwater. Yes. That is my disagreement. The original design has been approved by the Congress, and not that it needed it, but it has been approved by architects generally and by planners participating in the general planning for the city.

Mr. Thompson. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Bingham. Yes.

Mr. Thompson. Had the Fine Arts Commission approved the design?

Senator Goldwater. Yes, it had, to my knowledge.

Mr. Thompson. That isn’t technically under the law required, but it has become sine qua non, and without their approval, which this original design has, it would hardly be possible.

I refer, for instance, to their refusal to approve the most recent design of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial. It makes impossible, really, acceptance of that design by the Congress.

Do I understand, as Mr. Bingham was referring to, that somewhere along the line someone wants to go over this again and redesign it?

Senator Goldwater. This is true. I can say that within the last day or two I have seen some mention in the paper that a recommendation is being made that a new design be sought.

I think this would be a mistake. It would be a waste of money because the design has been approved. There has been no changes in the interim that would require any different planning, in my opinion.
Mr. Thompson. Thank you, Mr. Bingham?
Mr. Bingham. Thank you. I think that this building, if I am not mistaken, was authorized through this committee's activity and the chairman and I were both members of the committee. I don't know as far as this committee is concerned whether any redesign has been proposed.

Mr. Thompson. I have heard nothing in any official sense, even in writing, to the effect that there is a proposal to redesign it. I may have overlooked something, but I don't think so. But I agree with Senator Goldwater that in having achieved the approval, which isn't easy to do, it would be not only difficult, but extremely expensive to design. Architects don't do those things overnight.

Mr. Harvey?
Mr. Harvey. Senator Goldwater, we welcome you here this morning. I would like to say that I think you have performed a very great public service in coming here and in giving us the benefit of your personal glimpse of the Smithsonian Institution, how it operates and how it can be improved.

I listened very carefully to the observations made here just a few minutes ago as to whether President Nixon might approve or might not approve of a new building in light of his recent statements about congressional spending, but the thought occurred to me that it was President Nixon and his administration that has led the way in increasing the budget on the National Council of Arts from $20 million up to the $37 million which the House just recently approved.

I might say that he made a recent convert out of me in that regard, not with perhaps the enthusiasm of some of my colleagues, but I can see the wisdom of the expenditure and I went along with him and I think most of us did. And I think the majority of our side of the aisle would see the same wisdom in the museum that you are talking about.

The thought occurred to me, as you were presenting this, that, No. 1, those were my thoughts as far as the building itself was concerned, but insofar as the operating funds were concerned, I was impressed by the fact that you point out that the National Air and Space Museum receives only 1.7 percent of the budget.

Is there any way in the congressional budgeting system that increased funds can be earmarked so as to make sure that they get more money than that? I am not as avid a supporter of air and space as you have been in your lifetime, but I am an old Air Force veteran myself. I have always been interested in the air.

This shocks me as well as it does you. I would like to talk to some of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and see if some means can't be found to make certain that funds are earmarked in this regard, to make certain that this thing is corrected immediately.

The building is something that will take some time, but surely we ought to be able to do something about the operating budget immediately and be sure that is rectified.

Senator Goldwater. I am not well enough acquainted with the appropriations schedule to suggest how far the Congress should go. I do know Congress had appropriated much more for this general activity in 1970, but the cut was made within the Smithsonian itself. I think usually the Congress can show by discussions such as this and by discussions on the floor the interest of the Congress, and that the director of any expenditures would be wise to listen.
Dr. Ripley and I have not had extensive discussions on this, but I have touched base and I have put two of his letters in answer to mine in the record. I feel Dr. Ripley is moving in this direction. I think I can understand the situation having been on several museum boards in my life and being a president of a historical foundation myself.

It is very easy for the Board of Regents or the Board of Directors to push interest in a direction that the majority of that board feels it should go in.

I might recite an experience on the Phoenix Art Museum, where we came to a very bad division because there were those people who wanted Western art and there were those people who didn't think Western art was worthy of being in any art collection. So we almost had to start a separate museum, it was so divided.

We have settled it. But from this experience I can see where Dr. Ripley would be influenced by his Board of Regents or other advisers if they were inclined to disregard air and space, not being air- and space-minded, but more inclined toward the preservation of art or the preservation of national dress and so forth.

So while I might sound critical of Dr. Ripley, I think that I understand his position to a greater extent than most people would because I have lived through it myself, and I am hopeful that Dr. Ripley will give the attention that we feel is needed to these two museums.

Mr. Harvey. I gather you would personally not recommend any more specific earmarking than what has been done, but rather, a greater expression of opinion?

Senator Goldwater. I think a man in Dr. Ripley's position, who is asked to run the Smithsonian, should have pretty much the say-so of how it is done, but if he continues to disregard areas of great interest to the public, then I think the Congress has to call his attention to it.

If I were asked to run an institution like that, I would certainly want carte blanche in what I would do with the funds. But I would also expect the Congress to keep an eye on me to see that I did it right.

Mr. Harvey. I think you are probably right. I never really believed in the specific earmarking process myself. I have always felt the best job could be done if you don’t use that method.

Once again, let me say we thank you for your statement. This is certainly one of the most thorough and best that I have read in my time in Congress, and certainly on the Smithsonian.

Senator Goldwater. You ought to be thanking my assistant, Terry Emerson, who does this work for me.

Mr. Thompson. He does a very good job.

Mr. Schwengel?

Mr. Schwengel. Senator, I noticed on page 8, particularly the paragraph in the middle of the page, beginning “The situation is this. All the editors at the Smithsonian Press are on the Federal payrolls. Yet the same people are required to devote a portion of their time to working on books that are for sale by the private side of the Smithsonian.”

There may be an area of criticism there. You are not suggesting here that you keep completely separate all the activities that are supported by Federal funds versus those supported by private funds, are you?
Senator Goldwater. No. When Dr. Carmichael was head of the Smithsonian, there was a division. I can't bring full criticism to the making of money in any area. Whether it is proper to use Federal funds to make money for the private sector might be defensible. I don't know. I just wanted the question to be asked of Dr. Ripley when he testifies to see what his feelings are about it.

Mr. Schwengel. Has your study indicated that under previous management that there was that clear break and there was no cooperation between those in the private research projects and those on Federal payroll?

Senator Goldwater. There was a clear break as to how they got paid, but whether or not the break was so clear that there was no cooperation, I can't say. I doubt that there was that clear a break.

Mr. Schwengel. If there weren't cooperation, it would seem to me it would be an unfortunate situation. Let's take the Lilly Foundation contribution. We worked with you in getting the law changed so they could accept that.

Senator Goldwater. If they can make a little money off their efforts—

Mr. Schwengel. First, I want to establish the matter of working together. On the matter of making money, it would be another aspect.

Senator Goldwater. They would work together, but some would be paid with private funds. At present none are.

Mr. Schwengel. You would agree they should work together?

Senator Goldwater. Yes, I think that is up to the director to decide, but I wanted to have this brought out as a part of the record. I might say I think it is a wonderful thing you are holding this hearing. I don't think there has been one held in years and years.

Not that we have any suspicions about the Institution, but it is such a valuable part of our lives and the lives of our children that we should keep, I think, in almost annual touch with it.

Mr. Schwengel. On this question of writing books, you don't believe that the Smithsonian ought to go out of this business?

Senator Goldwater. No.

Mr. Schwengel. Having had experience in the historical society, we make a slight profit on that. It is plowed back into the history and so forth and things we are doing and plan to do, so if these funds that come from this profit go into this area, rather than to the individual, it would be in the public interest, wouldn't it?

Senator Goldwater. Yes. In my experience with museums or with historical foundation, you do write books. Our little foundation has written eight books and we use the money that we make—it is not much—to help run the museum. We pay the author, but we don't pay him an exorbitant fee and we assume the printing costs and then we try to make money out of it to help us run.

Mr. Thompson. If the gentleman will yield, the Senator is correct. No legislative committee in 100 years has had these types of hearings, although the Smithsonian people report regularly to the two appropriations committees.

Some questions have been raised publicly which gave rise to conversations between Dr. Ripley and myself, and as a result of which he welcomed rather enthusiastically these hearings, so we can have an understanding of how the Institution operates. We can't very well
legislate with regard to it without understanding it. We will go into
the question at some lengths of the handling of the public funds, vis-a-
vis, the handling of the numerous private funds. So that the answers
to a great many questions which the Senator has raised will be gotten
in the course of these discussions.

You have made a great contribution. Your staff man has obviously
done a very thorough job and should be congratulated.

Thank you very much.

Senator Goldwater. It has been a real pleasure.

Mr. Thompson. Our next witness will be Mr. James Bradley, Under
Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, accompanied by Mr. Frank
Taylor, Acting Director, Air and Space Museum.

Mr. Bingham is going to preside for a while, while I make a quorum
in another committee.

Mr. Bingham (presiding). Gentlemen, you may proceed in any way
that you wish.

STATEMENT OF JAMES BRADLEY, UNDER SECRETARY, SMITH-
sonian Institution, Accompanied by Frank Taylor, Act-
ing Director, Air and Space Museum

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Chairman, my name is James Bradley, and I am
the Under Secretary of the Smithsonian. This is Mr. Frank Taylor.
Frank Taylor is the Senior Museum Director of the Smithsonian and
is here this morning as the Acting Director of the Air and Space
Museum.

Let me, sir, please establish my reason for being here, in addition to
being a representative of the Secretary, as his Under Secretary. In
January of 1959 I was brought into the Smithsonian as a special as-
sistant to Dr. Carmichael, then Secretary, for 1 year. Then I was
made an Assistant Secretary and subsequently during this past year
made Under Secretary.

In all of this time, 11½ years, I have had the pleasure to work par-
ticularly on the Air and Space Museum. I was given three assignments
when I arrived, assignments in addition to administrative manage-
ment in general. One was the National Air Museum, as it was then
called, Sputnik just having gone into orbit about 2 years earlier. Later
it became the National Air and Space Museum.

The other two issues that were particularly in difficulty were, first,
the Astrophysical Observatory, where we were being funded by the
National Science Foundation in connection with satellite tracking and
we had to make a transition over to the National Aeronautics and Space
Administration funding. The other matter was to get the National
Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery moved into
the old original Patent Office Building.

So, I have been with this Air and Space Museum as a representa-
tive of Dr. Ripley, and Dr. Carmichael before him, for over 11 years.
I remember very vividly the efforts that had been made to get it off the
ground, no pun intended.

Others had sought, before I got there, such as Senator Anderson—I
think it was Congressman Bob Jones in the House and before that it
was Congressman Jennings Randolph in the House, who later was
electred to the Senate. They sought to get the public and the Congress to accept first the function and then the building.

There was authorized initially a site, which we today have by act of Congress: from Fourth to Seventh, along Independence Avenue and north to Jefferson Drive; and authorization was enacted for planning, but not for construction, on the contention. "Well, we have not had an air museum, let's see what it is going to look like." This is why we had this split authorization: for site and planning, the authorization for construction to follow.

We obtained planning funds in the amount of about $1,875,000. We got the site. We received from the National Capital Planning Commission and the Fine Arts Commission their approvals. Then we came back to the Congress for the construction authorization.

The first time around in 1965 we got through the Senate but adjournment overtook us in the House. We later went back and it was this committee in the House that put through the authorization bill. Regents Kirwan, Mahon, and Bow were yeomanly effective on the floor and we secured the authorization for an appropriation for construction.

In the Senate it was Senator Jordan and Senator Pell with Senator Randolph and Senator Anderson, all right in there.

Now, we have that authorization and we have tried to get construction appropriations. In 1966 we asked for $40 million, repeated that in 1967. Then we thought that perhaps we could phase this project, because we kept running into this block about "You mean to tell me this is going to cost over $40 million?"

We had an architect prepare recently some costing on different assumptions, as to in what years do we think we are going to be able to get under contract. The prices we have to assume will continue to go up simply because we are projecting what has happened recently.

If these projections are true, we could be in the $65 million cost bracket. Thus we are trying to get a costly but very necessary building, one that I certainly am close to, and I know the Secretary is close to, and trying to get it off the ground.

In 1968 we dropped our budget request down to $9.5 million on the theory that perhaps we could build the garage and get that into service and obtain some parking fees, and then build the superstructure later.

We tried that in 1968. We tried it again in 1969, but no luck. In 1970 we had a letter from the Bureau of the Budget that said "no Federal construction." So there we were.

In the meantime, as you have heard and discussed by our good friend, Senator Goldwater, there was a restrictive rider at the time of the authorization put in by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which declared that there should be no construction until Vietnam expenditures had materially reduced.

(The report follows:)

In reporting favorably on H.R. 6125, the Committee on Rules and Administration noted with satisfaction the letter of May 13, 1966, from Secretary Ripley, giving assurances that funds would not be requested in this session of Congress pursuant to the authorization in H.R. 6125. The committee expressly recommends that funding for the National Air and Space Museum should be deferred even further, if need be, and 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.
Mr. Bradley. We have since written—we went over that legislative history very carefully—and we have a response from Senator Pell and Senator Jordan representing that committee, to the effect they do not consider that there would be any objection to a replanning appropriation as distinguished from a construction appropriation, the latter they feel is not prudent at this time.

Out of that history and background came the idea to replan. It would be a more plausible project to lay before the Congress and, of course, we have to go through the Bureau of the Budget also, if we could show that we had attempted to redesign in order to reduce a projected $65 million cost down to the $40 million level.

Granted, redesign is going to cost some money. On the other hand, we would reduce the construction cost by $25 million if we were successful in getting money to replan. The plans would not be wasted, if as I assume, and this is only an assumption, the same architect were employed. He has spent a number of years studying the problem of accommodating very large air and space craft and very substantial crowds of people, starting initially with probably well over 5 million annually, and so he has had a sort of a postgraduate course in the design of an Air and Space Museum.

The choice of an architect has not been decided and it would be presumptuous for me to say so, but if we stayed with the same firm of architects, there would be a great deal of our investment that would come back to us in the way of a quicker design and I think some saving in cost.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to recite this personal involvement with the Air and Space Museum and without taking more of the committee's time, I can tell you it has been a long road. We have done everything that we can think of to try to get this building under construction.

Most recently, in spite of the refusal of the Bureau of the Budget, the Board of Regents liked the idea of possibly scaling down the building and we went to the White House this time. If my friends from the Bureau of the Budget were here, I think that they would scold me a bit because we decided that we should really get this on an appeal basis to the Chief Executive.

A letter was written that outlined some of this history. It did receive attention right at the top. We still didn't make it, but we tried. We speak of the second effort. This was the third and fourth and fifth efforts. We tried but we didn't make it.

Mr. Thompson (presiding). I gather, then, that the President upheld the position of the Bureau of the Budget, is that correct?

Mr. Bradley. That is correct.

Mr. Thompson. Do you have copies of that correspondence?

Mr. Bradley. Yes.

Mr. Thompson. I think it would be valuable to have that as a matter of the record so that in addition to the senatorial impediment, there is also the Bureau of the Budget, and the White House itself at this time, is that correct?

Mr. Bradley. That is correct.

(The letters referred to follow:)
Smithsonian Institution.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: As Chancellor of the Smithsonian Institution, I most respectfully call to your attention the tremendous surge of interest among all Americans engendered by the historic flight of Apollo 11. Their interest has appropriately been paralleled by your personal interest and delight in these unrivaled American achievements.

Under Public Law 89-509 the National Air and Space Museum, the showcase of our history of accomplishment in air and space, is authorized to be constructed on a reserved site on the Mall. The project has been held in abeyance since 1966 because of a provision in the Senate Report on this authorization which stated 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."

The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution believes that it is not too soon to begin planning for this great educational and exhibition center which will show the Nation and the world our ability to develop technological skill and to perfect inventive engineering for the benefit of all mankind.

This project could be considered as a determined effort by your Administration to place America's scientific and technological achievements on record in a building to be completed by 1976. In order to meet this schedule, the Smithsonian Institution would like to proceed with redesign of the building so as to come in with a smaller construction budget than soaring costs would ordain for the present design.

Rather than the estimated projected cost of $65 million for the building as presently designed, we would hope to streamline the design to cost no more than $40 million. It would be necessary, therefore, to obtain an appropriation of $2 million in fiscal year 1971 in order to initiate the redesign.

Construction when started would require four or more years, so that the budgetary effect of the estimated cost would be spread over a span of five years, thereby avoiding budgetary peaking. Under our plan of development, there would be undertaken first the underground garage which would be utilized for public parking on a fee basis. As a second stage, the remainder of the building would be erected and thereafter enjoyed by millions of Americans as the major exhibition and educational hall for air and space history.

The Smithsonian Board of Regents on November 5 approved the following resolution:

Voted that the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institutions recognizes the intense interest of the American people in the national air and space programs and in the historic flight of Apollo 11 to the Moon and return. The Regents recognize that by Public Law 89-509 the Nation's Air and Space Museum is authorized to be constructed on the Mall on a site designated by Act of Congress. The Regents further recognize that because of substantial increases in construction costs, the building as now designed should be scaled down from its present level of $65 million to a cost level not to exceed $40 million. The Regents, therefore, most respectfully and most urgently request that the President include in his budget for the fiscal year 1971 an amount of $2 million to finance the necessary redesign of this great educational and exhibition center for our air and space exploration.

We are convinced that this educational center will serve admirably to record for our people, especially the young, the history of the air and space age as it is being made.

Respectfully yours,

Warren E. Burger.
Chancellor, Smithsonian Institution.
THE WHITE HOUSE,  

Hon. Warren E. Burger,  
Chancellor of the Smithsonian Institution,  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chief Justice: The President has asked me to reply to your letter of November 19, 1969, in which you request an appropriation of $2 million in FY 1971 for redesign of the National Air and Space Museum.

While we consider the Board of Regents’ proposal to be meritorious, we are faced with the reality of serious budgetary constraints. It is for this reason that the Bureau of the Budget has not included funds for the redesign of the Air and Space Museum in the tentative 1971 budget. Your request, however, will be included in the list of appealed items presented to the President during his budgetary review.

Although initiation of this project may have to be deferred, we believe it should be considered for inclusion in the budget just as soon as conditions permit.

Sincerely,

John D. Ehrlichman,  
Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, D.C.

Mr. President: I would deeply appreciate the opportunity to see you in Washington upon your return from California. Should there be any possibility, I would like to see you during the last week in January.

My principal concern in wishing to see you is in my capacity as a Regent of the Smithsonian Institution. For this purpose, I would appreciate it if you would graciously allow me to bring with me the Secretary of the Institution, Dr. Dillon Ripley.

My concern arises from our intense desire to complete the National Air and Space Museum within the years of your incumbency as President. In order to complete such an historic structure in time for 1976 at the earliest, it will be necessary to commence planning for a rescaling downwards in cost of the present approved structure. The nation can save perhaps more than $20 million in completed costs by spending $2 million for replanning now.

This was what the Chief Justice wrote you about after our November Regents’ meeting, and we continue to feel that this small expenditure in the FY ’71 Budget will more than justify itself in future savings.

Mindful of the vital need which your Administration faces in cutting costs, it seems to me that this planning item, which could be inserted as an amendment to your Presidential Budget, would be viewed as a prudent investment for the future.

Respectfully yours,

William A. M. Burden.

January 6, 1970.

Mr. John D. Ehrlichman,  
Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs,  
The White House, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Ehrlichman: I was so happy that you and your wife could get to our dinner for the new Chancellor of the Institution. Since then I have been bedded with a series of colds and out of action.

On returning to the office I find from the Chief Justice, a copy of your letter to him of December 10 about the Regents’ desire to include a small planning item for the National Air and Space Museum in the Fiscal Year ’71 budget. As you know, they believe it a wise investment in order to save dollars in the future construction of that building.
Another of our Regents, Mr. William A. M. Burden of New York, who is a friend of the President's tells me he will be writing the President asking for an appointment to see him on various matters, and that he too will be anxious to see if the $2 million planning money could not be included as an amendment to the President's Fiscal Year '71 budget, as it is called technically, falling within some of the contingent funds of that budget. Congressman Bow continues to be greatly interested as does our Subcommittee Chairman, Mrs. Hansen.

I wanted to apprise you of the fact that Mr. Burden tells me he will be writing, as I know how pressed for time everyone is these days.

Cordially yours,

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary.

The White House,

Mr. S. Dillon Ripley,
Secretary, Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Ripley: For reply to your letter of January 6th, my checking with the Bureau of the Budget has developed the information that the $2 million requested for the proposed Air and Space Museum will not be included in the 1971 budget.

As you may know, the Senate requested in 1966 that appropriations for this purpose not be sought "unless and until there is a substantial redirection in our military expenditures in Vietnam." While the military effort in Vietnam is currently redirected, unfortunately the military expenditure level has not lessened appreciably. The President has directed very drastic cuts in all budgets for FY 1971, and I'm afraid there is no possibility of reinstating this request under the circumstances.

I wish I could bring you better news.

Yours sincerely,

John D. Ehrlichman,
Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs.

Mr. Schwengel. Mr. Chairman, I have a question here. First, I am glad to have this review of the legislative history and your involvement.

Has the Smithsonian always depended on public funds, tax money to build their facilities, or have you been able to use, in certain instances, money from your private sources, from your foundation?

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Schwengel, to give you a direct answer, appropriated funds are used primarily for plant expansion. Exception No. 1 was the original Smithsonian Building that was built from the proceeds of the Smithson bequest. As interest came in, the building was progressively put into place. That was the first exception.

Perhaps another exception you would be interested in would be in Cambridge, Mass., where we used the proceeds of grants and contracts for scientific research to enter into a long-term agreement with Harvard. Harvard put up the building for our Astrophysical Observatory and we repaid them by rental charges each year coming out of the NASA funds as a necessary expense in connection with satellite tracking.

(The table referred to follows:)
Mr. Thompson. Mr. Schwengel was at another committee meeting the other day where Dr. Ripley testified. Freer Gallery was also built by moneys donated by Mr. Freer, the Mellon Gallery, and the National Gallery by Mellon, and most recently Mr. Hirshhorn has donated $1 million toward the cost of construction of the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Gardens.

Mr. Schwengel. I want to thank the chairman. I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Chairman, I do thank Senator Goldwater for this remarkable show of support, particularly for the Air and Space Museum and for other parts of the Smithsonian.

We did not have an advance copy of his testimony this morning. We did have two exchanges of letters, commenting on his speech on the floor, and I can, if you care to, highlight many of the same topics arising from our earlier correspondence that he alluded to this morning.

I will tackle it if you say so, but there is so much I would like to answer in his very detailed presentation to you this morning.

Mr. Thompson. The Chair might say, Mr. Bradley, that we first saw the statement this morning. We had no advance copies of it. It is a very impressive one. It gives rise to a great many questions, so I think it is only reasonable in light of that fact and the fact that you hadn't an advance copy of it, that you prepare for us answers to as many of the questions which he raised as possible.

We will take that up at another time.

Mr. Bradley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you like, I can, as I say, highlight.

Mr. Thompson. If you would like to highlight, and then we will get into the specific details later, that would be useful. It is rather difficult to answer, I suppose, right off the top of your head the statement by the Senator that the Air and Space Museum and the National Museum of Natural History are victims of a shocking lack of attention by the Smithsonian top brass. However, why don't you make such comments as you feel free at this time?
Mr. Bradley. In a letter to the Senator that he has offered to put into the record, we mention that the history going back to 1846 when the Air Museum was established as a function, and then we quickly brought forward these other acts that I mentioned, the act of 1958, 12 years later.

Mr. Thompson. You mean 1946.

Mr. Bradley. Did I say 1846?

Mr. Thompson. Yes.

Mr. Bradley. We do deal in old things, but it is not that old. It is 1946.

Mr. Schwengel. You can go back to the Civil War time in this air interest, you know.

Mr. Bradley. Oh, yes.

Then in 1958, the Congress designated the site on the Mall that I alluded to. One of the first official acts that the present Secretary performed was in testifying in support of one of those planning appropriations for the fiscal year 1965 when he first arrived here. He walked right into an appropriation hearing.

The Senate committee in authorizing constitution in 1966 put in that stop order about Vietnam. In the meantime, we have secured letters from the same committee saying that a planning or replanning appropriation would be without objection.

Meanwhile, costs have gone up. As I mentioned earlier, we think that we are far above the $40 million mark now. It depends on when you assume you are going to sign the principal contract.

Mr. Thompson. There have been some questions raised which are current respecting the preservation projects in the existing facilities.

Under Dr. Johnston, who retired, there had been few, if any preservation projects, is that right?

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Chairman, I am unable to answer that. I can certainly obtain an answer for you, but I have no idea that Paul Johnston stopped preserving objects. I realize that an employee of the Air and Space Museum, and a man of integrity, has told me that he believes that to be the case. I don’t have the first hand knowledge to advise you of it. I would have to inquire.

Mr. Thompson. The subcommittee has some information accompanied by photographs taken by one of our staff people on an informal basis. For instance, here is a photograph of a Douglas jet bomber called the Versatile, which has a door open. The door was on the plane when it was originally acquired. When it rains or snows, it is out in the open and it rains or snows inside, which rather dramatizes the need for some sort of preservation work and/or some storage facilities, which obviously are rather desperately needed.
It is not that it would be useful to perhaps dispose, make some determination as to what the future of your present holdings are, and dispose of those which can't be preserved or which aren't going to be shown ultimately? These are at Silver Hill.

Mr. Bradley. I understand.

Mr. Thompson. There are a number of these showing heavy articles in wooden crates set on uneven ground, and the weight inside causes the crates to break and otherwise damage the articles, the historical value of which I am in no position to judge.

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Chairman, I think this is one of the first things that the new director should consider, and I should say that we have interviewed 31 potential directors. We have been diligent, we have been looking for an extremely capable man, and we don't yet have him, but we are zeroing in and we think we soon will have a director.

Mr. Thompson. The acting director, of course, in the interim, has responsibilities and if Senator Goldwater is correct, he just doesn't have the people with which to do the things that he should do or would like to do.

While you are pursuing diligently your search for a director, and I commend you for doing that, for looking for just the right person, there is the matter of maintaining that which exists so that the new director won't come into total chaos.

Mr. Bradley. Sir, I can certainly testify to this committee that total chaos does not exist at Silver Hill. You can accept, I think—
Mr. Thompson. I didn't mean to indicate that it does now. But unless something is done, to modify my statement, a highly undesirable set of conditions do exist.

Mr. Bradley (continuing). Mr. Chairman, 2 months ago the Air and Space Museum Advisory Board visited Silver Hill and toured the property and quite voluntarily offered a resolution which they spread on their minutes, saying that the place was orderly and it was doing a good job.

I suppose they all have the mental reservation that we are doing the best we can with what we have to do with, but it has been visited by experts and found to be in good order.

Mr. Thompson. [Photos projected on screen.] We will look at one or two of these pictures. The photographs which you have in your hands, Mr. Bradley, were taken yesterday. These are some of the storage facilities. There are some of the crates in which articles—we don't know what all of them are—are stored.

*Damaged crate containing aircraft parts*

Damaged crates seen from rear
—Photo taken July 20, 1970, at Silver Hill by subcommittee staff.

Crates containing aircraft parts
Outside you can see the weeds in the lower right-hand one, which probably aren't doing any particular damage, but the condition of the crates is alarming, I think.
(The material follows:)
Photographs of stored aircraft parts in the open or in damaged and partly exposed crates at the Smithsonian storage facility, Silver Hill, Md.

—Photos taken summer 1970 by Smithsonian employee.
Mr. Thompson. We understand from our staff inquiry that these heavy crates are on pallets, wooden pallets, and that they are moved from time to time by being pushed by bulldozers, is that correct?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir. That is to say, bulldozer in the sense that it is really a forklift. It is not shoved. A forklift goes under the pallet and lifts the load.

Mr. Thompson. These are photographs of some of the other storage facilities or lack thereof. They are outside, as you can see.

Mr. Schwengel. May I ask, is there anywhere room for these to be inside?

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Schwengel, I think that the answer has to be "No." Mr. Taylor, would you say there is any room inside?

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Schwengel, we are actually doing a great deal on this. We admit there is a deplorable condition there. To get all of these crates indoors, we would need about 70,000 square feet of covered space, which we don't have.

Mr. Thompson. The lower photograph is one of the Douglas jet bombers. [Photo projected on screen.] You will notice the door is open. It rained heavily yesterday and the insides of the aircraft were soaking wet. The other aircraft are in various stages of disintegration. These aren't presented, Mr. Taylor or Mr. Bradley, to be critical of you. Rather, they are presented to dramatize to this extent the need for some more sophisticated storage facilities.

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Chairman, may I say that there are 17 aircraft outside now, that we have recently completed one new storage building there, and that eight of these will be placed in the new building.

(The statement follows:)

Progress on Preservation and Restoration of Air and Space Collections

The former Director of the National Air and Space Museum, S. Paul Johnston, planned and put into effect a program for the storage, preservation, and the eventual restoration of aircraft in the collection of NASM at Silver Hill, Md.

The program has had 3 objectives: (1) To organize the storage of collections by cataloguing, inventorying, and improving the physical arrangement of the collections to make them accessible for research and reference; (2) to clean up and rearrange the area to provide a neater and more businesslike appearance; and (3) to improve the maintenance and preservation of the collection.

Note that when this program was initiated the collection of space craft and associated material was very small. The space collections have grown greatly (for example, approximately 3,500 items were received in f.y. 1970); and the program of acquiring significant space objects from NASA for circulation in the United States and abroad has been added. These activities have been accommodated while the condition of the aircraft has been improved.

In the past 4 years much has been accomplished in the program of preservation and restoration. Two storage buildings for space and aircraft have been erected: 42 aircraft have been assembled and placed indoors; accessible storage racks have been installed in 2 buildings which, when collections are shifted to them, will empty 3 other buildings to receive more of the material now outdoors; space has been made available for 3 of the aircraft now stored outdoors and they are in the process of being moved in; land surfaces were graded and graveled; many crates were moved to the graveled areas and set up on wooden stringers, and 70 crates were repaired by contract. Two aircraft, the NC-4 and the Fokker D VII have been completely restored; the Mistral Type 83E has been partially restored; 22 aircraft have been placed on loan to other museums in return for their restoration; restoration, preservation, or exhibits work was performed on 20 aircraft; and 15 spacecraft plus a number of rocket engines and satellites were prepared for exhibition.
Work in various stages of completion will accomplish, soon, the repair of all exposed crates; the moving of 6 of the outdoor aircraft to concreted areas; the assembly of 3 more aircraft; and the restoration of 5 additional ones.

Illustrations of some of the collections preserved at Silver Hill are included to show that much is well cared for.

Aircraft components such as propellers, instruments, and communications systems, being installed in newly erected racks. Building 10
Assembled aircraft stored in Building 10

Assembled aircraft and engines stored in Building 10
Assembled aircraft and the completely restored flying boat, NC-4, disassembled for storage, in recently erected Building 22.

Outdoor storage of metal aircraft on concrete ramp, near Building 22.

Aircraft engines in newly installed racks. Building 12.

Outdoor storage of crates.
Aircraft in crates and missile system in trailer.

I should also say that at the end of the last year, I initiated a contract for the repair of these crates, which has not actually been effected yet, but the contract is going through the process of being issued and worked upon.

When that is done, all of these crates—there are about 47 of them that will have some work done on them—all of them will be weather-proofed and will be ventilated, something that has not been properly taken care of before.

Mr. Thompson. When will this be done?

Mr. Taylor. I hope that by fall, October is the target date we have for getting indoors the planes that I mentioned and the repair of the crates.

(The information follows:)

Additional Information on Contract To Repair Crates

The pending contract for the repair of crates was originated June 16, 1970, with a requisition accompanied by four estimates obtained from contractors. The work requisitioned is: to supply the services and materials as necessary; to repair as required for weatherproofing; paint with black asphalt paint as necessary; and install louvre-type air vents for proper ventilation backed with wire screen to prevent entry of rain, snow, and birds. The Smithsonian Contracting Office has been requested to issue the contract. The expected date of completion is October 31, 1970.
Mr. Thompson. Are you going to dispose of any, or have you made a judgment as to which ones ultimately you are going to exhibit?

Mr. Taylor. We have talked of this and we have many lists. I should say that we are not inclined to dispose of any planes that we have now. What we are doing is lending aircraft to other museums. It was mentioned that one of them should go to the Air Force Museum in Dayton. We now have five planes there.

Mr. Thompson. That is the one I referred to earlier, the Enola Gay, which dropped the A bomb. I don’t think we should be very proud of that as a nation. At least it would offend me to see it exhibited in the museum.

Mr. Taylor. I do believe, though, that it should be preserved for its technical content. Technically, I think it will be of interest to students in the future.

We lend these plans to other museums, it may interest you to know, with the agreement that the museums restore them. We have quite a number now, in five or six museums around the country. The museums at their own expense restore them and we have an agreement that they may exhibit them for 3 years and after 3 years there is an option to renew for 1 year.

(The material follows:)

Aircraft Lent by the National Air and Space Museum to Others

The following list of NASM aircraft on loan to other museums and exhibitions, with the exception of the Lockheed Sirius which is on loan only for the Osaka Exposition, are lent for 3 years from the date of the agreement, with option to renew annually thereafter for periods of one year at the discretion of the NASM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft</th>
<th>Borrower</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sperry Messenger</td>
<td>USAF Museum, Wright-Patterson, Ohio.</td>
<td>Exhibition and restoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACO CG-4A assault glider</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAD XVI</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Exhibition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtiss R3C-2</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focke-Wulf 190D-9</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakajima Ki 43-2 Oscar II</td>
<td>Experimental Aircraft Association, Franklin, Wis.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. 5A</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Restoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfalz D-XII</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grumman F3F-3 Gulfhawk II</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Exhibition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Airacobra</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockheed Sirius</td>
<td>Japanese Government</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American SNJ</td>
<td>U.S. Marine Corps Museum, Quantico</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell TH 13 helicopter</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitsubishi Zero fighter</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas SBD-6</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS20-3 Vought Kingfisher</td>
<td>USS Massachusetts Memorial Committee, Fall River, Mass.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtiss N-9</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boeing F4B-4</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Model 7</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Gulfhawk F6C-4 converted to</td>
<td>Wings and Wheels Museum, Santee, Calif.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Schwenkel. I would like to establish one point about this equipment you have in pictures. Are they gifts to the Smithsonian or do we purchase them?

Mr. Taylor. The planes that we have?

Mr. Schwenkel. Yes.

Mr. Taylor. I would say the majority of them came by transfer from services, from the Air Force or the old Army Air Corps.

Mr. Schwenkel. They were gifts then?

Mr. Taylor. They were transferred as gifts, yes. We didn’t purchase them.

Mr. Schwenkel. I know of gifts that were received that had carried with it also some funds to take care of it. When it is a gift from the Government, I suppose this is not possible. Otherwise, it could be.

Further, on that question, wouldn’t it be advisable for you to say, “Well, yes, we will take them, but not until we can find a place to properly care for them?” because the original owner would probably have a place to protect them and care for them. Is there some urgency that developed that you have to take these now?

Mr. Taylor. We have been very careful about accepting planes. In fact, I have a note that 3 years ago, we had 200 airplanes. Today we have 214. So within that period we have accepted relatively few aircraft. It would interest you to know, I believe, that the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., is restoring a plane for us. The Lockheed XC-35, the first pressurized transport airplane, is being restored by a private contractor at the expense of the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif. It will probably cost $20,000 to $30,000 before it is complete. And the McDonnell Corp. restored the Gemini 8 space capsule and it is on loan to the McDonnell Douglas Space and Science Center in St. Louis.

So we have many planes being taken care of this way. I still am not arguing that the condition is good. I should defend Mr. Paul Johnston by saying that those members of our advisory board who saw the condition at Silver Hill in May were very high in praise for what had been done in the intervening months since they had been there last.

Mr. Thompson. On a comparative basis?

Mr. Taylor. We are getting there. That is the point. We are making progress. The new building which I mentioned is in being now. Given the time required to move the planes into the building, they will be protected.

At the same time, we will be removing the remaining planes off the earth and gravel on which they are sitting now. Moving crates and aircraft over concrete, so that they will be further protected.

The planes that are left outdoors are those in our opinion that can stand the weather best. If you have looked at photographs of museums on air strips and so on, you will note that many museums, such as the museum at Dayton, exhibit aircraft outdoors.

I cannot excuse having an open door or a door that is loose. We certainly can button up some of these things more carefully than they are now.
Mr. Thompson. It might be for all I know that that particular plane is of relatively little value.

Mr. Taylor. I don't think any of the craft we have now are of relatively little value. I think the screening has taken place. We did dispose of some planes several years ago that I don't have the particulars of, but I think those that we have now should be preserved for their technical value and I think they should be circulated both into the new museum when it is built and also into museums around the country under the scheme that I mentioned earlier.

(The material follows:)

Smithsonian Institution Policy, Screening, Aircraft Acquisitions

The policy of the Smithsonian is to acquire aircraft significant for technical advances or for historical performance. Some acquisitions are sought by the museum to fill gaps in the collection. Other aircraft are offered to the Smithsonian. In either case, the curator or assistant director involved puts the question of the acquisition before a meeting of the museum's curatorial staff acting as an informal accessioning committee to recommend approval or disapproval of the acquisition.

Mr. Thompson. It appears likely it is going to be a long time before the new museum is built.

Mr. Taylor. With the support we have had this morning, maybe not so long.

Mr. Thompson. If Senator Goldwater can persuade the Director of the Budget and the President, that might speed it up some.

What sort of personnel do you have attached to the Air Museum?

Mr. Taylor. The quality of them or the numbers?

Mr. Thompson. The number and types. We won't go into the quality.

Mr. Taylor. I can speak very highly of the quality. I believe that Senator Goldwater, in effect, alluded to this when he spoke of how many visitors we do have, and how enjoyable the museum is, I am tempted to say we must be doing something right.

Mr. Thompson. Oh, I am sure you are.

Mr. Taylor. When I speak of the quality of the staff, I took it over, of course, from Paul Johnston, the former Director, and I have been very much impressed with the devotion and the energy and productivity of that staff, which is small by museum standards, but very devoted and very productive.

Mr. Thompson. How many employees do you have in the working maintenance part?

Mr. Taylor. At Silver Hill we have 14.

Mr. Thompson. How many supervisors and directors do they have?

Mr. Taylor. We have one principal supervisor at Silver Hill who was selected by Mr. Johnston and a man in whom he had full confidence. I have talked with him about this operation there. He does not believe that there is anyone any better to put in charge of that. All that is good about it, and all that has happened to improve the conditions, over the past 2 years we might say, have been done by pretty much the same kind of an organization as we have there now.

Mr. Thompson. In other words, that is 15 people at Silver Hill?

Mr. Taylor. Fourteen, I believe.

Mr. Thompson. Including the supervisor?

Mr. Taylor. That is correct.
Mr. Thompson. In his view or in your view is that an adequate number to preserve the exhibits out there?

Mr. Taylor. I do not think so. I would prefer to have at least two other people there who could do some of the warehousing duties and relieve some of the more skilled craftsmen from the routine warehousing operations.

Mr. Thompson. If we can help you in any way to get them, let us know.

Mr. Taylor. That is very kind of you, and we appreciate it.

Mr. Schwengel. We are about to zero in on a very important date in this country, the bicentennial. I know what you are doing in your displays down there. I read about them, in a description, in a report to the President last night. I think it is thrilling. However, I think the full impact of the result, and this is what the Bicentennial Commission fortunately is working on, of the declarations, and those early pioneers, is going to be reflected throughout in their commemoration.

Had you thought of in any way identifying your development with the culmination of what you finally want with 1976?

Mr. Taylor. As I understand your question, do we think of the construction of the Air and Space Museum as an appropriate contribution to the celebration of the bicentennial?

Mr. Schwengel. Completed by 1976, at least?

Mr. Taylor. As a museum director and as a man in charge of moving this museum, I certainly would adopt any device for focusing attention on it and getting it built. I have not thought of tying this in with the bicentennial celebration, but it is a very good idea, one that I would not be adverse to using at all.

Mr. Schwengel. I would like to suggest that you give serious thought with tying it in with this, because it fits perfectly.

Mr. Bradley. If I may add, Mr. Schwengel, we did represent this in a very vigorous way as being a very natural part of the bicentennial celebration, particularly the activity that will take place on the mall where this museum is proposed to be located. That is where the people will be.

We think it would be a natural part of that bicentennial celebration.

Mr. Schwengel. I will leave that suggestion to go to something else.

On the matter of interpretation, you heard my question to the Senator, I have the feeling that in recent years we have maybe loss of the potential impact by not identifying literature with some of these developments. The quotes on the pillars of the Archives Building is magnificent. In many places in this area, in the earlier buildings, we have inscribed on them the thrilling statement that puts it in the words of Sandberg, in a nutshell.

At the same time, it has an impact. You noted what the Senator said. Yet I think there is a potential here in the field of aeronautics.
There must be somebody that can interpret this thing and give it to us in words or literature.

We mentioned the Cultural Center, the Kennedy Cultural Center. We got in a hurry with this by calling it a Kennedy cultural center. I opposed that, not because I wasn’t an admirer of John Kennedy, because I was a great admirer of him. I think we might have missed the point of not getting the proper interpretation of his impact in his time.

He certainly was interested in culture, but probably Kennedy’s greatest contribution will finally come in what he said. I felt like with few exceptions there were men that better interpreted his time, not only for his people, but for the world. Unless we bring about a relationship of what the air industry has done in literature, we might not get the full impact of the installation.

So I suggest that you have somebody work on this and maybe somebody has already worked on it. Maybe it is just a matter of searching the record to find some real eloquent literature that ties with it.

Mr. Thompson. Mr. Taylor, are any of the aircraft that are controlled by the museum operable?

Mr. Taylor. I don’t believe. Mr. Chairman, that any of them are operable now. The Sacred Cow was flown into Washington and disassembled and taken to Silver Hill. It probably is the closest to being operable.

Mr. Thompson. There is an interesting item that has come to my attention, that one of the curators for the museum took an instrument pilot course at the Smithsonian expense. Is that so?

Mr. Taylor. Yes, this is so.

Mr. Thompson. Why would that be necessary? It was only $795, but it just occurred to me to be rather an odd sort of an expenditure.

Mr. Taylor. I think it could be very easily justified on the ground that what he knows about modern flight and modern instrument flying is very helpful to a curator who is developing the history through objects and instruments. To relate to what is current now and how it is used, firsthand information of this sort is very useful.

Mr. Thompson. It might justify it in your mind, but it doesn’t justify it in my mind. I don’t see why he couldn’t study this matter without actually undertaking a flight course.

Mr. Taylor. Well, I think this is something on which we could disagree.

Mr. Thompson. Yes, we do.

Mr. Taylor. And we do, but I do know that, in my experience, not only with this museum, but with other museums of science and technology, quite often the best curators are those who come from engineering backgrounds.

Mr. Thompson. I certainly would agree that they should be competent, but I don’t know whether it is incumbent on the institution to give them that type of training when their area of competence should include it. I think, further, that like anyone else, they have an obligation to do some studying on their own to keep up to date in their own profession.
Mr. Taylor. I am quite sure this particular man does a great deal of studying on his own. This is just an additional effort on his part to be qualified.

Mr. Thompson. I might comment that I don't consider it to be at all appropriate, but I won't beg the point.

Do any of the Air Museum employees get paid for writing articles in public magazines?

Mr. Taylor. Yes, they do. This is work that they do on their own. They are requested by publishers because of their expert knowledge to make contributions. They write articles for the Encyclopaedia Britannica, for example, and they do this work on their own time. They may do it on the premises. They may come down Saturday and Sunday, but they do it on their own time.

Mr. Thompson. That could hardly be objectionable if it is in the line of research, I would think.

The Institution does under its charter have an obligation to provide educational material for the historical study of aviation and space flight. I would assume particularly competent people within the whole structure of the Institution would make contributions on their own time.

I think this would be entirely appropriate, much more so, I would say, than taking courses in instrument flying.

Mr. Bradley, did you have any further comment on Senator Goldwater's statement?

Mr. Bradley. With your leave, Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit it for the record, unless you have anything orally here. I think we would do better to put it in writing.

Mr. Thompson. That will be fine.

Responses to Statements Made by Senator Goldwater on July 21, 1970

The following responds to statements made by Senator Barry Goldwater in his presentation of July 21, 1970, before the House Subcommittee on Library and Memorials of the House Committee on Administration.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater referred to the direct monies which Congress will appropriate for the Smithsonian's operations, for the 1971 fiscal year being over $40 million. He indicated that this includes an increase of $7.6 million for salaries and expenses alone—a rise of 25% in one year.

Smithsonian Comment.—While Senator Goldwater is correct in stating that the Smithsonian will receive over $40 million for its operations for the 1971 fiscal year, this sum did not include an increase of $7.6 million for salaries and expenses. Rather, the appropriation included for the first time a sum of $3,000,000 for the National Zoological Park which previously had been funded through the District of Columbia government. The proper comparison would be $35,700,000 for fiscal year 1971 (including an estimated $1,000,000 for supplemental appropriations still to be voted to cover the federally legislated pay increase of May 1970) as against $32,765,000 for fiscal year 1970, made up of the $29,965,000 Congressional appropriation and $2,800,000 supplied for the Zoo in that year by the District of Columbia. Thus, the increase is $2,935,000, or 8.9%—not $7,600,000, or 25%.

It might be noted that of the $2,935,000 increase, $400,000 represents a special appropriation toward preparations for the American Revolution Bicentennial of 1976, and $150,000 represents a special item for the Smithsonian's contributions toward improvement of environmental quality. Without these special purpose allotments the increase would have been only $2,385,000 or 7.3%, an amount barely sufficient to meet increases dictated by inflation alone.
Subject.—Senator Goldwater questioned what the Smithsonian is doing with its approximately 3,400 employees; where have the increases in positions and appropriations gone; and have any units of the Institution been overlooked during this period of growth?

Smithsonian Comment.—The Smithsonian’s Federal employment and operating budget have increased from 1,348 authorized permanent positions and $191,000 in fiscal 1964 to 2,077 positions and $3,965,000 in fiscal year 1970. In addition, the number of part-time employees increased from an average of 33 during 1964 to an average of 91 in 1970.

This very substantial growth of some 700 positions and $16,800,000 reflects additional program and building operation responsibilities resulting from new legislation and other programs approved and supported by the Congress. It also reflects $4,500,000 in pay supplements to the Institution to help offset higher pay costs resulting from increasingly frequent General Schedule and Wage Board pay raises. At least $500,000 of the cost of these pay raises have been absorbed by the Institution at the expense of program performance.

The distribution of this growth in terms of Smithsonian activity is as follows and shows a strong effort to obtain a balanced program in the Institution.

The development and operations of the National Collections of Fine Arts, the National Portrait Gallery, and the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum have grown by approximately 80 positions and $2,000,000.

The museums and exhibits programs of the Smithsonian, other than art galleries, have grown by about 100 positions and $4,000,000. Included in this growth are $1,000,000 for the Office of Exhibits, $2,000,000 for the National Museum of Natural History, and smaller amounts for the initiation of the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, the National Museum Act, and other museum-related activities.

During this period, research activities, other than museums, grew by approximately 70 positions and $3,500,000. Notable in this development has been increased funding for the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory ($1,300,000), the Radiation Biology Laboratory ($500,000), and strengthened environmental science activities at the Institution’s Tropical Research Institute, Oceanographic Sorting Center, and the Center for Short-Lived Phenomena.

An increase of over 300 positions and $4,000,000 has been appropriated to the Institution for the Buildings Management Department to meet the needs of a greatly expanded physical plant (now in excess of three million square feet) and the research and exhibit collection programs these buildings house. New additions to the buildings of the Smithsonian include the National Museum of History and Technology (opened to the public in 1964). Additions on the National Museum of Natural History, the Fine Arts and Portrait Galleries building housing the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery (opened in 1968), the just renovated original Smithsonian Institution Building, and the Renwick Gallery now undergoing restoration and renovation.

The balance of about 150 positions and $3,000,000 has been applied to the establishment of the Institution’s higher and elementary and secondary education programs, the supervision of the foreign currency program and other international activities, the establishment of the Folklife Festival, and the strengthening of the Smithsonian’s libraries, publications, and computer programs, and its financial, personnel, and supply management services.

In fiscal year 1970, the Smithsonian had less than 1,000 private roll employees. The majority of these employees are restricted to grant and contract or other restricted fund activity of the Institution, or are paid from overhead funds resulting from grant and contract projects. Included in this total are approximately 300 employees at the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory paid from NASA funds and 100 at the Science Information Exchange funded by the National Science Foundation. Smaller numbers of private fund employees are attached to the Freer Gallery, the Smithsonian Museum Shops, the Smithsonian Press, and the Smithsonian Associates.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater concluded that Smithsonian management has neglected two of its major components: the National Air and Space Museum and the National Museum of Natural History; that management has little comprehen-
sion of the pressing needs of the nation's flight museum or the Natural History Museum; and that neither the funding nor the personnel of either museum is adequate.

**Smithsonian Comment.**—The Secretary has continued to make every possible effort to acquire an appropriation for construction of the National Air and Space Museum. Starting in 1966, the Smithsonian requested appropriations in their annual budget submissions to the Bureau of the Budget as follows: 1966, $40,045,000; 1967, $40,331,000; 1968, $8,500,000; 1969, $9,500,000; 1970. Letter from the Bureau of the Budget deferred Federal construction; 1971, $2,500,000 planning funds for redesign of museum building to reduce total costs not to exceed $40,000,000.

The Chief Justice of the United States and Chancellor of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian wrote to the President on November 19, 1969, urging that there be included in his budget presentation to the Congress an amount for redesign of the Air and Space Museum. A subsequent response from the President's Assistant for Domestic Affairs denied this request. Regent William A. M. Burden also requested that the President meet with him and Mr. Ripley to discuss the National Air and Space Museum construction. Copies of these letters follow.

Secretary Ripley sent letters to Senator B. Everett Jordan, Chairman, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, as well as Senator Claiborne Pell, Chairman, Subcommittee on the Smithsonian Institution, concerning the desire of the Smithsonian to request redesign funds. Both Senators responded that a request by the Smithsonian Institution for redesign funds would be consistent with the 1966 recommendation of the Committee. I have attached those letters also.

**Hon. Claiborne Pell,**
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Smithsonian Institution, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

**Hon. B. Everett Jordan,**
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

**Dear Senator Jordan:** Thank you for your kind letter of June 29, 1970, relating to the redesign of plans for the construction of the proposed National Air and Space Museum.

I am delighted to know that you concur with our desire to seek redesign funds for the eventual construction of the National Air and Space Museum and that you believe that the request for redesign funds would be consistent with the 1966 recommendation of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. We plan to seek an appropriation in our budget submission for fiscal year 1972.

I shall keep you advised.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary.

**Dr. S. Dillon Ripley,**
Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

**Dear Doctor Ripley:** This will acknowledge your letter of June 5, 1970, concerning the desire of the Smithsonian Institution to request two million dollars in the fiscal 1972 budget for the redesign of plans for the construction of the proposed National Air and Space Museum.

Upon receipt of your letter, I communicated directly with Senator Claiborne Pell, in his capacity as Chairman of the Subcommittee on the Smithsonian Institution. In pertinent part, Senator Pell commented as follows:

It is my understanding that the redesign of the proposed Museum building would result in plans for a smaller building costing not more than $40 million, compared with the estimated cost of more than $60 million for the Museum as now planned.

I continue to hold the view that it would be imprudent to begin construction of the Museum while expenditures for the war in Vietnam continue at a high level.
I believe, however, that a request by the Smithsonian Institution for redesign funds would be consistent with the 1966 recommendation of the Committee.

In my opinion, Senator Pell's remarks accurately express the position of the Committee on Rules and Administration and I am glad to join in them.

With all best regards,

Sincerely,

B. Everett Jordan, Chairman.

Hon. B. Everett Jordan,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: On October 10, 1969, I wrote to you about the proposed National Air and Space Museum indicating that the presently designed building would cost over $60 million and that costs could be reduced by a total redesign to product plans for a different building of small proportions.

The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution has endorsed the redesign recognizing that the cost of $2 million for new plans would result in a substantial reduction in ultimate construction costs. Although the Administration could not approve a request for $2 million in the fiscal 1971 budget, we now propose to repeat this request for funds in the fiscal 1972 budget.

You will recall that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration included in its report to the Senate on June 28, 1966, as follows:

"In reporting favorably on H.R. 6125, the Committee on Rules and Administration noted with satisfaction the letter of May 13, 1966, from Secretary Ripley, giving assurances that funds would not be requested in this session of Congress pursuant to the authorization in H.R. 6125. The committee expressly recommends that funding for the National Air and Space Museum should be deferred even further, if need be, and 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.

Because the above restriction applies specifically to construction, we believe that our request for redesign funds is not in conflict with the Committee's position.

We would indeed appreciate your assistance in approaching the Committee on Rules and Administration in support of this request for funds for redesign in the forthcoming budget for the fiscal year 1972.

Sincerely yours,

June 5, 1970.

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Rules and Administration,

Hon. S. Dillon Ripley,
Secretary, Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dillon: Thank you for your thoughtful letter regarding the proposal to redesign the National Air and Space Museum building. Senator Jordan, to whom you sent a similar letter, has requested my comments on the redesign proposal.

I have advised Senator Jordan that I continue to hold the view, that it would be imprudent to begin construction of the Museum while expenditures for the war in Vietnam continue at a high level.

I have also expressed to Senator Jordan my opinion that a request by the Smithsonian for funds to redesign the Museum building would not be inconsistent with the recommendation by the Committee on Rules and Administration in its report on the National Air and Space Museum Act of 1966.

All best wishes,

Ever sincerely,

Claiborne Pell,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Smithsonian Institution.
Hon. Claiborne Pell,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Claiborne: On October 10, 1969, I wrote to you about the proposed National Air and Space Museum indicating that the presently designed building would cost over $60 million and that costs could be reduced by a total redesign to produce plans for a different building of small proportions.

The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution has endorsed redesign recognizing that the cost of $2 million for new plans would result in a substantial reduction in ultimate construction costs. Although the Administration could not approve a request for $2 million in the fiscal 1971 budget, we now propose to repeat this request for funds in the fiscal 1972 budget.

You will recall that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration included in its report to the Senate on June 28, 1966, as follows:

"In reporting favorably on H.R. 6125, the Committee on Rules and Administration noted with satisfaction the letter of May 13, 1966, from Secretary Ripley, giving assurances that funds would not be requested in this session of Congress pursuant to the authorization in H.R. 6125. The committee expressly recommends that funding for the National Air and Space Museum should be deferred even further, if need be, and 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."

Because this restriction applies specifically to construction, we believe that our request for redesign funds is not in conflict with the Committee's position.

We would indeed appreciate your assistance in approaching the Committee on Rules and Administration in support of this request for funds for redesign in the forthcoming budget for the fiscal year 1972.

Sincerely yours,

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary.

P.S.—Thanks so much for your kind words about the Smithsonian last night. They were very encouraging indeed!

Secretary Ripley wrote to Senator Goldwater on June 5, 1970, a letter which serves to explain our efforts in behalf of the National Air and Space Museum construction. That letter is attached also.

Smithsonian Institution,  

Hon. Barry M. Goldwater,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Goldwater: I have read your long statement about the Smithsonian and in particular about the National Air and Space Museum, with very great interest. I regret that I did not have an opportunity to discuss with you your concerns before you delivered your speech. I would have been able to tell you of our continuing efforts in seeking to move forward on this front, and of some of the concrete steps we have taken.

The ultimate construction of a suitable building to house the Nation's air and space collections will be the successful culmination of 24 years of Congressional encouragement and legislative action in the interest of air and space science and history.

Starting with the Act of August 12, 1946, the Congress established the National Air Museum as a part of the Smithsonian Institution. The Congress included provisions for selecting a site for a National Air Museum building to be located in the Nation's Capital. By the Act of September 6, 1958, the Congress designated a site for a building to be on the Mall from Fourth Street to Seventh Street, Independence Avenue to Jefferson Drive. Planning appropriations in the amount of $511,000 and $1,364,000 have been made available to the Smithsonian by the Congress for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965, respectively. One of my first official acts as Secretary was to testify before the Congressional Committees in support of the planning appropriation for the fiscal year 1965.
I recall with pleasure that at the time of my letter of May 25, 1964, on S. 2602, 88th Congress, addressed to Senator Pell, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on the Smithsonian Institution, it appeared that the building might soon be approved for construction. It was so recommended but the bill was not passed by the House after it had been approved by the Senate.

The Congress subsequently enacted legislation approved on July 19, 1966, authorizing the construction of the National Air and Space Museum.

In connection with this authorization, P.L. 89-509, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration in its report to the Senate stated:

"In reporting favorably on H.R. 6125, the Committee on Rules and Administration noted with satisfaction the letter of May 13, 1966, from Secretary Ripley, giving assurances that funds would not be requested in this session of Congress pursuant to the authorization in H.R. 6125. The committee expressly recommends that funding for the National Air and Space Museum should be deferred even further, if need be, and 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."

Rather than assume the responsibility for interpreting the wording, "substantial reductions in military expenditures in Vietnam," the Smithsonian Institution continued to seek appropriations for the Air and Space Museum. Funds for construction were then requested in the fiscal year 1966 and fiscal year 1967 budget submissions to the Bureau of the Budget in the amount of $40,045,000 and $40,331,000 respectively, as estimated by the General Services Administration. Both requests were deleted by the Administration prior to submittal of the budget to the Congress. During preparation of the fiscal year 1968 budget, it was decided that an incremental request for construction funds for the foundation and underground parking garage might be more acceptable, following the precedent used by the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration to start the FBI Building and the new Labor Department Building. Funds in the amount of $9,700,000 were therefore requested for this purpose in both the fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1969 budget submittals to the Bureau of the Budget and each time the item was deleted and not submitted to the Congress.

With the passage of time and unusually sharp increases in construction costs, the GSA was requested to update the construction cost estimate. In January 1968 we were advised by GSA that the building would now cost nearly $56,000,000 and in the next few years would increase to $65 million, if the then planned planetarium were added to the project. This substantial increase in cost led to consideration of reducing the cost by reducing the size of the building and even completely redesigning if necessary.

The Chancellor of the Smithsonian Institution then wrote to the President on November 19, 1969, to inform him of the resolution approved by the Board of Regents on November 5, 1969, as follows:

Voted that the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution recognizes the intense interest of the American people in the national air and space programs and in the historic flight of Apollo 11 to the Moon and return. The Regents recognize that by Public Law 89-509 the Nation's Air and Space Museum is authorized to be constructed on the Mall on a site designated by Act of Congress. The Regents further recognize that because of substantial increases in construction costs, the building as now designed should be scaled down from its present level of $65 million to a cost level not to exceed $40 million. The Regents, therefore, most respectfully and most urgently request that the President include in his budget for the fiscal year 1971 an amount of $2 million to finance the necessary redesign of this great educational and exhibition center for our air and space exploration.

The Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs responded to the Chancellor's letter on December 10, 1969, and stated that funds for redesign had not been included in the 1971 budget by the Bureau of the Budget because of budgetary constraints, but that it would be included in a list of appealed items to be presented to the President during his review.

After a discussion of these efforts with me, Regent William A. M. Burden wrote to the President, urging that redesign funds be inserted as an amendment to the Presidential Budget. He stated that his concern "arises from our intense desire to complete the National Air and Space Museum within the years of your incumbency as President. In order to complete such an historic structure in time for 1976 at the earliest, it will be necessary to commence planning for a rescaling downwards in cost of the present approved structure. The nation can save per-
haps more than $20 million in completed costs by spending $2 million for re-planning now."

"Mindful of the vital need which the Administration faces in cutting costs, it seems to us that this planning item, which could be inserted as an amendment to the Presidential Budget, would be viewed as a prudent investment for the future."

In the interim, the architect has been authorized to prepare a feasibility study to show in outline form the maximum size and arrangement for a building estimated to cost $40 million. This study will be completed in June 1970.

The Smithsonian was subsequently advised that the Senate had requested in 1969 that appropriations for this purpose not be sought "unless and until there is a substantial redirection in our military expenditures in Vietnam." While the military effort in Vietnam is certainly redirected, we were advised, unfortunately the military expenditure level has not lessened appreciably. We were further advised that the President has directed very drastic cuts in all budgets for FY 1971 and that there is no possibility of reinstating this request under the circumstances.

In our submission of the fiscal year 1972 budget to the Bureau of the Budget, we will again request an appropriation of $2,000,000 for planning. We believe that the investment of redesign costs will result in a substantial decrease in ultimate construction costs and thereby increase the prospect of starting construction at the earliest possible date. We consider that an appropriation for redesign would not be in conflict with the previously stated position of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. We base this statement on the fact that the reference to the then pending legislation, H.R. 6125, was related to an authorization for construction of the building. Planning had been authorized earlier by the Act of September 6, 1958. Accordingly, I am writing to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, asking his concurrence in this interpretation and for his support of our proposed request for planning funds.

In order to provide additional exhibition space for the National Air and Space Museum, pending the construction of a proper museum building for this purpose, a substantial part of the Arts and Industries Building has been assigned to the Air and Space Museum. The exhibitions in this area are of great interest to our visiting public and serve admirably to complement the exhibitions in the adjoining Air and Space Museum hangar.

A number of potential candidates for the position of Director of the National Air and Space Museum have been interviewed. The search continues and we have called upon several of the Regents to assist in suggesting names and in evaluating applicants. The recent appointment of Mr. James E. Webb as a member of the Board of Regents by the Act of May 18, 1970, will provide another Regents with a strong interest in the Air and Space Museum and in the selection of a Director.

In the meantime, Mr. Frank A. Taylor, the senior museum director in the Institution, is serving as Acting Director.

In regard to the proposed Museum of Man, let me say that it was my hope that we could re-establish the Institution's primacy in the field of anthropology that prevailed from the late nineteenth century through the 1930's. I undertook, therefore, to consolidate the Bureau of American Ethnology and the Department of Anthropology to form an intellectual critical mass. In late 1968, sufficient progress had been made in evolving our anthropological programs to warrant the conversion of the transitional Office of Anthropology to the Center for the Study of Man. The Center reinforces and supports the more traditional, collection-based, scholarly activities that go on in the Department of Anthropology with an infusion of scholarship by distinguished ethnologists, social biologists and the like from outside the Smithsonian, including scholars from abroad.

A National Museum of Man would further strengthen the Smithsonian's contributions in the broad area of anthropology, a field that is rapidly undergoing a fundamental change both in the attitudes of its practitioners and in their sightings of new scholarly objectives.

Concerning the personnel of the National Museum of Natural History, I should say that when I came to the Smithsonian I was concerned with our inability to compete with other institutions for highly qualified scientists because of salary levels. Now we have succeeded in attracting a number of highly competent, indeed distinguished scientists to the professional staff in the National Museum of Natural History.
In 1965 we were able to convince both the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress of the merit of providing the Smithsonian with a direct appropriation for research. The appropriation was designed to offset the decline in support that we had been receiving from the National Science Foundation. Since that time, Congress has continued to appropriate funds for scientific research, but unfortunately the level of support has remained static. Nonetheless, the largest percentage of funds from that appropriation has been awarded to scientists in the National Museum of Natural History. In addition, our scientists have been the principal beneficiaries of funds brought into the Institution through our Office of Environmental Sciences, including the units of ecology and oceanography. Also, they have benefited from the Institution’s Foreign Currency Program. Finally, there has been the support for research and curation that I have been able to provide from the Institution’s limited private resources.

With gratitude, I recall that the Congress provided $18,636,000 for the addition of 512,000 square feet of laboratory space to the National Museum of Natural History. These additions, completed in 1963–65, provided a major expansion in the facilities for scientific research in this museum.

I am most grateful for your interest in the National Air and Space Museum and I would indeed welcome an opportunity to discuss with you the development of a new museum at the earliest possible time.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary.

P.S.—A copy of my letter of October 10, 1969, to Senator Jordan on this subject is enclosed.

October 10, 1969.

Hon. Claiborne Pell,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Smithsonian Institution, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Hon. B. Everett Jordan,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Widespread public interest in our Air and Space program has been further enhanced by the historic flight of Apollo 11 to the Moon and its return to Earth.

It appears to be appropriate therefore to recall that Public Law 89–509 which was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration on June 28, 1966, authorizes construction of the National Air and Space Museum. Funds for construction have not been appropriated. In its report to the Senate, the Committee included the following provision:

"In reporting favorably on H.R. 6125, the Committee on Rules and Administration noted with satisfaction the letter of May 13, 1966, from Secretary Ripley, giving assurances that funds would not be requested in this session of Congress pursuant to the authorization in H.R. 6125. The committee expressly recommends that funding for the National Air and Space Museum should be deferred even further, if need be, and 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."

Current actions to reduce the scale of military operations by the United States in Vietnam now being reported in the press, together with evidence of the strong public interest in the air and space program, lead me to ask for your further consideration of the possibility of initiating construction of the National Air and Space Museum in the fiscal year 1971 or 1972.

The President’s deferment of certain Federal construction in the fiscal year 1970 is recognized as a present barrier to Federal construction in general. Nevertheless, the message from the Bureau of the Budget on this subject does not at this time project the deferment beyond the fiscal year 1970.

Construction when started will require four or more years, so that the budgetary effect of the estimated cost of about $60 million will be spread over a time span of five years. The development would be achieved also through successive physical and funding stages, thereby avoiding budgetary peaking. Under this plan of development, there would be undertaken first the substructure, largely occupied by a garage, which could be utilized for public parking as soon as completed, on a fee basis. As a second stage, the central bays of the superstructure
of the building could be erected and utilized by the public as a major exhibition and educational hall for air and space achievements. As a third stage, the end bays of the superstructure could be undertaken to complete the building as now designed.

Another possibility would be a total redesign to produce plans for a different building of smaller proportions costing less than $40 million.

We are convinced that this great exhibition and educational center will be visited by more than five million of our citizens each year. When constructed, it will serve admirably to record for our people, especially the young, the history of the air and space age as it is being made.

With all best wishes.
Sincerely yours,

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary.

P.S.—The visitation to the specimen of Moon Rock now in our old exhibition building amply confirms the vast public awareness and excitement of our space accomplishments.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater stated that the National Air and Space Museum received an extremely meager share of the Smithsonian's Federal Budget—about 1.7%.

Smithsonian Comment.—The National Air and Space Museum budget compared to the total Smithsonian budget is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NASM S. &amp; E.</th>
<th>Smithsonian S. &amp; E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>$301,000</td>
<td>$13,191,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>308,000</td>
<td>15,540,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>384,000</td>
<td>18,921,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>438,000</td>
<td>22,523,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>488,000</td>
<td>24,340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>565,000</td>
<td>26,443,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>570,000</td>
<td>29,965,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As has been stated, the NASM in fiscal year 1970 had 31 positions and 2 vacancies. One of the vacancies is that of Director for which recruiting is proceeding. The other is for the Director's Administrative Assistant, who, it is believed, should be selected by the Director. As has been stated, the NASM received approximately 8½ man-years of work from the Smithsonian Office of Exhibits to which 7 exhibit workers were transferred from the NASM in order to improve the efficiency of operation.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater stated that an in-house survey reveals that 9 out of 10 visitors interviewed at the Mall had been to see the Air and Space Museum—a shocking contrast with the miniscule share of funds and employees which the Museum receives.

Smithsonian Comment.—The visitors counted entering the 4 buildings are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>A. &amp; I. Building</th>
<th>A. &amp; S. Building</th>
<th>NMHT</th>
<th>NMNH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1,493,141</td>
<td>1,225,959</td>
<td>4,174,071</td>
<td>2,916,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2,557,155</td>
<td>1,939,373</td>
<td>5,483,555</td>
<td>3,269,791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures show that nearly half as many visitors are counted in the Arts and Industries Building which contains the moon rock and air and space craft as are counted in the National Museum of History and Technology.

We are greatly encouraged, however, that our current utilization of the Arts and Industries Building for air and space exhibitions has drawn so great a response from the public.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater said that the Museum has had no Director for nearly a year, even though it has been 24 months since the last Director gave notice of his planned retirement.
Smithsonian Comment.—It was testified that nearly 30 candidates had been interviewed. The delay in appointing a director is the result, in part, of the time spent on 2 candidates. One of these had accepted the position at the time of the former director's retirement but subsequently asked to be released from his commitment. The other, a military officer, received a substantial promotion and assignment to a command of National importance which caused him to withdraw. Interviewing of candidates is continuing and results are encouraging.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater stated that for many years the Air and Space Museum was not considered to be one of the Institution's science and technology components. Rather it was put into the arts and humanities wing of the Institution.

Smithsonian Comment.—The NASM has both strong historical objectives as well as scientific and technological aspects. It might have been assigned logically to be administered by either the Assistant Secretary for History and Art or the Assistant Secretary for Science. The National Museum of History and Technology had previously been assigned to the jurisdiction of the Assistant Secretary for History and Art and it seemed equally appropriate to assign the NASM to the same office. This proved to be arguable, so a change was made, not under pressure, but in the interest of testing another organizational arrangement.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater stated that it can be proven that in 1969 the Smithsonian management threatened the Flight Museum and its exhibits with expulsion from the Mall. The Assistant Secretary for History and Art proposed to "get rid of the tin shed" and "get the missiles out of our view."

Smithsonian Comment.—The Assistant Secretary for History and Art did indeed suggest, in a private memorandum to the Secretary, that we should consider the possible use of the Pension Office Building as a temporary location for Air and Space Museum exhibits. This informal suggestion was based upon two premises: (1) the fact, recognized also by Senator Goldwater, that NASM exhibit facilities on the Mall are sadly inadequate; (2) the fact that, in view of the restraint placed upon us by the Senate Committee, we could hardly expect to have our great new Air and Space Museum on the Mall in less than five or perhaps ten years.

Given these circumstances, and given the fact that the future of the Pension Office Building was then under discussion with the GSA, the Assistant Secretary for History and Art believed that we should explore the possibility of using the magnificent inner court of that building, with its vast open space and surrounding galleries, as an interim home for NASM exhibits. The proximity of the Pension Office Building to the proposed National Visitors Center made this possibility seem even more attractive.

The proposal may or may not have been a sensible one, but there is simply no doubt that it was made in an effort to improve the situation of the National Air and Space Museum during the considerable period of time before it could have its own building on the Mall. The notion that this was an attempt to exile the National Air and Space Museum permanently to an inferior part of the city is simply not true.

Historically, the Pension Office Building has been considered as a possible Air Museum at frequent intervals over more than 25 years, at the request of museum personnel. It has the advantage that the large central space would permit the exhibition of a number of historical aircraft too large to be shown in the building on the Mall. All such suggestions have founded on the fact that very costly remodeling of the building would be required to provide access of large objects into the building.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater stated that most Flight Museum exhibits are badly housed, and deteriorating rapidly. The building labeled "National Air and Space Museum" is actually a World War I "temporary" hangar erected in 1917 and the other building used for Air and Space exhibits is 50 years old.

Smithsonian Comment.—The exhibitions of the National Air and Space Museum are in the Arts and Industries Building and the Air and Space Building (a corrugated steel building erected in World War I). Of the total exhibition space in the Arts and Industries Building, i.e., 35,000 s.f. in 13 halls, the National Air and Space Museum exhibits occupy 41,000 s.f. in 9 halls. The exhibits in this building are well maintained, they are not deteriorating, but are being improved almost daily. The exhibits in this building from the Wright plane to Apollo are in very good condition. These were visited by Prince Charles and Princess Anne.
National Air and Space Museum exhibits occupy all of the Air and Space Building, about 18,000 s.f. In fiscal year 1970 a new floor was laid over the whole area. The free standing exhibits of full-size planes, engines, and visitor-operated flight simulation devices, are in good condition. The wall panels depicting the history of flight have been worn by the crowds. One fifth of these were replaced with new exhibits in fiscal year 1970 and this work is continuing.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater stated that the visitor survey pointed out that 87.2% had been to the Air and Space Building as compared to 54.4% who had visited the Museum of History and Technology, and 47.1% who had visited the Museum of Natural History.

Smithsonian Comment.—These figures mean that a visitor interviewed in the Museum of History and Technology was asked what other museums he had visited. The MHT was naturally not mentioned though the Air and Space Museum was. The same question was asked in the Museum of Natural History, which was not mentioned but the Air and Space Museum was. So the Air and Space Museum had two chances to be named as another museum visited, while the two most attended museums each had only one chance in this particular question. The figures for the actual attendance at each of the museums mentioned appear previously on page 32.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater claimed that the study was openly biased in favor of visitors to the two museums where persons were being interviewed. Even so, he stated, almost 9 out of every 10 persons questioned said they had been to the Air and Space displays. In other words, the Flight Museum had drawn more visitors than either of the two museums where the questions were asked.

Smithsonian Comment.—It is clear that the buildings of the Air and Space Museum have not drawn more visitors than the National Museum of History and Technology or the National Museum of Natural History. If, however, the fiscal year 1970 attendance of the Air and Space Building and the Arts and Industries Building are added they total 4,396,528 visitors counted entering each building. This total exceeds the number counted at the Museum of Natural History in the same year. The difficulty of knowing how many individuals are represented in the total number of visitors entering two buildings side by side as in the case of the Arts and Industries Building and the Air and Space Building has been discussed many times. The attendance at the National Museum of History and Technology in each fiscal year 1969 and 1970 exceeds even the total of the two National Air and Space Museum buildings in the same year.

We are greatly encouraged, however, that our current utilization of the Arts and Industries Building for air and space exhibitions has drawn so great a response from the public.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater again voiced his disturbance that the Flight Museum does not have a full-time director and claimed that the Smithsonian has never said what requirements have been set for the position.

Smithsonian Comment.—There is a recruiting letter which solicits application for the position, and also describes the type of person desired. Qualifications for a “rare bird” position of this type are kept flexible. There follows a copy of that letter:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,  
Washington, D.C.

The Smithsonian Institution is seeking a Director for its National Air and Space Museum. The purposes of the National Air and Space Museum are to memorialize the national development of aviation and space flight; collect, preserve, and display aeronautical and space equipment of historical interest and significance; serve as a repository for scientific equipment and data pertaining to the development of aviation and space flight; and, provide educational material for the historical study of aviation and space flight.

The Director will oversee an expansion program which will result in the construction and equipping of a new multi-million dollar museum and concomitantly a major expansion in the existing exhibits and educational program.

He will have the personal satisfaction of managing a national program of aerospace historical research and archival activities in addition to planning, organizing and directing the curatorial, collections and exhibits functions of the museum.
The person sought is someone who has achieved a position of eminence in the field of aviation and space, a person who is challenged by the opportunity to direct a national program whose ultimate achievements will reflect his creativity, knowledge and ability. This program offers such an individual the opportunity to contribute in a highly personal and direct way to this nation’s commitment to aerospace.

The present Director of the National Air and Space Museum will retire in September 1969. The Institution, therefore, is interested in recruiting his replacement as soon as possible. Individuals who feel their education, experience, and interests have equipped them to assume the responsibilities of the position should forward a resume to Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary, Smithsonian Institution.

The present salary range authorized for the position is $28,976 to $32,840 per annum.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater stated that if the Congress had allowed the project for construction of the Air and Space Museum to start in 1966 when it was authorized, the total cost would have been around $40 million. He believes that there are new and persuasive reasons for moving ahead with the new facility now and that the American people want to have a decent home for the National museum where the country’s exciting story in air and space can be told.

Smithsonian Comment.—Senator Goldwater’s strong statement of justification for proceeding with the construction of a new building for the Air and Space Museum is strongly endorsed by the Smithsonian. The Smithsonian has endeavored to share the responsibility for determining when the reduction in the war effort in Vietnam has been reduced sufficiently to satisfy the restriction imposed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and accordingly has asked for appropriation since 1966.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater commented that if the building were to be redesigned, all the questions of its size, its relationship to other structures on the Mall, and, perhaps even its very location at the Smithsonian Park, would be reopened. He stated that it will require encouraging Congress to recognize that $60 million is not too large an investment for our Government to make in preserving the heritage of our people in the mainstream of aviation, rocketry, and space history.

Smithsonian Comment.—Senator Goldwater proposed that the Smithsonian continue to request appropriations for the construction of the new building as now designed. The following are the estimates of the cost to construct the building as now designed, from 1965 to the present, taking into consideration the escalation of costs since that time: 1965, $40,950,428; 1969, $51,352,627; 1970, $57,277,030; 1971, $63,334,906; 1972 $69,655,230, earliest possible date: 1973, $74,527,131 earliest probable date: 1974, $79,728,229.

The decision comes to one of judgment of the probability of obtaining an appropriation of $70 to $75 million for the building.

Though the building design has been accepted by the Fine Arts Commission and the Planning Commission a number of opinions have been expressed that the building as designed is too high and massive for the site. It is said that it would overshadow and diminish the National Gallery of Art and the office buildings to the south on Independence Avenue. This opinion is expected to be raised against appropriation for the construction of the building as designed.

Opposition to the present design is expected to take notice also of the fact that the building design was completed 5 years ago based on concepts developed over 5 to 10 years before 1965. It could oppose a building that would have a built-in old age of 5 to 15 years when started.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the Smithsonian subcommittee have agreed that a request for an application to restudy and redesign the building would not be considered in violation of the restriction against construction. These letters have been submitted for the record.

A feasibility study has been made by the architect for the character of the building which could be constructed for $40,000,000 in 1970, using the present design but reducing it in size and eliminating features such as parking space and the cafeteria.
To fulfill Part 1 of the National Air & Space Museum reduction feasibility study, we have analyzed four schemes for reducing the cost of the Air Museum as follows:

**Scheme A**—includes the following reductions:
1. Reduced cubage of the building by lowering the overall building 13'-26' (see attached building profile comparison and revised plans bound in this report).
2. Omit all parking on Level A (retain mechanical room).

**Scheme B**—includes the following reductions:
1. Reduced cubage of the building by lowering the overall building 13'-26' (see attached building profile comparison and revised plans bound in this report).
2. Omit all parking on Level A (retain mechanical room).
3. Omit all parking on Level B (retain museum shop).

**Scheme C**—includes the following reductions:
1. Reduced cubage of the building by lowering the overall building 13'-26' (see attached building profile comparison and revised plans bound in this report).
2. Omit all parking on Level A (retain mechanical room).
3. Omit all parking on Level B (retain museum shop).
4. Omit the east 90' bay of the museum (which includes cafeteria and a portion of the library) (revised plans bound in this report).

**Scheme D**—includes the following reductions:
1. Reduced cubage of the building by lowering the overall building 13'-26' (see attached building profile comparison and revised plans bound in this report).
2. Omit all parking on Level A (retain mechanical room).
3. Omit all parking on Level B (retain museum shop).
4. Omit the east 90' bay of the museum (which includes cafeteria and a portion of the library) (revised plans bound in this report).
5. Omit the west 90' bay of the museum which omits exhibit space plus a portion of the library (revised plans bound in this report).
### NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM COST REDUCTION STUDY, MAR. 4, 1970 (CALENDAR YEARS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost, scheme A</td>
<td>$40,950,428</td>
<td>$51,352,627</td>
<td>$57,277,930</td>
<td>$63,334,906</td>
<td>$69,655,230</td>
<td>$74,527,131</td>
<td>$79,728,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost, scheme B</td>
<td>$34,967,995</td>
<td>$43,850,240</td>
<td>$48,910,218</td>
<td>$54,082,333</td>
<td>$59,479,323</td>
<td>$62,001,560</td>
<td>$66,328,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost, scheme C</td>
<td>$32,841,954</td>
<td>$41,184,443</td>
<td>$45,936,495</td>
<td>$50,794,148</td>
<td>$55,863,002</td>
<td>$59,770,244</td>
<td>$63,941,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost, scheme D</td>
<td>$30,803,159</td>
<td>$38,627,756</td>
<td>$43,084,804</td>
<td>$47,640,889</td>
<td>$52,395,084</td>
<td>$56,059,788</td>
<td>$59,972,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The above estimates do not include planetarium fees, furniture, furnishings, models, solar screens, bookstacks, metal shelving, communication systems, auditorium protection or sound systems, telephone installations, window cleaning equipment, etc. Building E still exists in its old location. It must be removed (costs by others) this year or a sum of $2,500,000 additional provided for a 1-block staging area, within 2 miles of the site. In addition 1 full block just west of the site, within the mall, must be also provided for staging and storage.
Subject.—Senator Goldwater stated that his aim is to inquire whether the Smithsonian's list of priorities has slipped off course and whether the same level of attention should be given to the National Air and Space Museum that the Institution gives to so many other of its projects. He specifically asked the same question with regard to the Museum of Natural History.

Smithsonian Comment.—We believe that there is no question about the position of the Board of Regents or the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution concerning their interest in striving for a construction appropriation for the National Air and Space Museum Building.

The Museum of Natural History and the science of systematic biology represents one of the many important activities of the Smithsonian Institution. Not only have these areas been of concern since very early in the Institution's history, but they represent certain of the most significant sources of knowledge that the Institution has. The national collections for which we are responsible combine specimens collected over the many years of our existence with the accumulated knowledge about these specimens and the interpretations made concerning their role as members of ecological units. They comprise a body of knowledge unavailable elsewhere which has only recently been recognized as an essential basis for many of the programs of federal mission-oriented agencies in the field of pollution control and environmental enhancement. The geographic, ecological, and temporal data attached to each specimen provide essential ingredients for our attempts to prevent further deterioration, to restore quality where it has been degraded, and to assess probable effects of future environmental manipulation. For example, from this resource we may establish the natural radiation levels in organisms collected before nuclear weapons testing, the load of metallic compounds carried by them before air pollution advanced to its present threatening proportions, and the biochemical constitution of organisms before we began releasing persistent pesticides into the environment. The presence or absence of a particular species, or association of species, may be an indication of water pollution, or chemical conditions of the soil, of contamination of the air, or of previous land uses. An association of particular kinds of fossil organisms in a bed of known age is the key that unlocks our understanding of ancient environments, eons of time before there were intelligent observers. In like manner, studies, such as the one developing in arid southwestern Asia, of man's prehistoric use of the land tell us much about both natural and human ecology in distant times. Teams comprising archeologists, botanists, zoologists, and ecologists are reconstructing the culture of an ancient, highly productive people as it developed within the constraints of the environment. Such information has important implications for improving development programs in many similar parts of the world. Knowledge of the social systems of earlier civilizations, their failures and successes, provides us with valuable baseline information with which we approach the not dissimilar problems of population control, land use, and general environmental exploitation.

Of the several hundred papers produced by staff researchers each year, most contribute directly or indirectly to environmental knowledge, for even papers that are primarily descriptive contain ecological data as well as the characterization of organisms that constitute the living part of this world. Now research biologists in the Museum are increasingly directing their attention to specific problems that affect the quality of living in the nation. Pollution of our air, land, and waters is one of the areas of concern; projects are underway for monitoring the effects of solid-waste pollution of New York Harbor, for discovering and describing the nature of insects and crustaceans that indicate water pollution in southeastern streams, and for assessing the impact of pollution on aquatic organisms at the Smithsonian's Chesapeake Bay Center.

By way of summary, I should like to propose that our biologists are the producers and weavers of the fabric that they and their ecologically oriented colleagues tailor to meet the most urgent human problem—survival in a decaying environment.

The research collections of the National Museum of Natural History represent a unique national resource for science generally, but specifically they are increasingly recognized as the documentation for most of what we know about the natural world of which we are a part. They provide the kind of baseline information we must have in order to assess the impact of our activities on the environment now and in the past. Most importantly, these objects and the research
products derived from their study present us with information that may be used in unprecedented ways to predict the nature of the effects on the environment of future proposed manipulations.

The collections or natural history materials and the institutions that are the national caretakers are grossly deficient of the support they deserve and must have if they are to provide the data science must have. Consequently, the condition of the collections is deteriorating for lack of storage space and equipment; professional systematists are spending unconscionable amounts of time in menial tasks for lack of technical assistance; and the rate of growth of the manpower for systematic studies is far below the level already needed. Parenthetically, I must point out that the National Collections in the care of the Smithsonian Institution face precisely the same support problems as do the other collections centers in universities and in publicly or privately supported museums.

We have suggested that the National Academy of Sciences establish a standing committee on systematic biology that would give special attention to the requirements for adequate preservation of the invaluable resource represented by the major one hundred systematic collections in the museums and other centers across the land. Such a panel might also address itself to studies of preservation techniques that would make available materials now and in the future for biochemical studies that would complement the more conventional morphological/anatomical ones. Another concern might well be to assist systematists to develop and obtain support for interactive, computerized data-exchange systems by which the burgeoning needs of environmental, biomedical, crop improvement, and biological control studies might be satisfied. In any case, those of us who share the responsibility for maintaining national reference collections must find ways of fulfilling those responsibilities in the face of rapidly increasing demands for systematic information that are derived from national programs in oceanography, ecology, and the like.

**Subject.**—Senator Goldwater referred to sharp complaints about the decline of support to the National Museum of Natural History.

**Smithsonian Comment.**—Each year our budget submissions to the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress have justified the need for additional funds for support of our scientific research and the maintenance of the collections. Our success in acquiring additional funds in our appropriations for these purposes is usually a reflection of National economic conditions.

In the fiscal year 1965, the National Museum of Natural History was allotted $2,326,000 and 219 positions. In fiscal year 1966, this Museum expended $2,854,000 and had 236 positions. Included in these figures was support for the Office of Oceanography and Limnology and for the Ecology program. In fiscal year 1970 this Museum expended an estimated $3,885,000 and had 258 positions. The latter amounts are exclusive of Oceanography, Ecology, and the Center for the Study of Man, programs associated with the study of natural history.

The increase in the Museum of Natural History from $2,854,000 in 1966 to $3,885,000 in 1970, an amount of $1,031,000, was 36%. Included was a substantial amount for salary increases pursuant to law.

It is recognized that the Museum of Natural History is concerned primarily with the funds allotted to it for its purposes as distinct from funds for the associated programs, such as those just mentioned. The total for these associated programs is estimated at $640,000 in 1970. Thus, the total for these natural history programs in 1970 was $4,534,000, a 59% increase. In addition, associated research by staff members of the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, the National Zoological Park, and the Radiation Biology Laboratory should be recognized.

This increase in the various programs in natural history compares favorably with the increase in the Salaries and Expenses appropriation, from $18,921,000 in 1966 to $22,975,000 in 1970, an increase of 58%.

It should be noted that the programs of the Museum of Natural History are supported to a substantial degree through other, separately budgeted units of the Institution. In 1970, the Smithsonian Research Awards to the Museum of Natural History staff amounted to $295,000 and the Foreign Currency Program allotted $760,000, including certain multi-year awards.

**Subject.**—Senator Goldwater commented that the recommendation by the Smithsonian Council has demonstrated such a growing sense of concern by the Council that they felt it necessary to urge the Secretary to allocate additional resources to the Museum of Natural History so as to obtain increased support for the field of systematic biology.
Smithsonian Comment.—The Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Science, as well as other officials of the Institution, have attempted to convince representatives of the Executive Branch and the Congress of the importance of the kinds of research being conducted at the Museum of Natural History, specifically research in systematics. This is a very old field in biology, but one which nevertheless is essential to a correct understanding, not only of other disciplines such as physiology and biochemistry, but also of the relationships between plants and animals and their environment, generally known as ecology. No proper understanding of environmental control requirements can be achieved without a recognition of the interrelationships and varying responses of organisms to each other and their common physical environment.

Today, there is a growing demand for environmental restoration—a demand that we undertake the reconditioning of degraded lakes, rivers and land areas. Lake Erie is a case in point. Unfortunately, the knowledge of the ecological conditions that existed before the process of deterioration began is not available, and without it, restoration to a healthy, balanced condition is extremely difficult. The irony of the situation is that collections of ecological base-line data do exist, but only randomly, like the unassembled pieces of a vast jigsaw puzzle.

A great amount of ecological data already exists as an inherent part of the natural history collections in the Smithsonian Institution and in other natural history research museums throughout the world. If we had adequate support (1) to emphasize our systematic research and (2) to sustain the development of our electronic data processing systems for inventorying, retrieving and correlating the ecological data associated without collections, we could provide environmental planners with an effective and valuable set of ecological bench marks for many regions of our country, and for the world. These data would permit the environmental problem solvers to recognize the sequence of ecological changes that occurred over extended periods of time in those localities which are now being considered for environmental restoration.

The base-line knowledge could be used also in testing the validity of the mathematical models that are being developed to predict ecological changes resulting from environmental interventions, by comparing the conditions derived from the model with the changes that actually have occurred. This dependence on real data greatly improves the accuracy of our estimates of the consequences of such proposed environmental interventions as the Atlantic-Pacific Oceanic Sea Level Canal.

In summary, the combination of the natural history collections and the expertise of the Smithsonian scientists who produce knowledge from the collections of data constitutes a unique national resource. Unfortunately, this resource has yet to receive the recognition and support it merits from Congress and the federal agencies.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater stated that the Smithsonian has severely restricted the services provided to the National Museum of Natural History by the Smithsonian's Buildings Management Department.

Smithsonian Comment: The magnitude of expansion and growth in the Smithsonian has resulted in ever increasing demands for services and presented problems of staffing, funding, and supporting the many and varied activities during an extended period of inflation and rising costs. Generally the Buildings Management Department budgets for maintenance and repairs of the buildings and grounds; costs of utilities that include heating, air conditioning, electric power, water, and telephone services; providing custodial laborers; protection; and transportation of personnel and objects. The Buildings Management Department does not, however, budget for special services to support program related activities. The Buildings Management Department will continue to accommodate as many services as its staff and resources will permit.

The Museum of Natural History is the largest of the Smithsonian buildings and received materials and services from the Buildings Management Department in 1970 amounting to $2,384,000.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater stated that the scientific staff of the Museum of Natural History has fallen below the level it was at three years ago.

Smithsonian Comment.—Our records indicate that the total number of employees at the Museum of Natural History essentially has remained static over the last three years. The internal distribution of the allotment to the bureaus is made at the discretion of the bureau director who may decide whether to employ additional professional, subprofessional, or administrative personnel as he determines necessary.
Subject.—Senator Goldwater stated that the number of laboratory technicians available to assist the museum's research scientists has also declined since fiscal year 1967, thereby forcing individual scientists to do work that should be done for them by a support staff.

Smithsonian Comment.—Allotments for the major bureaus of the Institution are made to the directors of these bureaus. The director has the discretion to expend monies for those salaries he thinks most urgent and advantageous. It is, of course, a difficult decision when the need is so great for both professionals and technicians, whether to make funds available to hire one or the other.

Although it was agreed among the staff of the National History Museum and concurred in by the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary (Science) that an ideal ratio between professional and subprofessional help was one to two or three, it became evident that for budgetary reasons such a goal was not feasible. A temporary solution has been to pool the technical and secretarial help and have them available to the professionals as needed.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater stated that the Institution's Foreign Currency Program request for first priority research projects of the Museum of Natural History is down by 53% from last year—from $336,000 to $220,000.

Smithsonian Comment.—It should be understood that the Smithsonian's Foreign Currency Program is much more a grant program to other American museums and institutions of higher learning than a fixed source of funds for Smithsonian overseas research. Since its inception in 1965, the Program has been presented to the Congress and endorsed by the Congress essentially as a grant program to other institutions. Some 57 American universities and museums have benefited from it so far.

Elements of the Smithsonian, such as the Museum of Natural History, may also apply to the Foreign Currency Program for grants, but they must do so in competition with the proposals received from other institutions. Advisory councils composed of distinguished outside experts review all proposals on merit and with impartiality—including those of Smithsonian origin. Thus, under this procedure, which we believe is entirely correct and appropriate to the management of the Smithsonian's largest single source of research support, it is impossible for the Smithsonian to make purely administrative decisions on what will be allocated to one or another museum or bureau of the Institution.

The degree of support which any element of the Smithsonian may get from the Foreign Currency Program rests on the number and quality of the proposals submitted throughout the country.

Furthermore, the dollar totals assigned to projects in the lists of on-going research in the Program's budget justification for fiscal year 1971 are estimates only. They were based on projections available at the time the list was prepared in December 1969. Final dollar totals for grants from the FY 1971 appropriation will be determined in the course of the annual review of research progress undertaken by the Foreign Currency Program's scientific advisory councils. Final figures for some FY 1970 grants, shown as estimates in the budget justification, were determined in a similar way this past spring when our Advisory Councils met. In fact the final foreign currency total for the research of the staff of the Museum of Natural History for FY 1970 was $760,000, including certain multi-year awards. This total includes three projects which requested an additional year of funding which had not been anticipated in the budget justification and two new ones.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater stated that the Museum's research departments are being deprived of several hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in overhead monies which are brought into the Institution through research grants and contracts performed by the Museum's scientific staff, but are spooned off for the benefit of some other Smithsonian components.

Smithsonian Comment.—Contract and grant overhead is not profit. It is a recovery of the directly or indirectly related costs of obtaining and administering those contracts. Failure to recover these costs properly from grants and contracts would mean that the Institution would itself have to contribute these expenses from its scarce unrestricted private funds.

Research professionals almost universally misunderstand and dislike overhead as a charge against the research contracts which are awarded to them, be it in the Smithsonian Institution or in other museums or universities.
Overhead is variously considered by them to be either:
1. Profit siphoned off by the administration for other purposes;
2. Monies to which they are themselves at least partially entitled;
3. Charges which are higher than justified by services received; or,
4. In any event, a serious impediment to their receiving adequate funds for the research work itself.

Overhead has sometimes been defined, in fact, as "the indirect expenses of someone else's department which should be eliminated or reduced."
The fact is, there are very definite administrative costs associated with the negotiation and administration of grants and contracts. Directly related are the costs of the Contracts Office, which negotiates the contracts; the Grant and Contract Administration Office; the Fiscal Division, which maintains the accounting records and handles the payroll and other expense payments; the Supply Division, which processes requisitions, purchase orders, and receipt of materials, supplies and equipment; the Registrar's Office and Travel Office, which take care of transportation and travel arrangements; and the Personnel Office, which hires the scientists, technicians, and support personnel. Less directly associated, but of indirect assistance, are our administrative services such as the Duplicating Department; Libraries (to the extent supported with private funds); and the Legal Counsel Office, whose services are often necessary to advise on difficult legal points or assist in payment disagreements with granting agencies. Additionally, of course, the Secretary, his staff, and other administrative heads devote time directly or indirectly to grants and contracts as well as their other responsibilities. No portion of the costs of our Development Office, Public Affairs Office, Performing Arts group or other private funds activity not performing a related administrative function is included in the overhead charges.

The costs of all of these administrative departments and personnel must be paid for. Logically, they are charged to the activity receiving the benefit. By their very nature, however, administrative costs can rarely be directly identified with specific projects. Instead they are almost universally distributed in some reasonable, although necessarily arbitrary, manner (such as proration on basis of total direct costs) over all of the activities benefited. This is the case with the Smithsonian. Administrative costs, in other words, are distributed not only to grants and contracts but also against all of the Institution's other private activities. The distribution is made on a basis which has been negotiated with the various granting Government agencies and is audited regularly by the Defense Contracts Audit Agency. The Smithsonian's overhead rate is one which is recognized by contracting officers generally as being very much in line with overhead rates charged by other similar institutions for similar contract work.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater commented that because of the drop in support services provided by the Buildings Management Department (BMD), he wanted the Smithsonian to discuss a reported $1.5 million budget overrun in BMD, meaning that this amount of BMD resources went out unbudgeted for certain projects.

Smithsonian Comment.—The Buildings Management Department (BMD) is responsible for the maintenance, operation, and protection of eight major buildings and for serving nine other research, collection, and service facilities. Its operations include maintenance of the physical plant; space rental; the provision of heat, light, air conditioning, and communications; guard protection to the buildings and their contents; and special fabrication services in support of museum and research programs.

The Department's budget has grown from approximately $4 million in fiscal year 1954 to $8.6 million in fiscal year 1970. The BMD has never had a budget overrun despite the pressures brought about by the requirement to absorb parts of frequent General Schedule and Wage Board pay raises for its employees and inflation in the costs of all supplies, equipment, and services it must purchase. To the contrary, the Department makes funds available to other units in the Institution for buildings-management type expenses when it is determined that the receiving unit is in the best position to obligate the funds. For instance, funds have been made available to the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum for the rental of its museum building (a vacant theater) and for the purchases of custodial and maintenance supplies and equipment. Similarly, BMD has funded expenses of the Folklife Festival on the Mall.
Subject.—Senator Goldwater commented that the Smithsonian’s press office is unable to provide adequate support help to researchers in Natural History because editors who are paid from federal funds are directed to spend much of their time working on books sold by the Smithsonian to make money for its private funds.

Smithsonian Comment.—As stated in the testimony concerning Chapter Four of the GAO audit report, the Smithsonian and the GAO are presently engaged in a joint study of those public service activities of the Institution which generate revenues to help defray the cost of such activities. These activities are not money-making in the sense that a dollars-and-cents profit is realized; they are loss operations whose overall deficit is met from the unrestricted private funds of the Institution.

Among these activities is the Smithsonian Press, which has, for many years, been supported by both public and private funds. The Director of the Press, who is also its editor-in-chief, is paid from private funds. He has prepared the following analysis of the relationship of private and public support of the Press during fiscal year 1970, which indicates that, on balance, the private contribution to Federal publications outweighs the Federal contribution to private publications.

**PRESS PROGRAM SUPPORT BY FEDERAL AND PRIVATE FUNDS**

Since everything the Press does ends up as printed product, the most rational manner of determining whether a Smithsonian publication is “Government” or “private” is by the source of funds used for payment of manufacturing (printing) costs. Using this measure, the following table is a breakdown for fiscal year 1970:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of publication</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research reports</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogs (exhibit)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information leaflets</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official documents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A financial analysis by category of expense for fiscal 1970 (June estimated) is tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of expense</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$396</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and distribution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author’s royalties</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel, supplies, equipment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative overhead</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service contracts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>692</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Salaries and benefits are broken down by functional department as follows:

[Dollar amounts in millions]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The private roll employees are not strictly assigned to private publications, nor is the converse true of Federal roll employees. While private publications were only 16 percent of the total publications program in number and in dollars expended on manufacturing costs, private funds accounted for 22 percent of the total, private salaries and benefits were 26 percent of the total in that category. It is true that private expenditures represented 32 percent of all costs, but this is because virtually all costs of advertising, promotion, and sales-distribution, which are attendant on the sale of privately funded publications, are borne additionally with private funds. If, in gross terms, the balance of Federal vs. private publications is weighted by number of publications or (better) by investment in manufacturing expense, it is clear that the private roll employees supported the Federal publications of the Smithsonian Press in fiscal 1970.

Smithsonian Press publications are a major means of diffusing knowledge, and have been since 1848. Federal support of publications is simply and solely for the purpose of diffusing knowledge, and for many decades this infusion of Federal funds, in combination with private funds (which originally were the sole source of support), has expanded our publications program. Our sale of privately funded publications and retention of income is justified simply by its multiplier effect. That is, by earning private income, the Smithsonian is able to devote these additional resources to further programs in the increase and diffusion of knowledge which, if they were not so supported, would have to be terminated or funded from other sources, such as the U.S. Government.

ANDERS RICHTER,
Director, Smithsonian Press.

Subject.—Senator Goldwater stated that the condition of exhibit animals on display at the Natural History Building is deplorable.

Smithsonian Comment.—The general exhibit of mammals is admittedly in need of renovation. A number of the displays need to be replaced because the specimens are old, and because there have been changes in public concern and interest since their installation. In pleasant contrast, the hall of North American mammals and the habitat displays of African mammals and the habitat displays of African mammals collected by Theodore Roosevelt are in good condition. Curation and care of the collections are in competition for funds with research. Both are essential to the proper function of the Smithsonian Institution and the available moneys must be shared. A maintenance team has been organized and will spend one day a week cleaning and repairing exhibits. While this takes these people away from other curatorial work, it will make a start in improving the exhibits and we hope it will serve as a nucleus around which to build a staff of people hired for these purposes when funds become available.
Mr. Thompson. Mr. Bingham, do you have any questions at this time?

Mr. Bingham. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think it might be helpful just to in a general way if you would comment on the first three points that are made on the first page of Senator Goldwater's statement, Mr. Bradley, in which he draws the conclusion that there is a disproportionate relationship between the number of visitors that attend the Air and Space Museum and the budget proportion and the personnel proportion.

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Bingham, with the only comment that is valid, I have to say that there are many places in the Smithsonian that are short of funds. It is true that we have in our way tried to help the Air and Space Museum. The very fact that you are talking about two bodies of visitors brings us to explain to the committee that we have assigned the arts and industries building almost entirely, as far as exhibition space is concerned, to the Air and Space Museum.

That is what Senator Goldwater was talking about, and quite properly, the visitors to the air and space hanger, and the visitors to the arts and industries building, which gradually has become primarily space and air oriented.

So when the Secretary was testifying—and I haven't examined the transcript—but I would certainly assume that he was reading from a tabulation which is by building, and you come down to the air and space building and he probably found the figure of 2 million. Then another 2 million, and the Senator is entirely correct, undoubtedly went in the arts and industries building, which adjoins, to see primarily the air and space exhibitions.

They really are very good. This has been done in order to improve our offering in the field of air and space, with what we have to offer.

Mr. Bingham. Is that another 2 million? This was the question I raised with the Senator before.

Mr. Bradley. It could be the same people. We know that in the Museum of History and Technology, a little over 5 million a year are indicated. We know, speaking in round figures, that the total number of visitor entrances regardless of whether they are the same people might well be in the neighborhood of 13 million or 14 million.

I think a mathematician would say, "Then it is probably, it is almost certain that there is double-counting." If you wanted to know the number, the population of the people actually coming, it would be between the 5 million that we know entered one building and the 13 to 14 million that in the aggregate entered all buildings, and probably mathematically you would pick the midpoint and say probably there were 9 million different people.

(The material referred to follows:)
## VISITS TO THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION BUILDINGS ON THE MALL: (BY FISCAL YEAR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Smithsonian Institution</th>
<th>Arts and Industries</th>
<th>Natural History</th>
<th>Air and Space building</th>
<th>Freer Gallery of Art</th>
<th>History and Technology</th>
<th>Fine Arts and Portrait Galleries</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Evening visitors included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960...</td>
<td>1,039,704</td>
<td>2,680,034</td>
<td>2,218,747</td>
<td>136,068</td>
<td>120,077</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>6,494,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961...</td>
<td>1,024,526</td>
<td>2,912,371</td>
<td>2,047,973</td>
<td>987,858</td>
<td>130,746</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>7,103,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962...</td>
<td>1,222,112</td>
<td>3,471,050</td>
<td>1,113,063</td>
<td>1,986,319</td>
<td>130,597</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>8,923,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963...</td>
<td>1,630,280</td>
<td>3,534,182</td>
<td>2,288,397</td>
<td>1,673,618</td>
<td>183,359</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>10,309,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964...</td>
<td>1,311,061</td>
<td>2,457,243</td>
<td>2,512,306</td>
<td>1,854,186</td>
<td>168,625</td>
<td>2,509,774</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>10,813,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965...</td>
<td>1,065,635</td>
<td>2,078,175</td>
<td>3,051,472</td>
<td>1,705,683</td>
<td>210,972</td>
<td>5,091,776</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>13,153,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966...</td>
<td>870,010</td>
<td>1,756,715</td>
<td>2,985,006</td>
<td>1,494,922</td>
<td>222,089</td>
<td>4,829,112</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>12,150,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967...</td>
<td>920,312</td>
<td>1,638,873</td>
<td>3,408,937</td>
<td>1,484,423</td>
<td>212,920</td>
<td>5,546,102</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>13,312,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968...</td>
<td>847,176</td>
<td>1,344,622</td>
<td>3,257,957</td>
<td>1,123,698</td>
<td>169,533</td>
<td>4,750,023</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>11,523,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969...</td>
<td>752,259</td>
<td>1,493,141</td>
<td>2,915,749</td>
<td>1,225,929</td>
<td>179,374</td>
<td>4,174,071</td>
<td>30,888</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>10,430,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970...</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>2,557,155</td>
<td>3,269,791</td>
<td>1,639,373</td>
<td>217,305</td>
<td>5,483,555</td>
<td>216,523</td>
<td>13,583,702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Visitors by numbers per museum, last 10 years.
2 History and Technology opened January 1964.
3 National Collection of Fine Art opened May 1968.
4 July to August 1964, certain Smithsonian Institution buildings were open 4:30 to 10 p.m. for the 1st time.
5 Reflects the significant decrease in visitors to the Nation's Capital because of unsettled local conditions.
6 Closed.

Mr. Bingham. I don't even see that relationship. It seems to me what you really are talking about here are visits, not visitors. It might be better to use the word "visits."

Mr. Bradley. Traditionally called visitors, but, visits actually.

Mr. Bingham. Many of these might be people coming back 10 or 20 times in the course of the year, the same people.

What I was trying to get you to comment on, and you haven't quite met the point yet, is to what extent are your priorities, and I think basically Senator Goldwater's criticism has to do with what he senses to be the priorities now assigned within the Smithsonian, determined by the degree of visitor interest?

Mr. Bradley. To a substantial degree, of course the visitor appeal is a significant factor. But to try again to answer your question, Mr. Bingham, I think that so often events overcome us and direct what we are going to do next.

We have had 20 legislative enactments. We have had a plan of expansion, and I am most grateful for this, but it totals up to quite a few million dollars.

If you get a newly reconditioned and restored old Patent Office Building, and therein goes a Portrait Gallery, which is important to the history of this country, and a National Collection of Fine Arts, then it is incumbent on us to operate the building and to receive the public and to put a reasonable amount of curatorial staff into what becomes a new enterprise.

In regard to my own assigned project, the National Air and Space Museum, the nearest we have been able to do on that is to move it into the arts and industries building. I have always considered it to be the tradition around the Smithsonian, since I have been there, is that when you get a new building like the Museum of History and Technology, you staff it up and get ready to receive millions of visitors.
So I think that the time of the Air and Space Museum is the future. We are going to do all we can. As the chairman has said, don’t wait, start doing it right now, and we shall. But the important thing is that the Air and Space Museum needs this new building. This is what we have been concentrating on.

Mr. Bingham. I want to make it clear, Mr. Bradley, that I am not suggesting that the Smithsonian should be guided any more than perhaps it already is by the degree of visitors. I think this guide would be unreliable.

I seem to recall that the greatest number of visitors that ever came to the Metropolitan Museum in New York to see a particular painting came because that painting had been discovered to be a fake. So that I don’t think that visitor interest was a reliable guide.

I, for one, am not concerned that you don’t follow proportionately in terms of expense of personnel the degree of visitor interest. Nevertheless, it does appear that perhaps these activities are undermanned and under funded, and I think perhaps in your comments on this you might go into some detail in your efforts to meet those shortages.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(The statement follows:)

For FY 1971 the Congress appropriated $599,000 to the National Air and Space Museum and authorized 43 positions.

The Smithsonian FY 1971 allotment to the National Air and Space Museum from presently appropriated funds is $604,000 plus a minimum of $18,000 or maximum of $22,000 additional expected from the supplemental appropriations to cover mandatory pay increases. Realistically, it is safe to plan on a total $622,000. It is recommended to raise the personnel strength to 41 positions, estimated to cost $490,000 in FY 1971. This would leave an estimated balance in the funds appropriated and expected of only $132,000 for other classifications of expenses.

The cost of filling all of the authorized 43 positions would reduce the balance for other classifications to less than is necessary to carry out the purpose of the Museum. The FY 1970 strength of the National Air and Space Museum was 33 positions authorized of which 31 were filled at the end of the year. The two vacancies were in the positions of Director and his administrative assistant.

In addition, the National Air and Space Museum will receive $1\frac{1}{2} man years of work from the Smithsonian Office of Exhibits in both years, 1970 and 1971.

Mr. Thompson. I think having so many questions raised by Senator Goldwater’s statement, which Mr. Bradley is going to prepare answers to, that those answers will provide us such further information as we need with respect to the Air Museum.

Our situation is this: There will be on the floor this afternoon the appropriations for the Health, Education, and Welfare. We hope to be able to sit during general debate and to come back at 2:30. However, our situation must be fluid, because there will be some important amendments. So we will hope to go on as long as we can.

If we are required to go to the floor, we will have to do that and adjourn until later.

Mr. Bingham. Are we permitted to the 2:30 hour? It occurs if we came back earlier, we might have more chance to sit during general debate.

Mr. Thompson. We could come back at 2 o’clock. Would that be convenient for you, Mr. Bradley?

Mr. Bradley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, yes.
Mr. Thompson. The next subject is going to be the administrative structure of the entire Smithsonian Institution. So I think rather than hear you on that now, we will adjourn to come back at 3 o'clock.

Mr. Bradley. You have kindly included in the record earlier a statement of the recommendations of the Smithsonian Council, a very distinguished body. With your permission, I would like to submit a list of the members of that council.

Mr. Thompson. That would be very valuable. Without objection, it will be accepted.

(The biographies follow:)

Smithsonian Council Members


Professor Fred R. Eggan, Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago, 1126 East 59th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60601. Born 1906. Ph. B. University of Chicago, Ph. D. University of Chicago, 1933. Has been with the University of Chicago since 1934 (Chairman of the Department of Anthropology 1961–1963 and Director of the Philippine Studies Program since 1953). Has served as the official delegate to the Pacific Science Congresses in Manila (1953), Bangkok (1957), Honolulu (1961) and Tokyo (1967) and as a member of the Pacific


Dr. Philip Handler, President, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418. Became President of the National Academy of Sciences on July 1, 1969. Chartered by Congress 106 years ago to advise Government on scientific matters, the NAS is a non-profit institution that is considered to be the most prestigious body in American science.

A noted biochemist and member of the President's Science Advisory Committee, Dr. Handler is a James B. Duke Professor of Biochemistry and was chairman of the Biochemistry Department at Duke University School of Medicine. He is on indefinite leave of absence from Duke where he had been a member of the faculty since 1939, the year he received his Ph. D. in biochemistry from the University of Illinois.

He is Chairman of the National Science Board of the National Science Foundation and past president and chairman of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology as well as a past president of the American Society of Biological Chemists.

Co-author of the textbook, "Principles of Biochemistry," Dr. Handler has had over 200 research papers published in professional journals. Since 1953, he has served on a series of panels and the Councils of the National Institutes of Health, including the National Advisory Council on Research Resources and Facilities and the National Advisory Health Council. He also served on the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke, the President's Science Advisory Committee and The Surgeon General's Committee on Environmental Health.

Dr. Murray Gell-Mann, Robert Andrews Millikan Professor of Theoretical Physics, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91109. Born 1929. B.S. Yale University, Ph. D. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1951. Has served as a member of the faculty of the California Institute of Technology since 1955, formerly having taught and conducted research at the University of Illinois, University of Chicago and Columbia University. Has been a member of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey, 1967–1968; Fellow of the American Physical Society; and member of the National Academy of Sciences since 1960. Author of The Eightfold Way (with Yuval N'eman) (1964) and numerous articles on elementary particle physics and related fields. Received Franklin Medal 1967; Research Corporation Award 1969; Nobel Prize, 1963. Honorary degrees received: Sc. D.—Yale University, 1959; Sc. D.—University of Chicago, 1967; Sc. D.—University of Illinois, 1968; Sc. D.—Wesleyan University, 1968; Honorary Doctorate—University of Turin, Italy, 1969.


Professor Charles D. Michener, Watkins Distinguished Professor of Entomology and Systematics and Ecology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044. Born 1918. B.S. University of California at Berkeley; Ph. D. University of California at Berkeley 1941. Has been with the University of Kansas since 1948 (Watkins Distinguished Professor since 1959). Served as State Entomologist 1949-1961. Author of American Social Insects (with Mary H. Michener) (1951), Nest Architecture of the Sweet Bees (with S. F. Sakagami) (1962), and approximately 225 technical works, mainly on bees. His work reflects strong interests in the principles of systematics, in the origin and evolution of social behavior in insects, as well as in general behavior and ecology.

Dr. Peter M. Millman, National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa 7, Ontario, Canada. Born 1906. B.A. Toronto, Ph. D. Harvard University 1932. Past President of the Royal Astronomical Society of Canada and of the Meteoritical Society. A meteorite specialist whose studies include those of the upper atmosphere with planetary and space research; also interested in the culture of Japan and international exchanges.


Professor Cyril Stanley Smith, Institute Professor, Room 14N-317, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139. Born 1903. B.S. University of Birmingham, S.C. D. Massachusetts Institute of Technology 1926. D. Litt, Case Institute 1963. With American Brass Company from 1927-1942; became Director of the Institute for the Study of Metals, University of Chicago in 1945; with M.I.T. since 1961. Has been a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee in 1959. Co-author of Treatise on Divers Arts by Theophrastus (1963) and several other translations of sources for the history of metallurgy. Author of A History of Metallography (1960). A primary interest in the historical interaction between science, technology and art. He is a consultant to the Freer Gallery of Art and the Smithsonian Office of Anthropology.

Professor John D. Spikes, Professor of Biology, College of Letters and Science, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112. Born 1918. B.S. California Institute of Technology, Ph. D. California Institute of Technology, 1948. Has been with the University of Utah since 1948 (Dean of College of Letters and Science, 1964-1968), except for a period on leave as cell physiologist of the Division of Biology and Medicine of the Atomic Energy Commission. Author of numerous publications in scientific journals, bulletins, etc. May research is in biophysics, especially photobiology.


Mr. THOMPSON. The subcommittee will adjourn until 2.
(Whereupon, at 12:03 p.m. the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at 2 p.m. of the same day.)

AFTER RECESS
(The subcommittee reconvened at 2:15 p.m., Hon. Frank Thompson, Jr., presiding.)
Mr. THOMPSON. The subcommittee will be in order.
Other members will be coming as it is possible for them to do so.
At this point we will proceed with Mr. James Bradley on the subject of the administrative structure of the Smithsonian Institution.

STATEMENT OF JAMES BRADLEY, UNDER SECRETARY SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION—Resumed

Mr. BRADLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
With your permission, I would like to offer this prepared statement for the record and to highlight it.
Mr. THOMPSON. Without objection, the prepared statement will be placed in full in the record at this point. You may proceed to highlight it, if you will, Mr. Bradley.
(The document referred to follows:)

STATEMENT BY JAMES BRADLEY, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND MEMORIALS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, JULY 21, 1970

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

Effective administration and management provide the foundation for the Smithsonian Institution's capability for accomplishing its programs of education, exhibition, and research. The diversity of these programs, the importance of the national collections and the unrivalled complex of museums and art galleries to millions of visitors, and the dedication of the Institution to works of scholarship—all demand that its administrative management be equally responsive and progressive.

In its responses to opportunities and changes during the past decade, the Institution has endeavored to establish an organization that is focused clearly on its principal programmatic objectives. Accordingly, administrative and supporting services, including such essential services as libraries, publications, and automatic data processing, are carefully directed in order to facilitate accomplishment of the Institution's main purposes. Scientists, historians, educational leaders and other upper-level professionals are enabled to dedicate their com-
petence to the achievement of academic goals. Only a minimum of administrative action is required of scholars. A scientist is not required to resign from science in order to head a scientific organization in the Smithsonian. In these ways, management best serves the high purposes of the Institution.

Let me outline the nature of the Smithsonian in other terms. The Smithsonian was explicitly established as a charitable nonprofit corporation to carry out the trust responsibilities of the United States independent of the Government itself. It receives the support and assistance of each of the branches of the Government without becoming a part thereof. The acceptance by the Institution in recent years of increasing amounts of directly appropriated funds has affected its administrative procedures but has not changed the basic independent authority of the Board of Regents. This independence has been consistently reasserted on numerous occasions, of which the following are characteristic:

Chief Justice Taft, at the Conference on the Future of the Smithsonian Institution, in 1927: "I must make clear gentlemen, that the Smithsonian Institution is not, and has never been considered a government bureau. It is a private Institution under the guardianship of the Government."

Chief Justice Stone, in a letter to the Civil Service Commission, in 1943: "I am of the opinion that to make the retirement coverage mandatory might jeopardize the private status of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Gallery of Art and might have the effect of invalidating the Trusts which are administered for the benefit of those institutions. Those Trusts contemplate that the private character of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Gallery of Art shall continue and that certain of their employees shall remain private employees. To place those employees mandatorily under the Retirement Act might be construed as amounting to a change in their legal status and to that extent an invalidation of the Trust provisions."

Chief Justice Vinson, in reply to the Civil Service Commission's assertion of jurisdiction over Smithsonian private roll employees (including the Secretary), in 1953: "Absolute control over the appointment, compensation, direction and removal of the trust fund employees of the Smithsonian Institution is vested in the Regents of the Institution by the [following] provisions of its Charter: . . .

In 1923, President Harding suggested the inclusion of the Smithsonian in a new Department of Education and Welfare, but the Joint Committee on Reorganization concluded: "The Smithsonian Institution is one of the chief educational establishments under the Government, and the suggestion that it should be incorporated in the department of education and relief seems at first blush, to be entirely logical. But the institution is effectively a corporation established under the terms of a private bequest. It is only quasi-public in character. Its growth and its splendid success have been due not less to private benefactions than to public support; and there is every reason not to endanger its development by altering its relationship to the Government, or by superseding the arrangements under which it has so greatly prospered."

Senator William B. Allison, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in a memorandum to the Comptroller General, in 1933: "The Smithsonian Institution is not a Government institution. It is controlled by Regents appointed * * by the President of the Senate and * * by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and others * *; and the expenditures of the Smithsonian Institution are not even under the control of Congress * *. The Smithsonian fund is perpetually in the Treasury drawing a fixed rate of interest and the income is under the control of the Regents."

The Comptroller General, Joseph Campbell, in a letter to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution on September 1, 1961: "However, there is for consideration in this instance the unique nature of the Smithsonian Institution and of the property appropriated for its uses and purposes. * * From time to time the functions of the Smithsonian have been increased by laws placing under its control additional establishments or authorizing it to extend its activities into additional fields, but its organization and powers with respect to the subject matter of its creation have remained substantially unchanged. (See 20 U.S.C. 41-57).

Let me now outline the salient facts of Smithsonian operations. In the fiscal year 1970, the Institution was responsible for expenditure of the following funds:
Federal funds:
- Salaries and expenses: $29,965,000
- Special foreign currency program: 2,316,000
- National Zoological Park (transferred from D.C.): 2,802,000
- Construction, National Zoological Park: 600,000
- Restoration and renovation of buildings: 525,000
- Construction, Hirshhorn Museum: 3,316,000

Total Federal funds: 39,708,000

1 Estimate for 1971: House allowance, $35,737,000; Senate allowance, $35,816,000.

Non-Federal funds: $15,500,000 estimated.

(The expenditures are from income desired from investments, gifts, overhead on contracts and grants, restricted and unrestricted funds, and contracts and grants for scientific research.)

Current employment:
- Federal (includes Zoo): 2,233
- Non-Federal (includes 301 employees of the Astrophysical Observatory): 933

Total: 3,166

The Federal employees are financed through Federal Appropriations and are under Civil Service. The non-Federal employees are financed by grants, contracts, gifts, overhead recoveries, investments, and other non-Federal sources, and are not under Civil Service.

The Smithsonian operates five museums:
- National Museum of History and Technology
- National Museum of Natural History
- National Air and Space Museum (including Arts and Industries Bldg.)
- Smithsonian Institution Building
- Anacostia Neighborhood Museum.

(National Historical Museum Park to be designated the Bicentennial Park—projected)

The Smithsonian administers the National Zoological Park.

It administers five art galleries:
- Freer Gallery of Art
- National Collection of Fine Arts
- National Portrait Gallery
- Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden
- Cooper-Hewitt Museum of Decorative Arts and Design (Renwick Gallery of Design and Decorative Arts—projected)

It administers seven research and scientific centers:
- Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory
- Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute
- Radiation Biology Laboratory
- Office of Ecology
- Office of Oceanography
- Center for the Study of Man
- Center for Short-Lived Phenomena

The Institution is responsible for a number of special programs and other activities, including the Academic Programs, American Revolution Bicentennial, the Environmental Science Program, the International Exchange Service, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, the Science Information Exchange, and associated programs.

The Smithsonian is responsible for the maintenance and operation of eight major exhibition buildings and nine support facilities in the Washington area:

The exhibition buildings are:
- National Museum of History and Technology

1 Total assets: $32,100,000.
National Museum of Natural History
Fine Arts and Portrait Galleries
Smithsonian Institution Building
National Air and Space Museum
Arts and Industries Building
Renwick Gallery
Freer Gallery of Art

The support facilities are:
- Silver Hill Facility
- Oceanographic Sorting Center
- 24th Street Laboratory
- Lamont Street Storage
- Alexandria Storage Building
- Audubon Biology Building
- South Yard of the Smithsonian Institution Building
- Pension Building (in part)
- Chesapeake Bay Center

The Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory is based in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and has a world-wide data collecting network. The Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute is located in Gatun Lake, Barro Colorado Island, Panama Canal Zone.

BROADENING OF PROGRAMS

The Congress in recent years has substantially broadened the diversified programs of the Institution. Over twenty programs have been added by legislation, including such major museums and functions as the Museum of History and Technology, the National Portrait Gallery, the Foreign Currency Program, the National Air and Space Museum, and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. However, the growth of the Smithsonian’s role as trustee “for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men” and its needs for additional leadership positions is most dramatically presented in the following brief statistics. The Smithsonian personnel has increased from five hundred employees in 1955 to over two thousand employees in 1970 and our operating appropriations from $3 million to $30 million, or almost tenfold.

The Congress has recognized that visitors to the Smithsonian have increased from eight million in 1957 to an estimated nineteen million in 1970. Through the generosity and, may I say, the recognition accorded by the Congress to the Smithsonian, our buildings for the preservation of the national collections and for their exhibition have more than doubled, rising from 1.4 million square feet to 3.3 million square feet.

MANAGEMENT

The management of the Smithsonian is entrusted by Congress to the Board of Regents and its Secretary. The Board of Regents consists of the Chief Justice, the Vice President, three Senators who are appointed by the President of the Senate, three Representatives who are appointed by the Speaker, and six eminent private citizens appointed by joint resolution of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. In their service as Regents, the members do not act as officers of the United States. As provided in the basic legislation of 1846, the Secretary of the Smithsonian is appointed by the Regents, is directly responsible to them in managing the Smithsonian, and is compensated from the trust endowment of the Smithsonian, That Act also provides that the Secretary may, with the consent of the Board of Regents, employ assistants. The heads of Bureaus and the principal staff members are therefore appointed by the Secretary with the consent of the Regents, all on a non-partisan basis.

In addition to this basic authority, the Congress by the Act of November 2, 1966, expressly authorized two positions at Executive Level IV as Assistant Secretaries for Science and for History and Art.

The position of Assistant Secretary is needed to assist the Secretary in the executive direction of the Institution. He is responsible to the Secretary for the administration of a number of bureaus. He makes responsible recommendations to the Secretary regarding finances, legislation, appraisal of existing programs, formulation of new programs, and recruitment for top positions. He counsels the Secretary and Bureau Heads and coordinates the effort of the various bureaus.
Discretion of Bureau Heads

The major bureaus financed by Federal appropriations were founded pursuant to statutes. Their respective functions are expressed in the authorizing acts. The Bureau Heads are in active, day-to-day charge of their respective programs. A substantial amount of independence in administering their programs is vested in them. They are responsible for preparing budgets and executing financial programs, preparing exhibitions, undertaking research, publications, acquisitions, conservation, study, and lectures; operating libraries and providing information to scholars and the public; and personnel administration.

Boards and Commissions

A number of advisory boards and commissions aid the Secretary and the bureau heads in the administration of their programs. These professional advisors are needed because of the diversified programs of the Institution, and include the Smithsonian Council; National Collection of Fine Arts Commission; National Gallery of Art Board of Trustees; John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts Board of Trustees; National Portrait Gallery Commission; Cooper-Hewitt Museum of Decorative Arts and Design Advisory Board; National Air and Space Museum Advisory Board; National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board; Smithsonian Foreign Currency Program Advisory Councils; Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars Board of Trustees; Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum Board of Trustees.

In addition to members of these groups, primary contributions in all Smithsonian disciplines are made by the Institution’s Senior Scientists and Research Associates. The original Smithsonian endowment of $500,000 has now grown to over $30,000,000 and remains the basic resource to which, in recent years, Congress has added substantial annual appropriations and programs. Although the Smithsonian fully respects the budgetary and legislative procedures established by the Executive Branch, this does not change its essential nature as a separate corporate trustee with a direct mandate from the Congress.

Highlights of Programs

History and Art

The multidisciplinary nature of the Smithsonian’s complex and diverse programs is reflected in the History and Art area where the efforts of our scholars encompass eight teaching museums.

The Freer Gallery of Art, with a library of 30,000 volumes and a laboratory which conducts research on materials and methods of ancient craftsmen, functions as an internationally known research center for the civilizations of Asia. The Cooper-Hewitt Museum of Design is one of the country’s major assemblages of decorative art objects, representing world cultures spanning 4,000 years. Close to 100,000 objects and a library of 13,000 volumes provide for in depth study of industrial design, art history, cultural history, and decorative techniques. The Smithsonian is developing the Renwick Gallery of Art as a showcase of American crafts and design. Together with the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, the National Collection of Fine Arts, the National Portrait Gallery, the Air and Space Museum and the Museum of History and Technology, these museums comprise the History and Art program area.

The scholars in the varied disciplines of the History and Art program area have produced valuable information on the development of the Nation and our national heritage. The Smithsonian Institution has established a position of Director of American Studies to provide leadership in integrating and directing this information into a comprehensive program of relating and explaining the development of our Nation to its people. Drawing upon these unparalleled resources, the Director of American studies is expected to organize teaching and research programs which will provide an understanding of the plurality of American origin and explain America to Americans.

Science

The Astrophysical Observatory opened a new window on the universe in December 1968. Celescope, an orbital television-telescope astronomical observatory, enables man for the first time to make detailed observations of celestial objects and
ultraviolet light usually blocked from earth-bound astronomers by the earth's own atmosphere. This satellite will collect more ultraviolet data in three hours than scientists have so far collected in fifteen years of rocket flights. Scientists at the Observatory annually publish over 200 papers, articles, tables, and books covering a wide range of subjects in astrophysics.

The Radiation Biology Laboratory has been devoted to the study of the response of living organisms to various qualities and intensities of radiant energy and to the determination of the influence of various factors in the environment—light, temperature, humidity, and atmospheric content. The Laboratory's program of solar energy measurement and biological response correlation fills a significant gap in an understanding of the interacting factors that man must control and to which he must adjust in order to maintain a habitable environment.

The Center for Short-Lived Phenomena was established in 1968. This Center serves as a clearinghouse for the timely receipt and dissemination of information concerning rare natural events which might otherwise go unobserved or uninvestigated, such as remote volcanic eruptions and earthquakes, the birth of new islands, the fall of meteorites and large fireballs, and sudden changes in biological and ecological systems.

Equally significant work has been accomplished in oceanography and limnology, anthropology, and entomology, mineral sciences, paleobiology, and ecology.

The Museum of Natural History, the largest of the bureaus of the Institution, is an international center for the study of sciences and maintains the largest reference collections in the Nation of anthropological, biological, and geological materials. Over 450 publications were produced in fiscal year 1968 by scholars of this great museum.

The extensive science program, especially the disciplines of anthropology, environmental sciences, and sociology, provides the bases from which to draw the fundamental information necessary for a full understanding of man. In 1968, the Smithsonian Institution established a Center for the Study of Man to bring into focus and to establish the interdisciplinary bridges that are essential to improving our understanding of man and his relationships with all aspects of his total social, cultural and physical environment. Information concerning the evolution and status of subcultures in America or the customs of various immigrant groups is not only of scientific value, but is necessary for effective planning and implementation of many social and economic programs.

Public Service

The Public Service role of the Smithsonian was first enunciated by Secretary Joseph Henry, thus:

"... the worth and importance of the Institution are not to be estimated by what it accumulates within the walls of its buildings, but by what it sends forth to the world."

This is perhaps the greatest challenge facing the Smithsonian, requiring that the great reservoirs of information gained from the 62,000,000 objects and the contributions of individual scholars be brought to the attention of the public as intriguing and enjoyable learning experiences.

The Smithsonian is a point of liaison with many international organizations such as the Institute for International Education, the Organization of American States, the South East Asia Development Advisory Group, the American Subcommittee of the International Committee on Monuments, and UNESCO.

The international aspects of the Smithsonian Institution's Public Service role are exemplified by the Institution's responsibility under the foreign currency program. Last year, for example, more than $2,000,000 was made available through this program for research in biological, archeological, and anthropological studies. During the past three years, the Smithsonian cooperated with more than forty American institutions of higher learning in providing over 100 research grants for studies in Burma, Ceylon, Egypt, Guinea, India, Pakistan, Israel, Poland, Tunisia, Yugoslavia, and Morocco.

Another important international program is the Smithsonian's exchange service. The Institution is the designated agency through which all official United States publications are exchanged with foreign countries. The daily issues of the Federal Register and the Congressional Record are sent to 136 foreign libraries in exchange for their parliamentary journals.

The Institution prepares film reports and cooperates with international radio and television networks in bringing to the public such documentaries as "Man, Beast, and the Land" and the wonderful children's story of "The Enormous Egg."
Citizens throughout the Nation are able to join the Smithsonian in an Associate status and thus become partners in the Institution's quest to reach the public in a new and personal way. Most gratifying and heartening is the dramatic growth of the Smithsonian Associates whose members have increased from 1,500 to 15,000 in a two-year period. The Associates make available seminars and lectures in the arts, science, and humanities.

The annual Smithsonian Folklife Festival on the Mall, which interprets and preserves American folk arts and crafts, was attended by over 500,000 people last year.

The effectiveness of the Smithsonian's Public Service role was never more evident than when a former movie theater in the southeast corner of Washington, D.C., reopened its doors as the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum in 1968. This event was the result of an idea to bring the concept of a museum to the people, and with their involvement, to develop a museum as a means through which learning and education might be possible.

Libraries

The success of the Smithsonian Institution in attracting and holding researchers of quality depends to a great extent upon the availability of essential resources to support their work. Principal among these resources are libraries and information services. The Smithsonian's Libraries provide comprehensive information for research support in biological and physical sciences, engineering, industry, manufacturing, transportation, archeology, ethnology, history and art. The Institution maintains more than 750,000 books, journals, and catalogs and retains 1,000,000 books and journals on deposit at the Library of Congress.

The General Counsel

The General Counsel participates with the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries in assisting the Secretary in the formulation of all major policies and programs of the Institution. In the implementation of policy, he has final authority for the wide variety of legal matters arising out of the Institution's activities in both its public and private capacities. This involves responsibility for the preparation of legislation and testimony: representation of the Smithsonian in court proceedings; and negotiation of major agreements for mergers with other institutions, for the acquisition or lease of multimillion dollar properties, and for cooperative programs with public and private agencies at home and abroad.

Information Systems

The Smithsonian Institution's Information Systems program is highly dynamic and research oriented. It serves as an interpreter of information problems within the Institution and provides automatic data processing and systems engineering expertise to the museum community. In addition to its own equipment which includes a computer with 131,000 positions of memory, magnetic disc drives with 45 million positions for directly accessible data storage, and a high speed printer capable of 100,000 characters per minute, the Institution has telecommunications access to other computers in Cambridge, Massachusetts, Washington, D.C. and the National Bureau of Standards in Gaithersburg, Md. The program is generally concerned with information retrieval, mathematical computation, and program and management support.

Exhibits

The Smithsonian Exhibits program is responsible for the important tasks of presenting the vast number of objects held in the National Collections and of translating the knowledge of our scientists and scholars in a manner that both educates and intrigues the public.

Designing and constructing exhibits is a field that has been active for over 100 years. But creating an exhibit that truly involves the visitor—that causes him to think and allows him to learn, not simply to look—is a new challenge.

The Smithsonian Institution has met this challenge and has revolutionized many practices in the field of exhibits. To cite an example: working with scientists at the Bethesda Naval Hospital and at Walter Reed Hospital, our Exhibits staff has perfected the pioneering techniques of freeze drying and skeletal maceration. Formerly used for preserving plasma and bone tissues, these techniques now permit the exhibitions of birds and mammals in a more natural state than taxidermy methods permit.

The following pages relate to recent legislative enactments of the Congress concerning the Smithsonian Institution's programs and activities.
Appendix

RECENT LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS OF THE CONGRESS BROADENING THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION’S PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

The Museum of History and Technology was completed in 1964 to exhibit the Nation’s collections relating to American cultural, civil, and military history and the history of science and technology. The Museum maintains reference collections and interpretive exhibitions concerning all aspects of American life in times past. Its professional staff and other historians from all parts of the world perform research leading to the discovery and documentation of materials of historic significance.

In dedicating this Museum, the President stated:

“The gathering of knowledge is the supreme achievement of man.

“Four hundred years ago, Francis Bacon could immodestly declare: ‘I have taken all knowledge to be my province.’ Bacon would find this new Museum of History and Technology of the Smithsonian Institution to his taste, and to his aims.

“For I believe this new Museum will do that which causes us all to celebrate; it will excite a thirst for knowledge among all the people.”


The National Collection of Fine Arts, an original Bureau of the Smithsonian Institution, is dedicated to presenting American creative genius in the field of fine arts. It encourages and develops appreciation of American cultural achievement by programs of exhibitions, lectures, publications and research. The international stature of American art is enhanced by United States participation, organized by the National Collection of Fine Arts, in major international art exhibitions and through extensive circulation of American art abroad.

The Act approved on March 28, 1958, provided for the transfer of the original Patent Office Building to the Smithsonian and authorized the restoration and renovation of this historic building to house both the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery.

The Museum of Natural History is an international center for the natural sciences, maintaining the largest reference collection of anthropological, biological, and geological materials in the Nation. It continues a comprehensive program of original research on Man, plants, animals, rocks and minerals, and fossil organisms. The reference collections and the resident scientists provide an important focal point for cooperative research and educational activities among Federal agencies, universities and other scientific institutions. In recognition of its significant contributions to science and to the public, monumental additions to the existing museum buildings were completed in 1965 to provide 400,000 square feet of additional laboratory space for the expanding national collections.

The National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board is a Presidentially-appointed body established in the Smithsonian Institution under the provisions of Public Law 87-186, 87th Congress, approved August 30, 1961 to provide advice and assistance to the Regents of the Institution on matters concerned with the portrayal of the contributions which the Armed Forces of the United States have made to American society and culture.

The Advisory Board has recommended to the Board of Regents that the Smithsonian Institution’s facilities be expanded to include a National Armed Forces Museum Park and that the Institution seek to acquire lands in the Fort Foote area of Prince Georges County as a site for the museum park. The Board also has recommended that the Institution arrange with the Department of the Interior for joint use of certain facilities of Fort Washington, Maryland, as elements of the museum park.

On October 6, 1967, at the request of the Smithsonian Regents, Senator Clinton P. Anderson (for himself and Senator J. W. Fulbright), introduced Senate Bill S. 2510 which would authorize the Board of Regents of the Institution to acquire the necessary lands. Similarly, on January 25, 1968, Representative Michael J. Kirwan introduced House Bill H.R. 14853, seeking similar authority. Congressional action on legislation to authorize development of this museum is expected to be considered by the 91st Congress.
The National Portrait Gallery functions as a museum for the study, research, and exhibition of portraiture and statuary deploring men and women who have made significant contributions to the history, development and culture of the people of the United States. This gallery, the only such institution in the United States, is of national importance as a repository of historical and biographical iconography. By an Act approved on April 27, 1962, the gallery was established in the Smithsonian Institution.

In a related action, the Act approved on March 28, 1958, provided for the transfer of the original Patent Office Building to the Smithsonian Institution and authorized the restoration of the building to house the National Portrait Gallery. In October 1968 the National Portrait Gallery was formally opened by the President for the enlightenment of the public and the scholars of the nation.

In 1965 the Smithsonian Institution received authority from the Congress to make use of certain foreign currencies held by the United States abroad in excess to its needs. More than forty institutions of higher learning in America have benefited from grants in such excess currencies abroad; more than 100 research projects had been completed or are active; many books, monographs in scholarly and professional journals, and studies have enriched the cultural and scientific scene not only in America but in the world at large. In its fourth year, the Smithsonian Foreign Currency Program has become a major source of support for American universities, museums, and research institutes carrying out such work overseas.

On June 28, 1965, the President approved the transfer to the Smithsonian Institution for use as a museum and art gallery the building located at Pennsylvania Avenue and 17th Street, N.W. This building was originally designed as an art gallery for W. W. Corcoran by James Renwick, who also designed the Smithsonian Institution Building. It was occupied by the Corcoran from 1869 to 1897 and was acquired by the United States in 1961.

In a letter addressed to the Secretary, the President said:

“No more appropriate purpose for the building could be proposed than to exhibit, in the restored gallery, examples of the ingenuity of our people and to present exhibits from other nations, whose citizens are so proud of their arts.”

Restoration of the Renwick Gallery is well under way and is expected to be completed during 1969.

In accordance with the terms of a Joint Resolution approved August 13, 1965, the President as the presiding officer of the Smithsonian Institution issued a proclamation to announce the occasion of the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of James Smithson and to designate September 17 and 18, 1965, as special days to honor James Smithson and the accomplishments of the Institution which bears his name.

In his remarks at the Bicentennial Celebration, President Johnson said:

“Yet James Smithson’s life and legacy brought meaning to three ideas more powerful than anyone at that time ever dreamed.

“The first idea was that learning respects no geographic boundaries. The Institution bearing his name became the first agency in the United States to promote scientific and scholarly exchange with all nations in the world.

“The second idea was that partnership between Government and private enterprise can serve the greater good of both. The Smithsonian Institution started a new kind of venture in this country, chartered by act of Congress, maintained by both public funds and private contributions. It inspired a relationship which has grown and flowered in a thousand different ways.

“Finally, the Institution financed by Smithson breathed life in the idea that the growth and the spread of learning must be the first work of a nation that seeks to be free.

“We must move ahead on every front and every level of learning. We can support Secretary Ripley’s dream of creating a center here at the Smithsonian where great scholars from every nation will come and collaborate.”

The Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, located in the Panama Canal Zone, conducts and supports basic biological research, education, and conservation in the tropics. It performs these functions in several ways: by the scientific research of its own staff; through the maintenance of a natural biological research area of the Caribbean Islands; through operation of research facilities, including both terrestrial and marine laboratories, open to visiting scientists and students; by directing and supporting the education and training of students at
all levels from undergraduate to postdoctoral; and by providing technical and scientific information and counsel to other institutions, both private and governmental.

Public Law 89–280, approved on October 20, 1965, increased the amount of the authorization for annual appropriations, essential to the administration of the laboratory and other educational and research facilities.

By an Act approved on July 18, 1966, Public Law 89–503, the Attorney General was authorized to transfer to the Smithsonian Institution title to objects of art formerly in the custody of the Attorney General, from the Von der Heydt collection.

The National Air Museum was established by Public Law 79–722 on August 12, 1946, to memorialize the national development of aviation; collect and display aeronautical equipment of historical interest and significance; serve as a repository for scientific equipment and data pertaining to the development of aviation; and provide educational material for the historical study of aviation.

By Act of July 19, 1966, the original law was amended to add the field of space flight and space history to the province of this Museum and to change the name to the National Air and Space Museum. The Act also authorized the appropriation of funds for the construction of the Museum.

This Museum is the Nation's center for exhibition, education, and research in the history and principles of air and space flight and represents an unparalleled resource for research in aviation and aerospace history; in flight science and technology; in the contributions of flight to the economy and culture of the United States; and in the pioneering efforts of early aviators and astronauts. It is continuously acquiring, preserving, and documenting historically and technologically important objects and records resulting from air and space research, development, and exploration. Drawing upon its collections, the Museum produces exhibits and displays portraying the past, present and future of aeronautics and astronautics in America.

Funds have been appropriated for the preparation of plans and specifications for the Museum, for which a three-block site on the Mall has been reserved by Act of Congress.

The National Museum Act of 1966 recognized the cultural and educational importance of museum's to the Nation's progress and the need to preserve and interpret the Nation's heritage for the enrichment of public life in U.S. communities. It authorized the Smithsonian Institution to undertake cooperative studies of museum problems and opportunities, engage in cooperative training programs for career museum employees, prepare and distribute significant museum publications, research and contribute to development of museum techniques and cooperate with Federal agencies concerned with museums.

On November 2, 1966, the President approved Public Law 89–734 which provides for compensation at Executive Salary Act levels for four administrative positions of the Smithsonian Institution. This Act fixes the compensation of the positions of Assistant Secretary (Science) and Assistant Secretary (History and Art) at the rate for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule, and fixes the compensation of the positions of Director, U.S. National Museum, and Director, Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory at Level V. These positions are now classified at the levels of comparable positions in Federal agencies.

By an Act approved on November 6, 1966, the Smithsonian Institution was authorized to negotiate agreements granting concessions at the National Zoological Park to nonprofit scientific, educational or historical organizations. The net proceeds of such organizations gained from these concessions are to be used exclusively for research and educational work and to provide "for the advancement of science and instruction and recreation of the people" in keeping with the statutory charter of the National Zoological Park.

By the Act of October 4, 1961, the Board of Regents was authorized to undertake a capital improvement program at the National Zoological Park. The improvement program will modernize the exhibition facilities, eliminate automobile traffic through the Park, and provide facilities for a program of zoological research. The redevelopment plan is now in its seventh year.

The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden will be the permanent home of the collection of art donated to the Smithsonian Institution for the benefits of the people of the United States. This museum will be used for the exhibition, study, and preservation of a unique collection of art, including 7,000
paintings, drawings, and sculptures. The gift consists of American paintings from the latter part of the 19th century to the present and American and European sculpture of the 19th and 20th centuries.

By the Act approved on November 7, 1966, the Congress authorized the use of a prominent part of The Mall in Washington, between 7th Street and 9th Street, Independence Avenue and Madison Drive, as the permanent site for the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. The same Act authorized the construction of the museum and sculpture garden.

On accepting the Hirshhorn collection, the President said:

"Washington is a city of powerful institutions—the seat of government for the strongest Nation on earth, the place where democratic ideals are translated into reality. It must also be a place of beauty and learning. Its buildings and thoroughfares, its schools, concert halls, and museums should reflect a people whose commitment is to the best that is within them to dream.

"History will record that Joseph H. Hirshhorn has now joined the select company of James Smithson, Charles Freer, and Andrew Mellon, whose earlier contributions to the Smithsonian Institution have so enriched the cultural life of the Nation and its Capital City."

Funds were appropriated in the fiscal year 1968 for the preparation of plans and specifications for the Museum and Garden. Public Law 90–425 approved on July 26, 1968, provided an appropriation for the first phase of construction of the museum and also provided contract authorization to complete construction.

Josiah K. Lilly died in May, 1966, leaving a substantial estate. Included in the estate of Josiah K. Lilly was a unique and valuable numismatic collection of approximately 6,126 gold coins. This collection has been described as the greatest gold coin collection ever assembled by one person or ever likely to be assembled again. It contains superb examples of coinage of practically all nations from ancient to modern times. The collection includes the following principal categories of coins:

United States Colonial, Territorial and Confederate items, including examples of every gold coin minted by the United States with the exception of one $3.00 gold piece, of which only one exists. About 1200 individual items.

Central and South American coinage comprising about 1200 items.

Coinage with European origin from the age of Pericles in Greece through the Roman Empire; the British sovereigns, and examples of coinage of other European countries, comprising about 3500 items.

Chinese and oriental coinage consisting of about 300 items.

Following Mr. Lilly's death in May 1966, it was suggested that acquisition of the gold coins by the Smithsonian would be most appropriate in view of the national character of its complex of museums, its dedication to the history and scholarship of numismatics, and the millions of citizens who come to its educational and cultural exhibits each year. It was determined that the only feasible means of preserving this unique collection for the Nation was the enactment of legislation by the Congress to permit the Smithsonian to acquire the collection through a reduction of the estate's Federal estate tax liability in the amount of the fair market value of the collection.

Private Law 90–250 provides such a credit to the Lilly estate against its obligation for Federal estate tax and for delivery of the collection to the Smithsonian. The collection was received on June 13, 1968.

The addition of the Lilly collection to the Smithsonian's numismatic displays makes the national collection second to none in the world. The collection will be of the greatest interest and educational value to the millions of citizens who visit the Mall now and in he future. It will also be preserved as an invaluable and irreplaceable part of the scholarly resources which contain the clues to the unsolved mysteries in the history of man in society.

Enactment of legislation to establish a National Memorial to Woodrow Wilson represents the culmination of an effort which began when Congress, by a Joint Resolution in 1961, established a Commission to recommend a permanent memorial to Woodrow Wilson in the District of Columbia.

Since 1965, President Johnson has supported the efforts of the Smithsonian Institution and of other interested scholarly organizations, universities, and public agencies to establish in the Nation's Capital an International Center for Scholars. At the Smithsonian Bicentennial celebration in September of 1965, the President stated: "We must move ahead on every front and every level of learning. We can support Secretary Ripley's dream of creating a center here at the Smithsonian where great scholars from every nation will come and collaborate."
Encouraged by this support, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution joined with the Secretary of State, the president of Princeton University, and a number of others in testifying before the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission and urging that such a Center should be the Nation's memorial to Woodrow Wilson.

In 1968, at the request of the President, the Smithsonian Institution submitted legislation to establish within the Smithsonian Institution the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars as a living national memorial to the 28th President of the United States. It provides for the appointment of scholars from the United States and abroad, for fellowships to such scholars, for the operation of the Center, and for the preparation of plans for the development of necessary buildings and other facilities. The legislation authorizes the establishment and administration of the Center as suitable memorial to the spirit of Woodrow Wilson, symbolizing and strengthening the fruitful relations between the world of learning and the world of public affairs. The authorizing legislating. Public Law 90–637 was approved on October 24, 1968.

The Act of July 4, 1966, which established the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, included among the ex officio members of the Commission, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. Poised on the middle of the Mall, the Smithsonian has great opportunities to develop programs pointing towards the bicentennial in 1976. We also have invaluable assets for this celebration in our departments of history, in our collections of historic objects, and in our traditional concerns with improving the Nation's cultural and social life. We must do all we can to utilize these assets for the benefit of all but especially for our young people in these troubled times.

Mr. Bradley. The effective administration and management are necessary, axiomatically, to provide the foundation for the Smithsonian Institution to get on with its program of education, exhibition, and research. The diversity of these programs, the importance of the national collections, and the unrivaled complex of museums and art galleries to millions of our visitors, and the dedication of the institution to works of scholarship—all demand that its administrative management be equally responsive and progressive.

We find that the administrative and supporting services including the libraries and publications, and automatic data processing, should be carefully directed in order to facilitate accomplishment of the main purposes, the programmatic purposes.

So we have designed a system wherein only a minimum of administrative action is required of the professionals, the scholars and the scientists, and others.

We have a saying that a scientist is not required to resign from science in order to head a scientific organization in the Smithsonian.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to outline rather quickly the nature of the Smithsonian in other terms. The Smithsonian was established as a charitable, nonprofit corporation to carry out the trust responsibilities of the United States, but independent of the Government itself.

It receives the support and assistance of each branch of the Government without becoming a part thereof.

The acceptance by the Institution of increasing amounts of directly appropriated funds has affected its administrative procedures but has not changed the basic independent authority of the Board of Regents.

We have here a number of quotes.

Chief Justice Taft at the Conference on the Future of the Smithsonian back in 1927 said:

I must make it clear, gentlemen, that the Smithsonian is not and has never been considered a government bureau. It is a private institution under the guardianship of the government.
Chief Justice Stone, in 1943—referring to the Civil Service—said:

I am of the opinion that to make the retirement coverage mandatory might jeopardize the private status of the Smithsonian and the National Gallery of Art, and might have the effect of invalidating the trust which are administered for the benefit of those institutions.

Those trusts contemplate that the private character of the Smithsonian and the National Gallery shall continue and that certain of their employees shall remain private employees.

To place those employees mandatorily under the Retirement Act might be construed as amounting to a change in their legal status and, to that extent, an invalidation of the trust provisions.

May I just refer to the others?

Chief Justice Vinson said somewhat along the same lines.

President Harding, in 1923, suggested the inclusion of the Smithsonian in a new Department of Education and Welfare, but the Joint Committee on Reorganization concluded that:

The Smithsonian Institution is one of the chief educational establishments under the Government, and the suggestion that it should be incorporated in the Department of Education and relief seems at first blush to be entirely logical.

But the Institution is effectively a corporation established under the terms of a private bequest. It is only quasi public in character. Its growth and its splendid success have been due not less to private benefactions than to public support; and there is every reason not to endanger its development by altering its relationship to the Government or by superseding the arrangements under which it has so greatly prospered.

And others, including Senator Allison and the Comptroller General, Joseph Campbell, have spoken in a similar vein.

(The excerpt follows:)

**Excerpt From Memorandum Concerning Independent Status of SI**

The Smithsonian was, and is, explicitly established as a charitable nonprofit corporation to carry out the trust responsibilities of the United States independent of the Government itself. It receives the support and assistance of each of the branches of the Government without becoming a part thereof. The acceptance by the Institution in recent years of increasing amounts of directly appropriated funds has affected its administrative procedures but has not changed the basic independent authority of the Board of Regents. This independence has been consistently reasserted on numerous occasions, of which the following are characteristic:

Chief Justice Taft, at the Conference on the Future of the Smithsonian Institution, in 1927: "I must make clear, gentlemen, that the Smithsonian Institution is not, and has never been considered a government bureau. It is a private Institution under the guardianship of the Government. That point was clearly made in the first report of the House Judiciary Committee in 1836, when it said: "The sum given to the United States by Mr. Smithson's will is no wise and never can become part of their revenue. They cannot claim or take it for their own benefit. They can only take it as trustees to apply to the charitable purpose for which it was intended by the donor."

Representative James A. Garfield, a Smithsonian Regent, during a debate in 1878: "In regard to the position of Regent of the Smithsonian Institution, * * * that Institution is a private corporation and the House is invited, merely as a matter of courtesy, to help that private corporation, organized for a public purpose, by assigning men to serve as its trustees or Regents. But a Regent of the Smithsonian Institution does not become a United States officer at all."

Chief Justice Stone, in a letter to the Civil Service Commission, in 1943: "I am of the opinion that to make the retirement coverage mandatory might jeopardize the private status of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Gallery of Art and might have the effect of invalidating the Trusts which are administered for the benefit of those institutions. Those Trusts contemplate that the private character of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Gallery of Art shall
continue and that certain of their employees shall remain private employees. To
place those employees mandatorily under the Retirement Act might be con-
strained as amounting to a change in their legal status and to that extent an
invalidation of the Trust provisions."

Chief Justice Vinson, in reply to the Civil Service Commission's assertion of
jurisdiction over Smithsonian private roll employees (including the Secretary),
in 1958:

"Absolute control over the appointment, compensation, direction and removal
of the trust fund employees of the Smithsonian Institution is vested in the
Regents of the Institution by the [following] provisions of its charter: . . . ."

In 1923, President Harding suggested the inclusion of the Smithsonian in a new
Department of Education and Welfare, but the Joint Committee on Reorganiza-
tion concluded: "The Smithsonian Institution is one of the chief educational
establishments under the Government, and the suggestion that it should be in-
corporated in the department of education and relief seems at first blush, to be
to be entirely logical. But the institution is effectively a corporation established under
the terms of a private bequest. It is only quasi-public in character. Its growth
and its splendid success have been due not less to private benefactions than to
public support; and there is every reason not to endanger its development by
altering its relationship to the Government, or by superseding the arrangements
under which it has so greatly prospered."

Senator William B. Allison, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropria-
tions, in a memorandum to the Comptroller General, in 1933: "The Smithsonian
Institution is not a Government institution. It is controlled by Regents ap-
pointed * * * by the President of the Senate and * * * by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and others * * *; and the expenditures of the Smith-
sonian Institution are not even under the control of Congress * * *. The Smith-
sonian fund is perpetually in the Treasury drawing a fixed rate of interest and
the income is under the control of the Regents."

The Comptroller General, Joseph Campbell, in a letter to the Secretary of the
Smithsonian Institution on September 1, 1961: "However, there is for con-
sideration in this instance the unique nature of the Smithsonian Institution
and of the property appropriated for its uses and purposes. * * * From time to
time the functions of the Smithsonian have been increased by laws placing under
its control additional establishments or authorizing it to extend its activities
into additional fields, but its organization and powers with respect to the subject
matter of its creation have remained substantially unchanged. (See 20 U.S.C.
41-57). * * * By the act of June 28, 1955, 69 Stat. 189, the Congress authorized
the construction of 'a suitable building for a Museum of History and Tech-
nology * * * for the use of the Smithsonian Institution,' at a cost not to exceed
$36,000,000. While the cost of this building is covered entirely by appropriations
from the general treasury, we find nothing in the act to indicate any intention
that the building when complete shall not be as much the property of the
Institution, and subject to its control to the same extent, as the buildings
originally constructed from funds of the Smithsonian trust. In effect, the
building is appropriated to the Institution and dedicated to the trust purposes,
without qualification or restriction. Cf. 20 Comp. Gen. 581; 16 Comp. Gen. 887.
In the absence of any limitations in the authorizing act upon the powers and
authority of the Regents with respect to the completed building, we conclude that
the Regents have plenary authority to enter into whatever leases or concession
agreements they may deem proper for the accommodation of the public for
whose benefit the Museum is provided, and are not in that respect subject to any
laws requiring advertising of Government contracts."

Now as to the salient facts, Mr. Chairman, of Smithsonian operations,
looking at the fiscal year 1970, we had Federal funds in round figures of $39,700,000. The estimate for the year coming up, and we
just had our conference allowance today, is between $35.7 million and
$35.8 million for the salaries and expenses part of the $39 million.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would gather that this represents approximately
a $4 million cut in your request?

Mr. BRADLEY. I think that is about right.

Mr. THOMPSON. $39.7 million. The conferees have finished their
work, have they not?
Mr. Bradley. They finished today, yes. We didn’t get the report yet. We get it tomorrow. I was trying to point out that the $35.7 million compares to the first line, the $29.9 million, which is Salaries and Expenses only.

The reason that went up in very substantial part was the assumption by the Smithsonian, with the approval of Congress, of the operating expenses of the National Zoological Park which, in itself, is $3 million. Heretofore this had been carried in the budget of the District of Columbia government.

Mr. Thompson. For those persons receiving salaries under the Federal funds, are they part of the Civil Service Retirement Act?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. Are they under the act?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. What provision do you have for retirement benefits for the private employees?

Mr. Bradley. Under the Teachers and Insurance Annuity Association, known as TIAA in the trade and nationwide among the university groups, we have as nearly parallel a retirement system as man can devise so that the private roll man is treated the same as the Federal man.

Mr. Thompson. With approximately the same benefits for years of service?

Mr. Bradley. Exactly.

Mr. Thompson. The high 3 years would it now be?

Mr. Bradley. It is certainly at least the high three. I think it is high three, yes.

Mr. Thompson And 20 years of service?

Mr. Bradley. If one decides to retire under TIAA and really means it, and is not just retiring to take another job, he can retire with 20 years of service, yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

**Memorandum**

_February 20, 1970._

To ________________

In carrying out our established policy of maintaining personnel benefit plans for our private roll employees comparable to those available to our Civil Service employees, we have recently conducted a study of the retirement plans. This study indicated that changes in the Civil Service plan effected over the past few years have caused the retirement annuities to exceed those afforded by the TIAA retirement plan.

To remedy this disparity, we are making two changes in the TIAA plan. The total annual contribution rates are being raised, effective March 1, 1970, from 10% of the Social Security wage base of $7,800 and 15% of regular salary in excess thereof, to 12% and 17% respectively. The second change is to hold the 12% contribution at a fixed level of regular salary up to $7,800, with no increase above this $7,800 figure should the Social Security wage base be raised in the future. The employee cost of the combined TIAA-Social Security plans will remain at 7% of regular salary, the same as the present cost of the Civil Service Retirement plan. The 2% increase in contribution rates will be borne by the Smithsonian Institution.

These changes will bring your TIAA retirement annuities up to a comparable level with those afforded by the Civil Service Retirement plan for equal service at equal salary rates.

S. Dillon Ripley,  
Secretary.
TIAA and CREF are your annuity companies. You, as a policyholder, participate in the selection of four members of the Board of Trustees of each company in which you own an annuity. Both companies benefit greatly from the services of college professors and administrators who bring to the Boards the points of view of the policyholders and the colleges.

TIAA is a nonprofit, legal reserve life insurance and annuity company incorporated in the State of New York. Founded in 1918 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, TIAA provides annuities and life insurance for the college world at low costs.

Today there are more than 200,000 participants, most of whom are employed by the 1,500 educational institutions that have TIAA retirement or insurance plans.

CREF is a separate nonprofit corporation, companion to TIAA, established in 1952 by a Special Act of the New York State Legislature to provide a new and unique type of annuity for educators.

Policyholders can invest the full annuity premium with TIAA or they can allocate not less than 25% nor more than 75% of each premium to either TIAA or CREF, with the balance to the other company. Any allocations, of course, are subject to the retirement plan provisions of each participating institution.

TIAA and CREF employ no agents and pay no commissions. A modest charge covers operating expenses. Eligibility is limited to employees of colleges, universities, private schools and certain other nonprofit research or educational organizations.

This booklet is designed primarily for those participating in TIAA or TIAA—CREF annuities under a retirement plan at an institution, but it will also be of interest to educators who buy these annuities on their own.

The statements apply to all annuities issued after June 30, 1941. For older annuities, information may be obtained from your employing institution or from TIAA.

©Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association 1966.

AN INCOME YOU CAN'T OUTLIVE!

An annuity is a truly remarkable device—a pooling of resources by many people in order that each may be protected against the financial risk of "living too long." Without annuities, retired persons might try to live on only the interest earned by their life's savings, keeping the principal intact; or they would draw on both principal and interest, apprehensive that they might live too long—using up all the principal.

An annuity company, working with thousands of annuitants, can spread both principal and interest over the lifetimes of all retired persons no matter how long they live, assuring them a much larger income than they could receive from interest earnings alone.

The mortality tables tell us that out of each group of, say, 100,000 people of the same age, definite percentages are expected to die each year, year after year. The company doesn't know which individuals will live through each year, but it does know about how many will live. The company can therefore rely on the "law of averages" in guaranteeing a lifetime income for each annuitant.

Your annuity is a contractual agreement between you and the annuity company. In return for the premiums you and your employer pay during your working years the company promises to pay you a lifetime income during your retirement.

TIAA

Premiums to your TIAA annuity purchase a definite amount of future retirement income for you. To make sure you will receive this guaranteed income, TIAA invests your premiums almost exclusively in fixed-dollar obligations—a broadly diversified group of bonds and mortgages.

Your TIAA annuity money accumulates at compound interest during your working years. When you retire, TIAA sends you a check each month as long as you live. The amount remains the same from year to year except for dividends as declared. Working with thousands of annuity owners, your Association promises to pay each one a fixed-dollar income consisting of both principal and interest, no matter how long he lives.
This new approach to retirement income is called a variable annuity, or unit annuity. Together with TIAA, it is designed to provide annuitants an opportunity for reasonably stable purchasing power during retirement. Your share in CREF allows you to participate in the development of a cross-section of the national economy during your working years and after you retire.

During your working years premiums to CREF buy accumulation units (like shares of ownership) in a broadly diversified common stock fund. The earnings on your portion of the common stock fund are reinvested for you, buying additional units for your account.

During your retirement CREF pays you, each month for life, the current value of a certain number of annuity units—your retirement shares in the Fund. The number of annuity units to be “paid out” to you each month is determined actuarially when you retire and remains the same as long as you live. The dollar amount you receive changes, however, from year to year, reflecting primarily changes in the market prices and dividends of the common stocks owned by the Fund. Thus CREF links retirement income to the investment experience of common stocks so that you can receive an income based on common stock values and dividend earnings without any danger of outliving your income.

TIAA AND CREF

The TIAA-CREF system permits a portion of annuity premiums to be invested, through CREF, in common stocks; the balance is invested, through TIAA, in fixed-dollar obligations. Not less than 25% nor more than 75% of each premium may be allocated to either TIAA or CREF, with the balance allocated to the other company, subject, of course, to the retirement plan provisions of each participating institution. The CREF retirement income rises and falls with the investment experience of CREF’s common stocks. Historically, common stock prices have risen during most periods of inflation. The TIAA retirement income does not vary except for dividends, thereby providing a solid base of income during retirement, and moderating the effect of a rise or drop in the CREF income. Thus the purpose of the TIAA-CREF system is to provide a combined income that is more responsive to changes in the cost of living than a fixed-dollar annuity alone and less volatile than a variable annuity alone.

The “normal retirement age” is usually stated in the college retirement plan and that is the age when payments usually begin. However, as far as your annuity contract is concerned, you may begin to receive your annuity income at retirement or at any time after premium payments stop. This may be either earlier or later than the date you originally chose, but not later than age 71. It need not be the date on which you retire from employment.

Of course, the later you begin to receive payments, the larger they will be: in TIAA, more dollars each month for life; in CREF, more annuity units each month for life.

If you participate in CREF you may, at or after age 60, use the value of your CREF accumulation to purchase a TIAA annuity. This may be done at one time or year by year until you begin to receive your annuity payments. You would make this change only if you wanted a fixed-dollar income from your annuity, instead of participating in the common stock fund through the CREF variable annuity during your retirement.

Federal Income Tax.—Under present law, the part of your annuity income that represents a return of your own contributions will not be taxed as you receive it. The balance of your annuity income—the part attributable to employer contributions and to investment earnings—will be subject to federal income tax as you receive it.

While you are paying periodic annuity premiums (monthly, quarterly, etc.), you may make extra payments to TIAA-CREF annuities at any time.

The easiest way to increase your premium payments, at most colleges, is to ask the college business office to have the additional amount taken from your salary and sent in with the regular premiums. You may allocate extra payments between TIAA and CREF in any ratio, provided the amount being allocated to each company—retirement plan premiums plus any extras—is not less than 25% nor more than 75% of the total being sent concurrently to both companies. The college does not match extra payments made beyond the contribution rates specified in its retirement plan.
You may also pay additional single premiums of $100 or more to your TIAA annuity or $200 or more if to a TIAA-CREF annuity. These additional premiums may be paid whenever you wish.

You take your TIAA and CREF annuities with you, if you leave your present employer, including all benefits purchased by your own and your employer’s contributions. Under other types of retirement plans, you would normally forfeit all benefits purchased by your employer’s contributions if you left before retirement or before a specified number of years of service.

Ownership of TIAA and CREF retirement and survivor benefits is fully vested in you. This full vesting allows teachers, research personnel and scientists to move freely among more than 1,500 educational institutions that have TIAA plans, all the while accumulating retirement benefits. Even if you move to a college having no TIAA plan or if you leave the educational world, you take your annuity with you and may continue premiums on your own, at the same or a different amount.

The annuities do not provide for loans or cash surrender. No future change of a retirement plan, differences of opinion with a college, or other such circumstances can deprive you of the retirement income that has already been set aside for you. In turn, your employing institution is assured that these funds will be used solely for their intended purpose—providing retirement or death benefits for you and your family.

Vesting and transferability of benefits are vitally important for your future security, and help in making higher education an attractive career. In considering any change of employment, one factor you should weigh carefully is the type of retirement system available.

You will continue to own your annuity, including the portion purchased by your employer’s contributions.

The sums already set aside for you in TIAA and CREF continue to participate in earnings even though no further premiums are paid.

If you subsequently wish to resume premiums to your annuity you may do so under current TIAA-CREF practice without paying omitted premiums.

During leaves of absence with pay some institutions continue premiums. If your institution does not, you may continue premiums on your own, increase or reduce them, or stop them entirely. After a leave you may re-enter the retirement plan without paying any premiums omitted.

The full current value of your annuity accumulation, including the portion bought by your employer, will be paid as income to the beneficiary you have named if you die before retirement.

TIAA and CREF will report to you each year, among other figures, the value of your annuity accumulation. Naturally, the accumulation will be small at first, but it will become an increasingly important part of your security program as you pay premiums over the years.

You may choose one of the following income options for payments of the annuity death benefit or you may leave the choice to be made by your beneficiary:

1. Income for her (or his) lifetime, payments ceasing when she dies.
2. Income for her lifetime, with a minimum number of payments guaranteed in any event. The period of guaranteed payments may be either 10 or 20 years, as selected.
3. Income for a fixed period of years.

A single sum will be paid if your beneficiary is a corporation, association or your estate.

Benefits After Retirement

Just before you retire you will choose a type of retirement income from the several options available. All of these options provide a lifetime income for you, and all but one provide income for your beneficiary in event of your early death. TIAA provides a fixed-dollar income, and CREF a variable dollar income, called a unit annuity.
These are the options available:

A *Single Life Annuity.*—Pays you an income as long as you live. This method provides a larger monthly income for you than the other options, with all payments ceasing at your death. If you have no dependents when you retire, you may want to select this method.

A *Survivor Annuity.*—Pays you a lifetime income, smaller than the Single Life Annuity, and if your wife (or husband) lives longer than you, she continues to receive an income for the rest of her life. The amount continuing to the survivor depends on which of these three options you choose:

*Two-thirds Benefit to Survivor With 10-Year Guarantee.* At the death of either you or your wife, the payments are reduced to $\frac{2}{3}$ the amount that would have been paid if both had lived, continuing to the survivor for life. If both annuitants die within the first 10 years of payments, the $\frac{2}{3}$ amount is continued to a named beneficiary for the balance of the 10-year period.

*Full Benefit to Survivor.*—The full income continues as long as either you or your wife is living.

*Half Benefit to Second Annuitant.*—The full income continues as long as you live, and if your wife survives you she receives for life one-half the income you would have received if you had lived. If she dies first, the full income continues to you for life.

For a man aged 65 whose wife is about 2 years younger, the $\frac{2}{3}$ to Survivor option pays about 13% less than the Single Life Annuity would pay the husband alone. The Full Benefit option pays about 21% less; the Half Benefit option 12% less.

*I 0 or 20 Years Certain and Life.*—Pays you an income as long as you live with installments guaranteed to continue during the first 10 or 20 years, as selected, whether you live or die. If you die during the guaranteed period, payments are continued to your beneficiary for the rest of the period. If you live beyond the period, payments go right on for the rest of your life. For a man aged 65 the 10 Years Certain and Life option pays about 5% less than the Single Life Annuity; the 20 Year Certain and Life option about 16% less.

*Instalment Refund* (available in TIAA but not in CREF).—Pays you an income as long as you live. If you die before having received total payments equal to the full accumulation you had when annuity payments began, the income will be continued to your beneficiary until the sum of all payments equals that accumulation amount. For a man aged 65 this option would pay about 12% less than the Single Life Annuity.

Individual guidance in the selection of an option is always available. A few months before you retire, TIAA will send you specific figures for all options, as well as helpful material discussing the factors to be weighed in making your choice.

**TO ESTIMATE ANNUITY INCOME**

Each year TIAA sends you a statement of annuity premiums paid during the year and of benefits purchased to date, and CREF sends a similar report. These reports include an illustration of the annuity income you would receive at retirement under certain assumptions as to future premiums, your retirement age, the income option selected, TIAA dividends, and CREF investment experience.

A TIAA–CREF annuity pays two kinds of retirement income: (1) A *fixed-dollar* income from TIAA, plus (2) A *variable* income from CREF, if you participate in CREF. The dollar amount of your CREF income will change once each year during retirement, reflecting primarily changes in the market values and dividend earnings of CREF’s common stock investments.

The amount of your retirement income will depend on the number of years you participate in the plan, the amount of premiums paid each year during your participation, your age at time of retirement, the experience of TIAA and CREF, the income option you select at retirement and other factors. Although it is not possible to predict the effect of each of these factors upon your retirement income, the remaining portion of this booklet should be helpful in calculating the benefits that would be produced under certain conditions.
CREF BENEFITS

Business activity has its ups and downs—the investor in common stocks must expect them—but in the long run an accumulating share in the growth and earnings of the major American industries seems a good way to assure a healthy retirement income, much as industrial growth helps assure the continuing economic well-being of the nation as a whole.

The investment experience of CREF’s common stocks presumably will differ materially from the experience of the TIAA fund, which is invested almost entirely in mortgages, bonds and other fixed-dollar investments. CREF’s experience may be more favorable than TIAA’s in some years and less favorable in others.

Because CREF benefit amounts depend on common stock performance and cannot be predicted, the tables and example presented in this booklet assume that the entire monthly premium is paid to TIAA.

TIAA BENEFITS

Each premium paid to TIAA purchases a guaranteed amount of future annuity income, which may be increased by dividends but cannot be decreased. The following abbreviated table illustrates the TIAA benefits produced for several ages of entry and retirement on the basis of current TIAA Minimum Rates, exclusive of dividends:

YEARY SINGLE LIFE ANNUITY PURCHASED BY PREMIUMS OF $10 MONTHLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age when monthly premiums begin</th>
<th>Male annuity each year—income starting at age</th>
<th>Female annuity each year—income starting at age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>$439</td>
<td>$549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIAA will be pleased to prepare estimates upon request at any time, based on your exact age, premium amount and anticipated retirement date.

The table and example on the next two pages illustrate TIAA benefits including an allowance for dividends, since additional benefits resulting from dividends credited over the years can be substantial. Dividend scales are of course subject to change from year to year and are therefore not guaranteed for the future.
ILLUSTRATIVE YEARLY RETIREMENT INCOME PURCHASED BY PREMIUMS OF $10 MONTHLY CONTINUED FROM AGE IN LEFT COLUMN TO RETIREMENT AT AGES SHOWN IN OTHER COLUMNS

SINGLE LIFE ANNUITY (PAYMENTS CEASE AT DEATH)

(This table illustrates TIAA benefits on the assumption that dividends based on the current dividend scale are added to the benefits provided by current TIAA minimum rates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age when 1st premium is paid:</th>
<th>Male: Income starting at age—</th>
<th>Female: Income starting at age—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,110</td>
<td>$1,403</td>
<td>$1,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,052</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>1,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>1,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>1,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>1,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>1,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

Calculations are based on age to last completed month.
This table assumes that all premiums are applied under the current TIAA Minimum Rates and includes current dividends, which are subject to change in the future.
Mr. Thompson. Is military time computed as in the military system?

Mr. Bradley. I would like to verify that, but since we set out to make the two just as nearly identical, I would say yes.

Note.—Military service is not credited toward retirement under TIAA.

Mr. Thompson. Well, that isn’t of any great consequence. In other words, they are as closely alike as a private fund can be made with relationship to the Civil Service Retirement System?

Mr. Bradley. Exactly, sir.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you.

Mr. Bradley. The non-Federal funds available in the fiscal year 1970 were about $15,500,000. These are derived from income from investments, gifts, overhead earned on contracts and grants primarily for scientific research, restricted and unrestricted funds, and then the contracts and grants themselves for scientific research as distinguished from the overhead.

Mr. Bingham. Could you give us a rough breakdown of what is income and what is gifts and so forth? How much comes from your endowments?

Mr. Bradley. The endowment fund, sir, of $33 million, has an income of approximately $1.4 million.

Mr. Bingham. So you have, then, some $13.5 million of income from gifts and other sources that you can’t be sure of from year to year?

Mr. Bradley. That is correct. Contracts and grants represent a very substantial part of that, primarily from NASA, the space agency, some from Atomic Energy, some from the National Science Foundation.

But these, as you say, are not guaranteed year after year.

Mr. Thompson. That is a relatively modest income from $33 million, is it not?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The matter has been very carefully weighed by investment counsellors and by the Board of Regents in order to balance income with growth and with the security that is inherent in investing these kind of funds for this kind of an institution.

Mr. Thompson. Who is your principal investment counselor? Do you have a financial institution?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, Scudder, Stevens & Clark are the investment counsellors in principal part.

Mr. Thompson. What financial institution do you use primarily? Riggs?

Mr. Bradley. Riggs National Bank.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (LIST SUBMITTED BY SI)

United States:
American Security & Trust Co., Washington, D.C.
Riggs National Bank, Washington, D.C.
Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N.Y.
Chemical Bank & Trust Co., New York, N.Y.
Michigan State Bank, Detroit, Mich.
Maryland National Bank of Pocomoke City.
Busey First National Bank, Urbana, Ill.
First National Bank of Hawaii.
Valley National Bank, Tucson, Ariz.
Havana National Bank, Havana, Ill.
Mr. Bradley. The current employment, the Federal roll, which includes several hundred at the Zoo, is 2,233; the non-Federal, which includes 301 employees up in Boston, in Cambridge, technically, at the Astrophysical Observatory, are 933, for a total of a little over 3,100.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

“SALARIES AND EXPENSES”

Report on the number of permanent positions by organization unit, 1970

Unit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States National Museum</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Museum of History and Technology</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Air and Space Museum</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Zoological Park</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anacostia Neighborhood Museum</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freer Gallery of Art</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Collection of Fine Arts</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Portrait Gallery</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Biology Laboratory</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Ecology</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Oceanography and Limnology</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for the Study of Man</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Short-Lived Phenomenon</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Academic Programs</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Revolution Bicentennial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences Program</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Activities</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Central Support Activities</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings Management Department</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand total                                                                 2,077

Employees on the Private Roll of the Institution as of June 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual grants, contracts, and gifts</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIE</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freer</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting services divisions</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum shops</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust funds</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper Hewitt Museum and Archives of American Art</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Foundation</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                                                                 985
The Federal employees are financed through Federal appropriations and are under Civil Service. The non-Federal employees are financed by these gifts and contracts and other non-Federal sources and are not under civil service.

As to the organization that we are responsible for, the Smithsonian has five museums including notably the Museum of History and Technology, and the Museum of Natural History, the Air and Space Museum, the Smithsonian Institution building, itself, and the Anacostia Park.

We do administer and have for many years, the National Zoological Park. We have five art galleries, including the Freer, the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery which live together in the old original Patent Office; the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden under construction, and the Cooper-Hewitt Museum, located in New York City.

We have seven research laboratories and scientific centers.

Mr. Thompson. Excuse me. The Renwick Gallery, is that under construction?

Mr. Bradley. Sir, that is under reconstruction. It was the original Corcoran Gallery of Art, built over a century ago.

Mr. Thompson. The red brick building?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, right on the corner across from the White House. It was built as an art gallery.

Mr. Thompson. Is that staffed at the moment?

Mr. Bradley. Practically not at all. We have a guardian over there, a watchman, and an occasional visit by a steam engineer to make sure in the wintertime that the building doesn't freeze up. But it is essentially a holding operation until we can get a little more money.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you.

Mr. Bradley. The research laboratories and scientific centers includes the Astrophysical Observatory in Cambridge, Mass., the Tropical Research Institute in the Canal Zone; the Radiation Biology Lab which is out near Rockville; the Office of Ecology and the Office of Oceanography; the Center for the Study of Man and the Center for Short-lived Phenomena.

We have a number of special programs including the academic programs, the American Revolution Bicentennial, Environmental Science program, International Exchange Service, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and the Science Information Exchange.

We are responsible for a physical plant that includes eight exhibition buildings and nine support facilities. They are listed here and I need not read them unless you want me to.

Mr. Thompson. No.

Mr. Bradley. As I mentioned, the Astrophysical—

Mr. Thompson. I might ask you about the Pension Building. Is that the building up around Eighth or Ninth Street with the frieze around it?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir; at 5th and G with the famous soldiers marching frieze around the entire building.

Mr. Thompson. What is that being used for now?
Mr. Bradley. A variety of purposes under GSA, not under the Smithsonian. We have 20 rooms in there. We are in there with our overflow. But it is essentially under GSA. Word has it that it is headed to be a courts building under the District of Columbia government.

Mr. Thompson. So that you really have very little part in it or responsibility for it at the moment?

Mr. Bradley. That is correct, at the moment.

Mr. Thompson. That building was characterized this morning as being in a state of disrepair or not of much value. It doesn’t appear to be that to me. But you have no ultimate plans for it for the Smithsonian Institution, I gather?

Mr. Bradley. We have not at the present time. At one time we did, but it looks like events have overtaken the destiny of that building. I think it will go to the courts.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you.

Mr. Bradley. In respect to broadening of the programs, Mr. Chairman, I want, if I may, please, to call to your attention that the Congress has been very generous and has added about 20 programs to the Smithsonian.

Rather than recite all of those, I would like to include as a part of this statement a rundown summary of the recent legislative enactments that have given us a broadened base.

Among other programs that have been added are the Museum of History and Technology, which is not only a building but also a program of scholarship and exhibition; and the same goes for the Portrait Gallery; and then the foreign currency program.

Mr. Thompson. What is the foreign currency program?

Mr. Bradley. Foreign Currency, sir, is the program primarily in archeology and biology but not entirely, including some in oceanography, in those countries abroad where there are landlocked currencies that must be spent in that country.

Mr. Thompson. Counterpart funds, do you mean?

Mr. Bradley. Counterpart funds, exactly.

Mr. Thompson. In how many nations is this program active?

Mr. Bradley. Nine.

Mr. Thompson. This is for overseas archeological work, environmental biology, astrophysical studies, museum programs for American institutes of higher learning; outgoing research based on progressively broader authority to employ the funds now consuming the entire appropriation.

Do you get the authority to use these counterpart funds from the Committee on Foreign Affairs or from the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. Bradley. Sir, that came through the Committee on Appropriations with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget who found that the President could approve the inclusion of certain programs in the request to Congress.

It has to go through the whole appropriation process and the Appropriation Committees have accepted that.

Mr. Thompson. How much of this foreign currency is used?

Mr. Bradley. The going amount for 1971 is $2.50 million.
### SMITHSONIAN FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM—GRANT EXPENDITURES BY COUNTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>$73,204</td>
<td>$255,955</td>
<td>$200,459</td>
<td>$657,235</td>
<td>$1,186,853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>$76,850</td>
<td>$222,485</td>
<td>$481,439</td>
<td>$368,310</td>
<td>$393,568</td>
<td>$1,542,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>$230,200</td>
<td>$856,315</td>
<td>$538,598</td>
<td>$402,803</td>
<td>$934,616</td>
<td>$2,962,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>$16,229</td>
<td>$25,128</td>
<td>$23,211</td>
<td>$23,400</td>
<td>$87,968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>$22,454</td>
<td>$47,071</td>
<td>$118,437</td>
<td>$11,658</td>
<td>$199,620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>$237,090</td>
<td>$121,393</td>
<td>$305,149</td>
<td>$620,362</td>
<td>$1,283,994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.A.R. (Egypt)</td>
<td>$330,850</td>
<td>$311,534</td>
<td>$307,830</td>
<td>$144,591</td>
<td>$1,474,001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>$2,030</td>
<td>$210,870</td>
<td>$353,425</td>
<td>$508,422</td>
<td>$1,074,747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicountry</td>
<td>$31,685</td>
<td>$75,301</td>
<td>$9,540</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$191,520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$637,900</td>
<td>$1,840,688</td>
<td>$2,114,164</td>
<td>$3,435,592</td>
<td>$10,095,733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Burma and Guinea are also listed on the Treasury Department’s list of excess foreign currency countries, but the program has made no grants for work in these 2 countries. Cey'on was removed from the Treasury's excess currency list in June 30, 1970; Israel is expected to be removed at the end of fiscal year 1972.

Mr. Thompson. I would assume that in some measure, at least where there is necessary foreign travel involved, that arrangements are made to purchase tickets with counterpart funds in the place of destination, as is done in other programs?

Mr. Bradley. That is correct; yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. To what committee do you account for such expenditures?

Mr. Bradley. In the House and in the Senate it is the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Committee, with the Subcommittee on the Smithsonian under Mrs. Hanson and Senator Bible, respectively.

Mr. Bingham. Mr. Chairman, I have a question on that point.

I thought that all expenditures of foreign currencies were under Mr. Rooney’s Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Bingham, I can only say that I believe we have had this now since about the time Mr. Ripley came. That would be 6 years. So far it has worked very well.

Mr. Bingham. So the same subcommittee deals with the dollar expenditures as foreign currency?

Mr. Bradley. That is right.

Mr. Thompson. This year you requested $4.5 million for fiscal 1971. Last year the Congress provided $2.3 million. Why so dramatic an increase in request?

Mr. Bradley. The increase in the request was a direct reflection of the interest and the applications from American universities and other learned societies that we were not able to fill. So we justified an additional amount to the Congress and had a modest increase of about $200,000.

Mr. Thompson. I rather approve of the concept. As you know, there are tremendous amounts of moneys available. In some cases the interest being received exceeds the expenditures.

Under a somewhat analogous program, some years ago I and several others caused the construction of a pediatrics hospital in Poland from the use of these funds. It is a very successful thing.

Please go on. I am sorry to keep interrupting you, but it will save time later.
Mr. Bradley. Thank you, sir.

As we have said, the management of the Smithsonian is entrusted by the Congress to a Board of Regents and to the Secretary. You know the makeup of the Board of Regents, so I wouldn't pause on that.

It is of interest that the Secretary of the Smithsonian is appointed by the regents and is directly responsible to them in managing the Institution, and is compensated traditionally from the trust endowment of the Smithsonian. The heads of bureaus and the principal staff members are appointed by the Secretary whether they are under civil service or not, with the consent of the regents, all on a nonpartisan basis.

Mr. Thompson. In that connection, they are appointed by the Secretary but do I assume that the Secretary uses Standard Federal Civil Service Form 57 applications for those who are going to be under the civil service system?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. Does the Secretary have to consult with the Civil Service Commission with respect to these appointees?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. If the Secretary wants to enlarge the staff by, let us say, five members in one area or another, to whom does he go to get authority to enlarge that staff?

Mr. Bradley. Essentially to the Appropriations Committee, if it is going to be, as I assume for the moment, from appropriated funds.

If it were not going to be from appropriated funds, he would have to go and see Mr. Wheeler, the Treasurer, and make sure that the private funds budget would accommodate such an increase in staff.

Mr. Thompson. In other words, really the increase or decrease in personnel is contingent upon available moneys rather than on a justification of the need for a particular type person, is that correct?

Mr. Bradley. I am trying for accuracy, of course, Mr. Chairman. May I just enlarge on that a little bit to explain that we have a single operating appropriation which excludes construction.

Legally, this is just one entity. This is that $29 million or $35 million we were looking at, called the Salaries and Expenses Appropriation. This is available for all 41 line items; these being identified activities such as many of these on the organizational chart.

Legally, the funds are available, but we have a committee on either side of the Congress that stipulates frequently in their reports how they think the money should be applied.

Mr. Thompson. Do they stipulate with respect to specific personnel?

Mr. Bradley. Frequently, yes, and to the number of personnel. That is to say, they are more interested in our respecting the total number of positions that they give us than the dollars that go with those positions.

If we have a pay raise act, as we have had almost every year for the last 6 or 7 years, and we can find any money to put into payroll out of "other objects," that is all right. But we must respect the number of total positions.

Then if there is any serious adjustment—and that depends on judgment—if there is any material divergence from the way they mark up the bill as they report it in their respective reports, then we must
go back and get what is called a reprogramming, which amounts to their agreeing to a change in the way we allot the $35 million or $30 million among these 41 different applicants.

Mr. Thompson. So, in effect, the two Appropriations Subcommittees are at once those responsible for granting you the funds which you must justify before them and, in a further sense, they have a responsibility for the personnel.

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. To use an old cliche, let us assume that the Air Museum were to get off the ground, although from the condition of some of those aircraft that might be a miracle if it were to happen, and whoever becomes the permanent director decides that he needs 14 more people.

What process do you go through to get those 14 people? Do you ask for a number of dollars or 14 specific positions?

Mr. Bradley. Both, but we would have to do it out of available funds. A supplemental appropriation would not be considered in our experience.

We would have to first decide, with Mr. Taylor or the other Director, and the Secretary would have to come to grips with the decision on whether he can afford to take those 14 jobs from somewhere else, because we have to live within the total of what we have, and then if he thinks we have a good case, we write up both the need for the addition and where we are going to get that money from. Then we submit it to the two committees.

Mr. Thompson. Let us assume that you need 14 and that the Secretary somehow or other finds the money available right now without having to go to the subcommittee to request additional funds.

Is he then free to appoint the 14 people without coming and asking for specific permission?

Mr. Bradley. I would say not, Mr. Chairman, because 14 is a very substantial number relatively to the size of the Air Museum. If this were 14 in buildings management we might arrive at another decision, where they have over 800 employees.

Mr. Thompson. Fourteen wouldn’t be as visible there as they would doubling the size of an existing organization.

Mr. Bradley. Exactly.

Mr. Thompson. But were the funds not available, would the Secretary then go to the committee and say, “I want to add 20 support personnel to buildings management and I don’t have the money”?

Would he ask for them by specific position or would he ask by the total amount of money he needed to pay them?

Mr. Bradley. He would ask for them as specifically as we could make it in order to be convincing. But if he didn’t have the money, he wouldn’t go there in the first place.

In my experience, we simply do not get supplemental appropriations through unless it is for something like a pay act.

Mr. Thompson. I am not assuming that they are necessarily supplemental, Mr. Bradley. I am assuming they are positions requested in the first instance rather than in the supplemental case.

Mr. Bradley. If they were positions that we could find the money for, then we should go with as much in the way of specifics as possible to justify them to the two committees.
Mr. Thompson. Maybe I am belaboring the point, but my impression is that were there money to be available without the need for an extra amount of money in the original appropriations bill on in the supplemental, then the Secretary would be free to hire those personnel, would he not?

Mr. Bradley. If it were in accordance with the way we last showed it to the Congress, substantially in accordance, yes. We used the example of 14 people in the Air Museum versus 14 in buildings management.

Mr. Thompson. That would indicate a considerable degree of latitude on the part of the Secretary.

Mr. Bradley. All right, sir. I was troubled by the words “considerable degree of latitude.” We have some degree of latitude.

Mr. Thompson. Some degree. Thank you.

Mr. Bradley. The discretion of the bureau heads is sometimes a matter of inquiry. The major bureaus that are financed by Federal appropriations are those that were founded pursuant to statute.

Their functions are described in the statutes. The bureau heads are appointed to be active, day-to-day managers of their respective programs. In my opinion—and this is subjective—a substantial amount of independence exists in the bureau heads to administer the programs they are charged with.

For example, they are responsible for preparing budgets and executing financial programs, preparing exhibitions, undertaking research and publications, acquiring acquisitions, conservation of collections, studies, lectures, operating libraries, and personnel administration.

Because of the diversity of the Smithsonian, we have a number of advisory boards and commissions. I referred to some of those last week, if you will remember. I don’t want to be repetitious. We have put up on the board the principal boards and commissions that are advisory to the Secretary.

You asked me, sir, if I would supplement that with any others. I would like to offer a secondary list additive to those for the record, if you care for them.

Mr. Thompson. Fine.

(The document to be furnished follows:)

BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Original appointment</th>
<th>Appointment expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Justice of the United States, Chancellor (ex officio)</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of the United States (ex officio)</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton P. Anderson</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. William Fulbright</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Scott</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank T. Bow</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George H. Mahon</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nicholas Brown</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William A. M. Burden</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford N. Greenwall</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryl P. Haskins</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James E. Webb</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas J. Watson, Jr.</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (PERMANENT COMMITTEE)

Chancellor, Board of Regents.

ADVISORY BOARD OF THE COOPER-HEWITT MUSEUM OF DESIGN

[Henry Francis duPont chairman; Mrs. Jacob M. Kaplan vice chairman]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Original appointment</th>
<th>Appointment expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William A. M. Burden, 530 5th Ave., New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Francis duPont, Winterthur, Del.</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jacob M. Kaplan, 53 East 80th St., New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William Katzenbach, care of American Federation of Arts, 41 East 65th St., New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Howard J. Sachs, 3 East 71st St., New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Calvin Stillman, 171 West 57th St., New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John B. Trevor, 15 East 90th St., New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles Van Ravenswaay, Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum, Winterthur, Del.</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 2-year term.

Ex Officio: S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560; and Miss Margaret Nelson, Secretary to the Board (non-voting), c/o Stroheim & Roman, 41 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10016.

CHESAPEAKE BAY CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

SCIENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Members:
Dr. Vagn Flyger, Natural Resources Institute, University of Maryland, College Park, Md. 20742.
Dr. Wolfgang Schleidt, Department of Zoology, University of Maryland, College Park, Md. 20742.
Dr. William J. L. Sladen, School of Hygiene & Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, 615 North Wolfe Street, Baltimore, Md., 21205.
Dr. George F. Watson, chairman, Department of Vertebrate Zoology, Smithsonian Institution, MNH 369, Washington, D.C. 20560.
Dr. Stanwyn G. Shetler, Department of Botany, Smithsonian Institution, MNH W401, Washington, D.C. 20560.
Dr. Howard H. Seliger, Department of Biology, Johns Hopkins University, 33rd & North Charles Streets, Baltimore, Md. 21205.
Dr. Francis S. L. Williamson, Director, Chesapeake Bay Center for Field Biology, Smithsonian Institution, Box 622, Route 4, Edgewater, Md. 21037.
Dr. Loren D. Jensen, Department of Geography & Environmental Science, Johns Hopkins University, 33rd and Charles Streets, Baltimore, Md. 21205.
Dr. Carleton Ray, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, 615 North Wolfe Street, Baltimore, Md. 21205.
Members are appointed for an indefinite period of time.
Meetings are called at the discretion of Dr. George F. Watson, Chairman.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Chairman: Roger L. Stevens.
Ex Officio: Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs: Secretary, Smithsonian Institution; Commissioner, US Office of Education; Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts; Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Chairman, Recreation Advisory Board (D.C.); Commissioner of the District of Columbia; Librarian of Congress; and Director, National Park Service.

U.S. House of Representatives: Frank Thompson, Jr., Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, and James C. Wright, Jr.


OFFICERS

Honorary chairman: Mrs. Richard M. Nixon, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, Mrs. Aristotle Onassis, and Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Chairman, Roger L. Stevens; Vice Chairman, Robert O. Anderson; Vice Chairman, Solomon M. Lownitz; General Director, William McC. Blair, Jr.; Administrator, Phillip J. Mullan; General Counsel, Ralph E. Becker; Music Advisor, Julius Rudel; Artistic Administrator, George London; Secretary, K. LeMoyne Billings; Treasurer, Robert C. Baker; Assistant Treasurer, John L. Bryant; Assistant Treasurer, Kenneth Birgfeld; Assistant Treasurer, Paul J. Bisset; and Assistant Treasurer, L. Parker Harrell, Jr.

SMITHSONIAN FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM ADVISORY COUNCILS

ARCHEOLOGY AND RELATED DISCIPLINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Original appointment</th>
<th>Appointment expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Lieban (observer), program director for anthropology, National Science Foundation, 1800 G St. NW Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Millet, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literature, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan H. Smith, vice president, academic, Washington State University, Pullman, Wash.</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Wilkins (observer), inspector general, Foreign Service Inspection Corps, Department of State, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy B. Schmitz, director, foreign currency program, Office of International Activities, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SYSTEMATIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL BIOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Original appointment</th>
<th>Appointment expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenton Chambers, Department of Botany, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Ore.</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles F. Cooper (observer) program director ecosystem analysis program National Science Foundation 1800 G St., NW, Washington, D.C. 20550</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O. Corliss (observer) director, systematic biology program, National Science Foundation 1800 G St., NW, Washington, D.C. 20550</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. Costlow, director, Duke University Marine Laboratory, Beaufort, N. C. 28516</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hamilton III, Department of Zoology, University of California, Davis, Calif.</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul D. Hurd, Jr., 112 Agricultural Hall, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard F. Johnston, Department of Systematics and Ecology, Museum of Natural History, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Thimann, Division of Natural Sciences, University of California, Santa Cruz, Calif.</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy B. Schmitz, director, foreign currency program, Office of International Activities, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Bureau Directors.
From: Russell Shank, Director of Libraries.
Subject: Library Advisory Committees.

S.I. Office Memorandum 733 called for the creation of several advisory committees to work with me on the consolidation of library collections. I am using these committees, of which there are two, for more general advisory purposes. The names of the committee members are listed below for your information.

LIBRARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN SCIENCE

Dr. George Watson, Department of Vertebrate Zoology; Dr. David Pawson, Department of Invertebrate Zoology; Dr. Maurice Margulies, Radiation Biology Laboratory; Mr. John T. Schlebecker, Department of Arts and Manufactures; and Dr. James A. Peters, Department of Vertebrate Zoology.

LIBRARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN HISTORY

Dr. Gordon Gibson, Department of Anthropology; Dr. Melvin Jackson, Department of Science & Technology; Mr. Ernest Robischon, National Air & Space Museum; Mr. Robert Stewart, National Portrait Gallery; Mr. Jon Eklund, Department of Science & Technology; and Dr. Elizabeth Harris, Department of Arts & Manufactures.

NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM ADVISORY BOARD

Chairman: Secretary, Smithsonian Institution.

Membership and original appointment:

Vice Admiral Thomas F. Connolly, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air), Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C. 20350 (January 1967).
Mr. Julian Scheer, Assistant Administrator for Public Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C. 20546 (October 1966).
Mrs. O. A. Beech, Wichita, Kan. (November 1969).

NATIONAL ARMED FORCES MUSEUM ADVISORY BOARD (CHAIRMAN: MR. JOHN NICHOLAS BROWN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Original appointment</th>
<th>Appointment Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Nicholas Brown, Regent of the Smithsonian Institution, 50 South Main St., Providence, R.I.</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of the Army (Stanley R. Resor), the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of the Navy (John H. Cheafe), the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of the Air Force (Robert C. Seamans, Jr.), the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex officio: Secretary of Defense, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NATIONAL COLLECTION OF FINE ARTS COMMISSION, MAY 1970

Dr. Charles H. Sawyer, chairman; Mr. Walker Hancock, vice chairman; and Mr. S. Dillon Ripley, secretary.

Mr. S. Dillon Ripley, ex officio, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

Mr. Leonard Baskin (1966) 1972, Department of Art, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts 01060.

Mr. William A. M. Burden (1963) 1972, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10020.

Mr. H. Page Cross (1963) 1972, 157 East 75th Street, New York, N.Y. 10021.

Dr. David E. Finley (1937) 1972, 8318 O Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.

Mr. Martin Friedman, director (1965) 1972, Walker Art Center, 1710 Lyndale Avenue, South, Minneapolis, Minn. 55403.


Dr. Walker Hancock (1951) 1971, Lanesville, Gloucester, Mass. 01930.

Mr. Bartlett H. Hayes, Jr. (1954) 1971, American Academy, Via Angelo Masina 5, Rome, Italy.

Mr. August Heckscher (1968) 1972, 820 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10021.

Mr. Thomas C. Howe (1968) 1972, 2700 Larkin Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94109.

Mrs. J. Lee Johnson, III (1968) 1972, 1200 Broad Avenue, Fort Worth, Tex. 76107.

Mr. Samuel C. Johnson (1963) 1972, 1525 Howe Street, Racine, Wis. 53403.

Dr. Wilmarth S. Lewis (1958) 1973, Farmington, Conn. 06032.


Mr. Ogden M. Pleissner (1957) 1973, 35 East Ninth Street, New York, N.Y. 10003.


Executive committee: Dr. Finley, chairman; Mr. McIlhenny, Mr. Pleissner, Dr. Sawyer, ex officio, Dr. Hancock, ex officio, and Mr. Ripley, ex officio.

Honorary members: Dr. Alexander Wetmore, Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Dr. Gilmore D. Clarke, Mr. Paul Mellon, Mr. Stow Wengenroth, and Mr. Andrew Wyeth.

Date of election shown in parentheses.

Date for re-election shown in italic.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Chairman, Chief Justice of the United States.


Ex officio: Chief Justice of the United States, Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, and Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY COMMISSION—CHAIRMAN, MR. JOHN NICHOLAS BROWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Original appointment</th>
<th>Appointment expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Catherine Drinker Bowen, 260 Booth Lane, Haverford, Pa.</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Nicholas Brown, 50 South Main St., Providence, R.I.</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lewis Deschler, 101 Lucas Lane, Bethesda, Md.</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David E. Finley, 3318 O St. NW., Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Wilmarth S. Lewis, Main St., Farmington, Conn.</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. E. P. Richardson, 285 Locust St., Philadelphia, Pa.</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Whithfield J. Bell, Jr., 106 South Fifth St., Philadelphia, Pa.</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Andrew Oliver, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jules D. Prown, Box 2120, Yale Station, New Haven, Conn</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY COMMISSION

Mr. J. Carter Brown, Director, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., ex officio.
Mr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., ex officio.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

[Chairman, Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice chairman, Allan Nevins]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Original appointment</th>
<th>Appointment expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Cuneo, New York</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Oct. 23, 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles A. Horsky, Maryland</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Oct. 23, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubert H. Humphrey, Minnesota</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Oct. 23, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry C. McPherson, Jr., Texas</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Da.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Nevins, California</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Oct. 23, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John P. Roche, Massachusetts</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Oct. 23, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Roche, Connecticut</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Oct. 23, 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel P. Moynihan, counselor to the President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex officio:
- Secretary of State
- Secretary of HEW
- Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities
- Librarian of Congress
- Archivist of the United States
- Secretary, Smithsonian Institution

1 Not available.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION COUNCIL

(January 16, 1970)

Mr. H. Harvard Arnason, Vice President for Art Administration, Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, 1071 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N.Y. 10028. Phone: (212) 722-8542.

Mailings to: 1075 Park Avenue, New York City, N.Y. 10028. Phone: (212) 9-5110.

Dr. Herman Branson, president. Central State University, Wilberforce, Ohio 43844. Phone: (513) 376-6332.

Prof. Fred R. Eggin, Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago, 1126 East 59th Street, Chicago, Ill. 60601. Phone: (312) 643-0800.

Professor Donald S. Farner, chairman, Department of Zoology, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 98105. Phone: (206) 543-1620.


Dr. Murray Gell-Mann, California Institute of Technology, 1201 East California Avenue, Pasadena, Calif. 91109. Phone: (213) 795-6941.

Dr. Phillip Handler, president, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20418. Phone: 961-1231.

Prof. G. Evelyn Hutchinson, Sterling Professor of Zoology, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 06520. Phone: (203) 432-4711.

Professor Jan LaRue, Department of Music, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, New York University, New York City, N.Y. 10003. Phone: (212) 598-3431.

Mailings to: 15 Edgehill Drive, Darien, Conn. 06820.

Mr. Clifford L. Lord, president, Hofstra University, Hempstead, N.Y. 11550. Phone: (516) 560-3271.

Professor Charles D. Michener, Watkins Distinguished Professor of Entomology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans. 66044. Phone: (913) 844-2700.

Dr. Peter M. Millman, National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa 7, Canada. Phone: (613) 993 9245.

Mr. Elting E. Morison, acting master, Timothy Dwight College, Yale University, 63 Wall Street, New Haven, Conn. 06520. Phone: (203) 436 2039.

Professor Norman Holmes Pearson, Department of English and American Studies, 2731 Hall of Graduate Studies, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 06520. Phone: (203) 436 0621.
Mr. Gordon N. Ray, president, John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, 90 Park Avenue, New York City, N.Y. 10016. Phone: (212) 687 4470. Mr. André Schiffrin, managing director, Pantheon Books, 201 East 50th Street, New York City, N.Y. 10022. Phone: (212) 751 2600. Professor Cyril Stanley Smith, institute professor, Room 14N-321, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Mass. 02139. Phone: (617) 864 3722. Professor John D. Spikes, College of Letters and Science, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112. Phone: (801) 322 6517. Professor Stephen E. Toulmin, Department of Philosophy, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich. 48823. Phone: (517) 353 9833. Professor Warren H. Wagner, Jr., Department of Botany, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48105. Phone: (313) 764 1168. Dr. Rainer Zangerl, Field Museum of Natural History, Roosevelt Road and Lakeshore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60605. Phone: (312) 922 9410.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE PAPERS OF JOSEPH HENRY

This joint committee consists of two representatives from the Smithsonian Institution, two from the American Philosophical Society and two from the National Academy of Sciences. The agreement to form a joint committee was made in 1964, and several organizational meetings were held during that year. The first joint committee meeting was held in 1965.

There is an annual meeting. There are no formal dates of appointments. Committee representatives are as follows:

American Philosophical Society: Dr. Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., and Dr. H. D. Smyth. National Academy of Sciences: Dr. J. H. Van Vleck, Miss Lee Anna Embrey. Smithsonian Institution: Mr. S. Dillon Ripley, Mr. Charles Blitzer.

Mr. Thompson. Some of these advisory boards are composed of persons, in the case of the John F. Kennedy Center, with the Speaker naming some, the President of the Senate, the President, and others.

So the Smithsonian, itself, is, in a sense, a housekeeping agency for them. It doesn’t appoint these advisers, nor does it exercise any substantial degree, if any, of control over their activities. Is that correct?

Mr. Bradley. That is certainly correct, particularly in the case of the Kennedy Center. It does vary, Mr. Chairman, as a point of accuracy. There are some boards that are appointed by the Smithsonian.

Mr. Thompson. Yes, but I said some are not. The National Portrait Gallery is another where they are not, isn’t that so?

Mr. Bradley. That is appointed by the Regents.

Mr. Thompson. And the Woodrow Wilson Center would be another? Isn’t that appointed by the Speaker, the President of the Senate and the White House?

Mr. Bradley. Ex officio and by the White House; yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. Former Vice President Hubert Humphrey is the Chairman of that, is he not?

Mr. Bradley. That is right; yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you.

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Chairman, I have elsewhere in this statement, and I don’t want to exceed my time so I think I better go more quickly since you permitted me to offer this for the record, the highlights of programs set forth under the main fields of history and art, science, public service, libraries, the general counsel’s participation, information systems and exhibits.

We are also offering for your consideration this recent legislative history of additions to our programs.
I thought it might be of some interest, if I may, and this stems from your earlier agreement with the Secretary when he was talking last week, if we might have the Secretary continue with his statement having to do with the management of the Institution.

If I may offer that for the record and then highlight it, I would certainly appreciate it.

Mr. Thompson. Without objection, it will be made a part of the record.

(The document to be furnished follows:)

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY

The Museum of History and Technology was designed and constructed to house and exhibit the Nation's collections relating to American cultural, civil, and military history and the history of science and technology. The Museum maintains reference collections and interpretive exhibitions concerning all aspects of American life in times past. Its professional staff and other historians form all parts of the world perform research leading to the discovery and documentation of materials of historic significance.

By an Act approved June 28, 1955, the 84th Congress authorized the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to construct a new Museum of History and Technology at a cost not to exceed $36,000,000. The cornerstone for the new building was laid on May 19, 1961, with appropriate ceremonies.

On January 22, 1964, President Johnson dedicated the new Museum of History and Technology at impressive ceremonies attended by distinguished Members of Congress, scholars and scientists, and patrons of the arts and humanities.

Extracts from the President's dedication address follow:

"The gathering of knowledge is the supreme achievement of man. "Four hundred years ago, Francis Bacon could immodestly declare: 'I have taken all knowledge to be my province.' Bacon would find this new Museum of History and Technology at the Smithsonian Institute to its taste, and to his aims.

"For I believe this new Museum will do that which causes us all to celebrate; it will excite a thirst for knowledge among all the people.

"My earliest predecessor, George Washington, in a letter to the officers of the American Philosophical Society, founded in Philadelphia by Franklin, wrote these words: 'If I have a wish ungratified, it is that the arts and sciences may continue to flourish with increasing lustre.'" "The more we understand the meaning of the past, the more we appreciate the wisdom of the future.

"If this Museum did nothing more than illuminate our heritage so that others could see a little better our legacy, however so small the glimpse, it would fulfill a noble purpose.

"I am glad to be here.

"I am always glad to be where America is."

NATIONAL COLLECTION OF FINE ARTS

The National Collection of Fine Arts, an original Bureau of the Smithsonian Institution, is dedicated to presenting American creative genius in the field of fine arts. It stimulates national pride in American cultural achievements by programs of exhibitions, lectures, and publications which develop public awareness and appreciation of this heritage. The international stature of American art is being enhanced by United States participation, organized by the National Collection of Fine Arts, in major international art exhibitions and through extensive circulation of American art abroad.

The Act approved on March 28, 1958, provided for the transfer of the existing Civil Service Commission Building, formerly known as the Patent Office Building, to the Smithsonian Institution and authorized the remodeling of the building to house the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery.
In 1962, an appropriation of $400,000 was made for planning the restoration and renovation of the building and in 1964 and 1965 appropriations totalling $6,465,000 were approved for the contract work.

On May 3, 1968, President Johnson presided at the opening ceremonies of this magnificent gallery of American art. The following are President Johnson’s remarks:

Distinguished Regents of the Smithsonian, Secretary Ripley, Dr. Scott, ladies and gentlemen, this is a proud moment. I wanted to say that dedicating the new home of this National Collection makes me feel like a proud father, but on the plane this evening coming back from Kansas City, Mrs. Johnson said that would sound boastful.

So then I thought I might say that I felt like a proud grandfather. But some people, she told me, think I already talk too much about my grandson.

So tonight, my friends, I am authorized to tell all of you that I do feel very much like a proud uncle of the National Collection.

I think you know how an uncle is. He doesn’t visit very often, but he likes his relations to do well and it is good to see that the National Collection is doing well.

If I will never be remembered as a patron of the arts, I should be delighted to be known as an uncle of the arts.

Truly, this is a historic night for all of us. Until now, the United States was the only great country which had no national museum devoted to its own art.

The American collection was shunted about our Capital like a cultural step-child. It was always in search of a home. Tonight it has a home, a great, historic home whose sandstone came from quarries that were first operated by George Washington, and whose halls welcomed Abraham Lincoln on the night of his Inaugural Ball.

So tonight, thanks to the tireless dedication of many, many Americans, we see laid out before us the creative history of our great Nation.

From the beginning, America was known as a very vigorous and a very dynamic nation. It grew quickly in size, in population, and in wealth. From the beginning, America was a wonder of the world, and also a hope for the world.

And it would have been most unusual, I think, if all of this energy had not been accompanied by great artistic outpouring. As we can see here this evening, it was, and it is.

Through art, it is said, the soul of a nation is revealed. This new museum is a great resource for America, and for all the world, for that matter.

I am proud that I can be here with you to open this museum. I am very proud of the patrons who have made it possible. I am proud to wish it a long, a happy, and a prosperous life.

Let me add another word.

This is a day that we shall remember for another reason. It was 1 o’clock this morning that I was awakened and informed that Hanoi was prepared to meet us in Paris, to talk about peace.

We often think about peace as an absence of war. But, in fact, peace is a struggle, an achievement, an endless effort to convert hostility into negotiation, bloody violence into politics, and hate into reconciliation.

I have sought this moment for more days and nights than you will ever credit, and in enough places for all the historians to judge that we were fully credible when we said “any time, anywhere.”

Now we shall begin. The days, the weeks, and the months ahead are going to be very hard and hazardous and trying, and exact the best from all of us. But with every fiber of my being, I shall try to move us from fighting to peace, from enmity to brotherhood, and from destruction to common efforts on behalf of the men and women and children of all of Southeast Asia.

In all of this, I ask all of you for your prayers.

Thank you, and goodnight.

Note.—The President spoke at 10:09 p.m. in the interior courtyard of the renovated Old Patent Office Building, now galleries for the Smithsonian Institution’s National Collection of Fine Arts. The building, renamed the Fine Arts and Portrait Galleries Building, will also contain the National Portrait Gallery, scheduled for opening at a later time.
The following is a chronological account of the history of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (formerly, the National Cultural Center).

The authorizing legislation for the National Cultural Center passed the United States Senate unanimously on June 20, 1958. The National Cultural Center Act was signed by President Eisenhower on September 2, 1958.

As President of the U.S. Senate, Lyndon Johnson reappointed Senators J. William Fulbright, Joseph S. Clark and Leverett Saltonstall to the Cultural Center's Board of Trustees in 1961 and 1963.

Amending legislation to extend the fund raising deadline of the Cultural Center was enacted on August 19, 1963. This legislation also authorized an additional 15 Trustees for the Center's Board.

President Johnson sent an administration request to the Congress on December 11, 1963, which expressed support of legislation to rename the National Cultural Center in honor of President Kennedy (Exhibit A—Letter).

The John F. Kennedy Center Act passed Congress and was signed into law on January 23, 1964 (Exhibit B—John F. Kennedy Center Act.) This legislation authorized an unprecedented appropriation for a project in the arts: a Federal grant of $15.5 million for construction provided that an equal amount could be raised privately.


On December 2, 1964 President Johnson spoke at the ground breaking ceremony for the Kennedy Center and wielded the ceremonial spade. The 15 Trustees President Johnson had appointed the previous summer were sworn in on that occasion by Mr. Justice White.

On October 20, 1965 legislation was enacted which authorized the showing of the U.S.I.A. film "John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning—Days of Drums" to the American public and the transfer of six copies of the film from the U.S.I.A. to the Kennedy Center. All profits from the film were to benefit the Kennedy Center.

On February 23, 1967 reappointed were Roger L. Stevens, Chairman, Richard Adler and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. and appointed Robert Lehman, Jack Valenti and Ralph W. Ellison to ten-year terms on the Center’s Board of Trustees. Robert I. Millonzi was appointed to fill a two-year term.

As First Lady, Mrs. Johnson serves as honorary chairman of the Kennedy Center with Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Mrs. John F. Kennedy.

Exhibit A

(Letter of President Johnson to the House and Senate Committees on Public Works expressing support of legislation to rename the National Cultural Center in honor of President John F. Kennedy, as reprinted in the Hearings before the joint session of these two committees dated December 12 and 16, 1963.)

The record at this point, without objection, will contain the letter addressed to the chairman of the House and Senate committees from the President.

(The letter referred to follows:)

THE WHITE HOUSE,
December 11, 1963.

Hon. Charles A. Buckley,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I should like to take this opportunity to express my wholehearted support for the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 136 or H.J. Res. 828) presently before the Congress to rename the National Cultural Center in honor of President Kennedy. It seems to me that a center for the performing arts on the beautiful site selected would be one of the most appropriate memorials that a grateful nation could establish to honor a man who had such deep and abiding convictions about the importance of cultural activities in our national
life. In this connection, it is my understanding that the Kennedy family would prefer to have the Center named "The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts" in order to indicate more specifically the nature of the memorial to him.

In a speech a month before his death, President Kennedy said, "I see little of more importance to the future of our country and our civilization than full recognition of the place of the artist." He understood that history remembers national societies less for the might of their weapons or for the mass of their wealth, than for the quality of the artistic legacy they bequeath to mankind. By carrying forward the project of a national cultural center, we can all help strengthen the traditions and standards of the arts in American society. And in doing this we carry forward the spirit and concern of John F. Kennedy.

That the Federal Government should participate in this undertaking by providing funds to match the contributions which have already been made, and will be made in the future, by people throughout this Nation and the world is entirely fitting. This action should insure prompt completion of the Center to which President Kennedy gave his full support and which he saw as an embodiment of our Nation's interest in the finest expressions of our cultural activity. I hope that the Congress will take early action on this resolution.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Exhibit B.

John F. Kennedy Center Act

Amended September 21, 1959, Public Law 86–297, 73 Stat. 573
Amended August 19, 1963, Public Law 88–100, 77 Stat. 128
Amended January 23, 1964, Public Law 88–260, 78 Stat. 4

AN ACT To provide for a John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts which will be constructed, with funds raised by voluntary contributions; on a site made available in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "John F. Kennedy Center Act".

Board of Trustees

Sec. 2. (a) There is hereby established in the Smithsonian Institution a bureau, which shall be directed by a board to be known as the Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Board"), whose duty it shall be to maintain and administer the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and site thereof and to execute such other functions as are vested in the Board by this Act. The Board shall be composed as follows: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Librarian of Congress, the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Chairman of the District of Columbia Recreation Board, the Director of the National Park Service, the Commissioner of the United States Office of Education, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, three Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives ex officio; and thirty general trustees who shall be citizens of the United States, to be chosen as hereinafter provided.

(b) The general trustees shall be appointed by the President of the United States and each such trustee shall hold office as a member of the Board for a term of ten years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, (2) the terms of any members appointed prior to the date of enactment of the National Cultural Center Amendments Act of 1963 shall expire as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and (3) the terms of the first fifteen members appointed to the Board
pursuant to the amendments made by the National Cultural Center Amendments Act of 1963 shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three on September 1, 1964, three on September 1, 1966, three on September 1, 1968, three on September 1, 1970, and three on September 1, 1972.

(c) There shall be an Advisory Committee on the Arts composed of such members as the President may designate, to serve at the pleasure of the President. Persons appointed to the Advisory Committee on the Arts, including officers or employees of the United States, shall be persons who are recognized for their knowledge of, or experience or interest in, one or more of the arts in the fields covered by the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The President shall designate the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on the Arts. In making such appointments the President shall give consideration to such recommendations as may from time to time be submitted to him by leading national organizations in the appropriate art fields. The Advisory Committee on the Arts shall advise and consult with the Board and make recommendations to the Board regarding existing and prospective cultural activities to be carried on in the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The Advisory Committee on the Arts shall assist the Board in carrying out section 5(a) of this Act. Members of the Advisory Committee on the Arts shall serve without compensation, but each member of such Committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in connection with the work of such Committee.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Sec. 3. The Board shall construct for the Smithsonian Institution, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, a building to be designated as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts on a site in the District of Columbia bounded by the Inner Loop Freeway on the east, the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge approaches on the south, Rock Creek Parkway on the west, New Hampshire Avenue and F Street on the north, which shall be selected for such purpose by the National Capital Planning Commission. The National Capital Planning Commission shall acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, lands necessary to provide for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and related facilities. Such building shall be in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

DUTIES OF THE BOARD

Sec. 4. The Board shall—

(1) present classical and contemporary music, opera, drama, dance, and poetry from this and other countries,

(2) present lectures and other programs,

(3) develop programs for children and youth and the elderly (and for other age groups as well) in such arts designed specifically for their participation, education, and recreation,

(4) provide facilities for other civic activities at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts,

(5) provide within the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts a suitable memorial in honor of the late President.

POWERS OF THE BOARD

Sec. 5. (a) The Board is authorized to solicit and accept for the Smithsonian Institution and to hold and administer gifts, bequests, or devises of money, securities or other property of whatsoever character for the benefit of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Unless otherwise restricted by the terms of the gift, bequest, or devise, the Board is authorized to sell or exchange and to invest or reinvest in such investments as it may determine from time to time the moneys, securities, or other property composing trust funds given, bequeathed, or devised to or for the benefit of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The income as and when collected shall be placed in such deposits as the Board shall determine and shall be subject to expenditure by the Board.

(b) The Board shall appoint and fix the compensation and duties of a director, an assistant director, and a secretary of the John F. Kennedy Center for the
Performing Arts and of such other officers and employees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts as may be necessary for the efficient administration of the functions of the Board. The director, assistant director, and secretary shall be well qualified by experience and training to perform the duties of their office.

(c) The actions of the Board, including any payment made or directed to be made by it from any trust funds, shall not be subject to review by any officer or agency other than a court of law.

ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 6. (a) The Board is authorized to adopt an official seal which shall be judicially noticed and to make such bylaws, rules, and regulations, as it deems necessary for the administration of its functions under this Act, including, among other matters, bylaws, rules, and regulations relating to the administration of its trust funds and the organization and procedure of the Board. The Board may function notwithstanding vacancies and twelve members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(b) The Board shall have all the usual powers and obligations of a trustee in respect of all trust funds administered by it.

(c) The Board shall submit to the Smithsonian Institution and to Congress an annual report of its operations under this Act, including a detailed statement of all public and private moneys received and disbursed by it.

(d) The Board shall transmit to Congress a detailed report of any memorial which it proposes to provide within the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts under authority of paragraph (5) of section 1 of this Act, and no such memorial shall be provided until the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution shall have approved such memorial.

TERMINATION

Sec. 7. (a) This Act shall cease to be effective, and all offices created by this Act and all appointments made under this Act shall terminate, if the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution does not find that sufficient funds to construct the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts have been received by the Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts within eight years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) If the offices of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts terminate under the provisions of subsection (a), all funds and property (real and personal) accepted by the Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts under section 5(a), and income therefrom, shall vest in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and shall be used by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to carry out the purposes of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the transfer of the Civil Service Commission Building in the District of Columbia to the Smithsonian Institution to house certain art collections of the Smithsonian Institution," approved March 28, 1958, and for the acquisition of works of art to be housed in the building referred to in such Act; except that such funds or property, and the income therefrom, shall vest in an organization designated by the donor of such funds or property at the time of the making of the donation thereof, if, at such time, such organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and is exempt under section 501(a) of such Code, and if, at such time, a contribution, bequest, legacy, devise, or transfer to such organization is deductible under section 170, 2055, or 2106 of such Code.

APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board for use in accordance with this Act, amounts which in the aggregate will equal gifts, bequests, and devises of money, securities, and other property, held by the Board under this Act, except that not to exceed $15,500,000 shall be appropriated pursuant to this section.
BORROWING AUTHORITY

SEC. 9. To finance necessary parking facilities for the Center, the Board may issue revenue bonds to the Secretary of the Treasury payable from revenues accruing to the Board. The total face value of all bonds so issued shall not be greater than $15,400,000. The interest payments on such bonds may be deferred with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury but any interest payments so deferred shall themselves bear interest after June 30, 1972. Deferred interest may not be charged against the debt limitation of $15,400,000. Such obligations shall have maturities agreed upon by the Board and the Secretary of the Treasury but not in excess of fifty years. Such obligations may be redeemable at the option of the Board before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations, but the obligations thus redeemed shall not be refinanced by the Board. Each such obligation shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average rate on current marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligations of the Board. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any obligations of the Board to be issued under this section and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Board's obligations under this section.

GIFTS TO UNITED STATES

SEC. 10. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States any gift to the United States which he finds has been contributed in honor of or in memory of the late President John F. Kennedy and to pay the money to such appropriation or other accounts, including the appropriation accounts established pursuant to appropriations authorized by this Act, as in his judgment will best effectuate the intent of the donor.

NATIONAL MEMORIAL

SEC. 11. The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, designated by this Act, shall be the sole national memorial to the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy within the city of Washington and its environs.

NOTE.—Public Law 88–200 entitled “Joint Resolution providing for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, authorizing an appropriation therefor and for other purposes,” approved January 23, 1964, contained the following preamble and section:

"Whereas the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy served with distinction as President of the United States, and as a Member of the Senate and House of Representatives; and

"Whereas the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy dedicated his life to the advancement of the welfare of mankind; and

"Whereas the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy was particularly devoted to the advancement of the performing arts within the United States; and

"Whereas by his untimely death this Nation and the world has suffered a great loss; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the Congress that it is only fitting and proper that a suitable monument be dedicated to the memory of this great leader; and

"Whereas the living memorial to be named in his honor by this joint resolution shall be the sole national monument to his memory within the city of Washington and its environs:

* * * * * * * * *

"Sec. 2. In addition to the amendments made by the first section of this Act, any designation or reference to the National Cultural Center in any other law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be held to designate or refer to such Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts."

Compilation by Ralph E. Becker, General Counsel, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.
REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING S.J. RES. 136, THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS


Members of the Kennedy family, Members of the Congress, ladies and gentlemen:

It gives me great pleasure to approve this Bill which renames the National Cultural Center the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and authorizes Federal participation in its financing.

President Kennedy was actively concerned in the progress of the plans for this project. He was, himself, a man of a very inquiring mind, a distinguished historian, a master of language, and a lover of excellence wherever it appeared. He delighted not only in the classic forms through which our civilization has found expression, but also in the popular arts of today, with their variety, their humor and their capacity to touch the lives of all of our people. He and Mrs. Kennedy often talked to me about this Center, and I participated in many meetings with them concerning it. They approved the design of the building.

The President expressed the hope that he might see it completed during his term of office.

It is, therefore, I think, entirely fitting that the Center should be named in his memory, and should be dedicated anew to the great purposes for which it was originally concerned. By this Bill, Federal funds are provided to match money donated by private sources. The Center will become a fine example of cooperation between citizens and their government. Thousands of Americans acting as individuals, as members of corporations or labor units, or trustees of foundations, at the President's request and at the request of many others, have already made substantial contributions. Foreign governments have also shared the cost. I am told that the Board of Trustees will continue their fund raising efforts and that they hope to start construction this year so that the Center may be completed late in 1966 or early 1967.

The Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is not simply a Washington building. It is a national institution. The vitality and the well-being of the people is closely related to their capacity to always produce a high level of art and to enjoy it, and to appreciate it.

In signing this Act, I am aware of its far-ranging consequences. I am confident we have chosen well that the institution now given the breath of life will have a long and distinguished future. All those who worked in this cause can now know that they are not only honoring the memory of a very great man, but they are enriching our whole American life.

Personally, I would like to express my own deep gratitude for the promptness with which the Congress acted on this matter. It give me great satisfaction to sign this bill this morning.

Now if I may have your attention, I am going to ask the very able Junior Senator from Massachusetts to make a brief response.

EXHIBIT D

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE GROUND BREAKING CEREMONY FOR THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

(As actually delivered)

Bishop Hannan, Mr. Justice White, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Stevens, Trustees of the Kennedy Center, My Fellow Americans, distinguished members of the Diplomatic Corps, Ladies and Gentlemen:

John Kennedy once said, "I look forward to an America which will steadily raise the standards of artistic accomplishment and which will steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all of our citizens."

As I sat here on the platform this morning, I reviewed some of the efforts that were made as a result of his inspiring leadership to make possible the ground-breaking that will take place here today. I recalled that we all met in the White House under the leadership of his mother-in-law, and we used the First House of this land one of the first times to raise funds to make this event possible.
I remember going to Mrs. Post’s home and meeting with patriotic and dedicated citizens who in their generosity were willing to come there and spend the evening to try to add their bit to this great effort. I recall the contribution of the members of the Congress, and, through them, all the people of the United States who took the funds from the farmer and the laborer, the banker and the artist, to appropriate them so that we might be here today and participate as we are.

We are taking a very important step toward that dream that President and Mrs. Kennedy had, and to which most of you have contributed your bit. This Center will brighten the life of Washington but it is not just, as I have said, a Washington project. It is a national project and a national possession, and it became a reality, as Mr. Kennedy has observed, because of the willingness of all the representatives of all the people to make it possible. It is dedicated to the common awareness of all men. It was conceived under the Administration of President Eisenhower. It was inspired and encouraged and led by the imagination and the purpose of President Kennedy. And after his death, the Congress, realizing that, named it in his memory and generously, and I think wisely, provided the matching funds so that we could get on our way.

If it fulfills our hopes, this Center will be, at once, a symbol and a reflection and a hope. It will symbolize our belief that the world of creation and thought are at the core of all civilization. Only recently, in the White House, we helped commemorate the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare. The political conflicts and ambitions of his England are known to the scholar and to the specialist. But his plays will forever move men in every corner of the world.

The leaders that he wrote about live far more vividly in his words than in the almost forgotten facts of their own rule.

Our civilization, too, will largely survive in the works of our creation. There is a quality in art which speaks across the gulf dividing man from man and nation from nation, and century from century. That quality confirms the faith that our common hopes may be more enduring than our conflicting hostilities. Even now men of affairs are struggling to catch up with the insights of great art. The stakes may well be the survival of civilization. The personal preferences of men in government are not important—except to themselves.

However, it is important to know that the opportunity we give to the arts is a measure of the quality of our civilization. It is important to be aware that artistic activity can enrich the life of our people; which really is the central object of government. It is important that our material prosperity liberate and not confine the creative spirit.

The role of government must be a small one. No act of Congress or Executive Order can call a great musician or poet into existence. But we can stand on the sidelines and cheer. We can maintain and strengthen an atmosphere to permit the arts to flourish, and those who have talent to use it. And we can seek to enlarge the access of all of our people to artistic creation.

As a veteran of 24 years in the Congress, I am not a prophet but I do want to suggest to my friend, the new Senator from New York, he is in for listening to more poetry than he would surmise in some of the morning sessions of the Senate.

Last September, I signed a bill establishing the National Council on the Arts. Versions of this proposal had been under consideration since 1877. I intend to consider other ways in which government can appropriately encourage the arts. I want to, as the leader of this country, express my personal gratitude to the persons on the platform with me, and particularly to the persons like Mrs. Auchincloss and others that I see in the audience, for the sacrifices in time and effort they have made to encourage, lead and direct this effort.

This Center will reflect the finest artistic achievements of our time. It is our hope that it will house the leading artists and performers. Almost every industrialized nation in the world, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, has one or more national centers for the arts. Washington has lagged behind. Far too often, American actors and singers and musicians must travel to foreign countries to even be heard. Now, because of President Kennedy’s leadership and your efforts, they will have a stage here in the capital of their own country.

I expect this Center to be a living force for the encouragement of art. Washington needs new theaters and new concert halls. But if that is all that we are building, we will have fallen far short of today’s expectation and promise.

This Center will have a unique opportunity to bring together worlds of poetry and power—and bring it to the benefit of each of us. It must give special attention to the young; to increasing their interest and stimulating their creativity.
It can serve as a model and instructor to other cultural centers around our Nation. It should open up new opportunities to be heard to young singers and film-makers and playwrights. It must take the lead in bringing the best in the performing arts to every part of our beloved and rich country; so that theater and opera are not the privilege of the lucky citizens of just a few metropolitan centers.

Yes, this is our ambitious program. But so was the vision of the man in whose memory this Center is today named.

Pericles said, "If Athens shall appear great to you, consider then that her glories were purchased by valiant men, and by men who learned their duty."

As this Center comes to reflect and advance the greatness of America, consider then those glories were purchased by a valiant leader who never swerved from duty—John Kennedy. And in his name I dedicate this site.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY

The Museum of Natural History is an international center for the natural sciences, maintaining the largest reference collections of anthropological, biological, and geological materials in the nation and conducting a comprehensive program of original research on man, plants, animals, rocks and minerals, and fossil organisms—their classification, distribution, and relationship to the environment. The reference collections and the resident scientists provide an important focal point for cooperative research and educational activities among Federal agencies, universities and other scientific institutions. Its studies of living and fossil plants and animals provide critical data for problems of pollution, medicine, development of food sources, and earth sciences pursued by Federal agencies and private research groups. Through its exhibits and public activities it interprets the natural sciences to the nation.

During fiscal year 1958 an appropriation of $800,000 was provided for planning for two additional wings to the existing museum building and in fiscal years 1961 and 1962 appropriations totaling $17,836,000 were approved for the contract work. Both additions were ready for occupancy in 1965 and provided in excess of 400,000 square feet of space which is devoted exclusively to the housing of the growing national collections, laboratory, and office space.

THE NATIONAL ARMED FORCES MUSEUM ADVISORY BOARD

The National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board is a Presidential- appointed body established in the Smithsonian Institution under the provisions of Public Law 87-186, 87th Congress, approved August 30, 1961, to provide advice and assistance to the Regents of the Institution on matters concerned with the portrayal of the contributions which the Armed Forces of the United States have made to American society and culture.

The Congress also authorized expansion of the Smithsonian Institution’s facilities for portraying the contributions of the Armed Forces and directed the Smithsonian Institution’s Board of Regents, with the advice and assistance of the Advisory Board, to investigate lands and buildings in and near the District of Columbia suitable for the display of military collections. The Board of Regents was further directed to submit recommendations to the Congress with respect to the acquisition of lands and buildings for such use.

The National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board is composed of eleven members, consisting of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Smith- sonian Institution, both of whom serve ex officio, and nine members appointed by the President, three of whom are recommended by the Secretary of Defense to represent the Armed Forces and two of whom are appointed from among persons recommended by the Regents of the Institution.

The present membership of the Advisory Board is as follows:
Hon. Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, continuous service since 1962; reappointed by the President in 1968.
John Nicholas Brown, continuous service as chairman from 1962 to 1968; reappointed by the President in 1968.
David L. Kreeger, continuous service since 1962; reappointed by the President in 1964.
William H. Perkins, Jr., appointed by the President in 1964.
James H. Cassell, Jr., appointed by the President in 1964.
Robert C. Baker, appointed by the President in 1968.
Hon. Clark Clifford, Secretary of Defense, ex officio from entrance into office in 1968.
Hon. Stanley R. Resor, Secretary of the Army, appointed by the President in 1965 upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.
Hon. Paul R. Ignatius, Secretary of the Navy, appointed by the President in 1967 upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.
Hon. Harold Brown, Secretary of the Air Force, appointed by the President in 1966 upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.
Hon. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, ex officio from entrance into office in 1964.

The Advisory Board has recommended to the Board of Regents that the Smithsonian Institution's facilities be expanded to include a National Armed Forces Museum Park and that the Institution seek to acquire lands in the Fort Foote area of Prince George's County as a site for the museum park. The Board also has recommended that the Institution arrange with the Department of the Interior for joint use of certain facilities of Fort Washington, Maryland, as elements of the museum park.

The Board of Regents has given its approval to the foregoing recommendations and on January 25, 1967, in view of rising land values and the threat posed by private development, voted that the Institution move without delay to seek legislative authority for acquiring the necessary lands in the Fort Foote area.

On October 6, 1967, at the request of the Smithsonian Institution, Senator Clinton P. Anderson (for himself and Senator J. W. Fulbright), introduced Senate Bill S. 2510, which would authorize the Board of Regents of the Institution to acquire the necessary lands. Similarly, on January 25, 1968, Representative Michael J. Kirwan introduced House Bill H.R. 14853, seeking similar authority. Congressional action on both bills is now pending.

**Preservation of Historic and Artistic Contents of the White House**

The Act approved September 22, 1961, provides that articles of furniture, fixtures, and decorative objects of the White House, when declared by the President to be of artistic or historic interest shall be considered to be the property of the White House. The law provides further that any such article when not in use or on display in the White House shall be transferred by direction of the President as a loan to the Smithsonian Institution for its care or exhibition. Such articles are returned to the White House from the Smithsonian on notice by the President.

**National Portrait Gallery**

The National Portrait Gallery functions as a free public museum for the study, research, and exhibition of portraiture and statuary depicting men and women who have made significant contributions to the history, development and culture of the people of the United States and of the artists who created such portraiture and statuary. This gallery, the only such institution in the United States, has the potential to become of major importance as a repository of historical and biographical iconography.

By an Act of the 87th Congress approved on April 27, 1962, the gallery was established in the Smithsonian Institution and authorization was provided for the appropriation of funds necessary to carry out its functions.

The Act approved on March 28, 1958, provided for the transfer of the existing Civil Service Building, formerly known as the Patent Office Building, to the Smithsonian Institution and authorized the remodeling of the building to house the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery.

In 1962, an appropriation of $400,000 was made for planning the restoration and renovation of the building and in 1964 and 1965 appropriations totalling $6,465,000 were approved for the contract work.

During October 1968 the National Portrait Gallery is scheduled to be opened to the public in the newly restored Fine Arts and Portrait Galleries Building.
POLICING OF BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Public Law 88-391 approved August 1, 1964, amended the Act of October 24, 1951, relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus. The Act authorized furnishing special police equipment; described the buildings, grounds and areas in the Smithsonian's jurisdiction for such police activities and added special police enforcement powers.

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS IN A SCIENTIFIC OR TECHNICAL CAPACITY

Public Law 88-549 approved August 31, 1964, provided that the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, subject to adequate security and other appropriate investigations, and subject further to a prior determination by him that no qualified United States citizen is available for the particular position involved, is authorized to employ and compensate aliens in a scientific or technical capacity at authorized rates of compensation without regard to statutory provisions prohibiting payment of compensation to aliens.

FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

In 1965 the Smithsonian Institution received authority from the Congress to make use of certain foreign currencies held by the United States abroad in excess to its needs. The impetus for granting this authority was the lack of regular sources of support for American archeological work in foreign lands and the fact that American archeologists had distinguished themselves in some of the very countries where these "excess" foreign currencies were available. The Smithsonian's authority for the use of the funds provided for the award of grants to American institutions of higher learning for research in "archeology and related disciplines."

An initial appropriation of $1.3 million enabled the Smithsonian to provide support to such American archeological efforts as the Hebrew Union College's Biblical School of Archeology in Jerusalem. This organization serves the principal training ground for American biblical scholars in Israel. Support was provided also to the Carnegie Museum's excavations at the Philistine city of Ashdod, recently expanded to include underwater archeology work in the area; the project of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory of the University of California for "X-raying" the Egyptian pyramids in an effort to discover any hidden chambers; a project of the University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, to sort out and match by using modern computer techniques the thousands of stone blocks which once formed the massive Temple of Akhnaten in Egypt; and the American Academy of Benares, a research center in India devoted to work in archeology and art history in India.

In subsequent years the Congress increased the appropriation to $2,316,000 and broadened the authority to use the funds for "museum programs and related research," especially research in systematic and environmental biology. Projects undertaken under this authority include the establishment of an oceanographic sorting facility at Salammbô, Tunisia, which aims to accelerate the identification of the marine organisms of the Mediterranean; a University of Georgia study in collaboration with the Polish Academy of Sciences which aims to study the flow of energy in small rodents who consume food which would otherwise be available to man; a study of the Ceylonese elephant in its natural habitat which is now being threatened by the increase of the human population and the expansion of agriculture in Ceylon.

More than forty institutions of higher learning in America have benefited from grants in excess currencies abroad; more than 100 research projects had been completed or are active; many books, monographs in scholarly and professional journals, and studies have enriched the cultural and scientific scene not only in America but in the world at large.

In its fourth year, the Smithsonian Foreign Currency Program has become a major source of support for American universities, museums, and research institutes carrying out such work overseas.
RENWICK GALLERY

On June 23, 1965, President Johnson approved the transfer to the Smithsonian Institution for use as a museum and art gallery, the building located at Pennsylvania Avenue and 17th Street, N.W. This building housed the Court of Claims for many years and was originally designed as an art gallery for W. W. Corcoran by James Renwick, who also designed the Smithsonian Institution Building. It was occupied by the Corcoran from 1869 to 1897 and was acquired by the United States in 1901.

In a letter dated June 23, 1965, addressed to Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, President Johnson said:

"I am enthusiastic about your suggestion that the Smithsonian Institution take over the old U.S. Court of Claims Building and establish it as a gallery of arts, crafts and design.

"No more appropriate purpose for the building could be proposed than to exhibit, in the restored gallery, examples of the ingenuity of our people and to present exhibits from other nations, whose citizens are so proud of their arts."

Restoration and renovation of the building is well under way and is expected to be completed during 1968.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Dr. S. Dillon Ripley,
Secretary, Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Ripley: I am enthusiastic about your suggestion that the Smithsonian Institution take over the old U.S. Court of Claims Building and establish it as a gallery of arts, crafts and design.

No more appropriate purpose for the building could be proposed than to exhibit, in the restored gallery, examples of the ingenuity of our people and to present exhibits from other nations, whose citizens are so proud of their arts.

I would hope that tours of this Gallery might play a memorable part in the official Washington visits of foreign heads of State, offering them not only a glimpse of our art but an opportunity to enjoy the friendliness and hospitality of our people.

I have therefore approved your recommendation, and am instructing Mr. Lawson Knott, Administrator of the General Services Administration, to transfer the building to the Smithsonian Institution under existing authority. This is contingent, of course, upon your obtaining authorization for the funds necessary to renovate the building for use as a gallery.

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson.

SMITHSONIAN BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

In accordance with the terms of a Joint Resolution approved August 13, 1965, President Johnson, as the presiding officer of the Smithsonian Institution, issued a proclamation to announce the occasion of the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of James Smithson and to designate September 17 and 18, 1965, as special days to honor James Smithson and the accomplishments of the Institution which bears his name.

In his remarks at the Bicentennial Celebration, President Johnson said:

"Yet James Smithson's life and legacy brought meaning to three ideas more powerful than anyone at that time ever dreamed.

"The first idea was that learning respects no geographic boundaries. The Institution bearing his name became the first agency in the United States to promote scientific and scholarly exchange with all nations in the world.

"The second idea was that partnership between Government and private enterprise can serve the greater good of both. The Smithsonian Institution started a new kind of venture in the country, chartered by act of Congress, maintained by both public funds and private contributions. It inspired a relationship which has grown and flowered in a thousand different ways."
“Finally, the Institution financed by Smithson breathed life in the idea that the growth and the spread of learning must be the first work of a nation that seeks to be free.

We must move ahead on every front and every level of learning. We can support Secretary Ripley’s dream of creating a center here at the Smithsonian where great scholars from every nation will come and collaborate. At a more junior level, we can promote the growth of the school-to-school program started under Peace Corps auspices so that our children may learn about—and care about—each other.

Together we must embark on a new and a noble adventure:
First, to assist the education effort of the developing nations and the developing regions.
Second, to help our schools and universities increase their knowledge of the world and the people who inhabit it.
Third, to advance the exchange of students and teachers who travel and work outside their native lands.
Fourth, to increase the free flow of books and ideas and art, of works of science and imagination.
And, fifth, to assemble meetings of men and women from every discipline and every culture to ponder the common problems of mankind.
In all these endeavors, I pledge that the United States will play its full role.’

SMITHSONIAN TROPICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

The Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, located in the Panama Canal Zone, conducts and supports basic biological research, education, and conservation in the tropics. It performs these functions in several ways: by the scientific research of its own staff; through the maintenance of a natural biological reserve on Barro Colorado Island; through operation of research facilities, including both terrestrial and marine laboratories, open to visiting scientists and students; by directing and supporting the education and training of students at all levels from undergraduate to postdoctoral; and by providing technical and scientific information and counsel to other institutions, both private and governmental. On October 20, 1965, President Johnson approved Public Law 80–280 which increased the amount of the authorization for annual appropriations from $10,000 to an amount not to exceed $350,000. These funds are essential to the maintenance of laboratory and other educational and research facilities.

VON DER HEYDT COLLECTION

By an Act approved on July 18, 1966, Public Law 80–503, the Attorney General was authorized to transfer to the Smithsonian Institution title to 44 pieces of jade, stone, and bronze objects of art formerly in the custody of the Attorney General.

NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM

The National Air Museum was established by Public Law 79–722 on August 12, 1946, to memorialize the national development of aviation; collect and display aeronautical equipment of historical interest and significance; serve as a repository for scientific equipment and data pertaining to the development of aviation; and provide educational material for the historical study of aviation. By an Act of July 19, 1966, President Johnson approved an amendment to the original law to add the field of space flight and space history to the province of this Museum and to change the name to National Air and Space Museum. The Act also authorized the appropriation of funds for the construction of the Museum. This Museum is the nation’s center for exhibition, education, and research in the history and principles of air and space flight and represents an unparalleled resource for research in aviation and aerospace history; in flight science and technology; in the contributions of flight to the economy and culture of the United States; and in the pioneering efforts of early aviators and astronauts. It is continuously acquiring, preserving, and documenting historically and technologically important objects and records resulting from air and space research, development,
and exploration. Drawing upon its collections, the Museum produces exhibits and displays portraying the past, present and future of aeronautics and astronautics in America.

Funds in amounts of $511,000 and $1,364,000 were appropriated during fiscal years 1964 and 1965, respectively, for the preparation of plans and specifications for the Museum.

**NATIONAL MUSEUM ACT OF 1966**

The National Museum Act of 1966 recognized the cultural and educational importance of museums to the Nation's progress and the need to preserve and interpret the Nation's heritage for the enrichment of public life in U.S. communities. It authorized the Director of the U.S. National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution to undertake cooperative studies of museum problems and opportunities, engage in cooperative training programs for career museum employees, prepare and distribute significant museum publications, research and contribute to development of museum techniques and cooperate with Federal agencies concerned with museums.

The National Museum Act of 1966 was reported out of the Senate on October 11, 1966, and signed into law on October 15, 1966, as Public Law 89–674. The law carried an authorization for a total $1 million for the first four years of operation to initiate the programs it advocates.

**SMITHSONIAN EXECUTIVE SALARY ACT**

On November 2, 1966, the President approved Public Law 89–734 which provides for compensation at Executive Salary Act levels for four administrative positions of the Smithsonian Institution. This Act fixes the compensation of the positions of Assistant Secretary (Science) and Assistant Secretary (History and Art) at the rate for Level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule, and fixes the compensation of the positions of Director, U.S. National Museum, and Director, Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory at Level V. These positions are now classified at the levels of comparable positions in Federal agencies.

**NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK**

Since 1890, the National Zoological Park has been administered by the Smithsonian "for the advancement of science and instruction and recreation of the people".

By an Act approved on November 6, 1966, Public Law 89–772, the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution was authorized to negotiate agreements granting concessions at the National Zoological Park to nonprofit scientific, educational or historical organizations. The net proceeds from these concessions are to be used exclusively for research and educational work and to provide for the advancement of science and instruction and recreation of the people in keeping with the mission of the National Zoological Park.

Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1966 transmitted to Congress on June 13, 1966, transferred to the Smithsonian Institution all those functions of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia which were vested in the municipal architect of the District with respect to the buildings of the National Zoological Park, and all the functions of that Board which were vested in the engineer of bridges of the District of Columbia in respect to bridges of the National Zoological Park.

By the Act of October 4, 1961, the Board of Regents was authorized to undertake a capital improvement program at the National Zoological Park. The improvement program will modernize the exhibition facilities, eliminate automobile traffic through the Park, and provide facilities for a program of zoological research.

The redevelopment plan is in its seventh year and has been funded in the amount of $7,688,000 through the fiscal year 1968.

**JOSEPH H. HIRSHHORN MUSEUM AND SCULPTURE GARDEN**

The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden will be the permanent home of the collection of art donated by Mr. Hirshhorn to the Smithsonian Institution and accepted on May 17, 1966, by President Johnson for the benefit
of the people of the United States. This museum will be used for the exhibition, study, and preservation of a unique collection of art, including 7,000 paintings, drawings, and sculptures. The gift consists of American paintings from the latter part of the 19th century to the present and American and European sculpture of the 19th and 20th centuries.

By the Act approved on November 7, 1966, the Congress authorized the use of a prominent part of The Mall in Washington, between 7th Street and 9th Street, Independence Avenue and Madison Drive, as the permanent site for the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. The same Act authorized the construction of the museum and sculpture garden at an estimated cost of $15,000,000.

Excerpts from remarks by President Johnson concerning the Joseph H. Hirshhorn gift:

"From the days of his youth in Brooklyn—when he first began collecting reproductions of art work—until this hour, Joseph Hirshhorn has been driven by a passion for painting and sculpture. Throughout the world he has sought the great art of our time—those expressions of man's will to make sense of his experience on earth, to find order and meaning in the physical world about him, to render what is familiar in a new way.

"Many suggestions were made to Mr. Hirshhorn about the disposition of his collection, as well there might be—for among private collections it is virtually without parallel in its field. That he has chosen the Nation's Capital is a cause for celebration, pride and deep gratitude.

"Washington is a city of powerful institutions—the seat of government for the strongest Nation on earth, the place where democratic ideals are translated into reality. It must also be a place of beauty and learning. Its buildings and thoroughfares, its schools, concert halls, and museums should reflect a people whose commitment is to the best that is within them to dream.

"History will record that Joseph H. Hirshhorn has now joined the select company of James Smithson, Charles Freer, and Andrew Mellon, whose earlier contributions to the Smithsonian Institution have so enriched the cultural life of the Nation and its Capital City.

"Mr. Hirshhorn, we accept your splendid gift to the American people. We shall treasure it and use it well—in giving pleasure and enlightenment to men and women of every age, from every walk of life."

Funds in the amount of $800,000 were appropriated in the fiscal year 1968 for the preparation of plans and specifications for the Museum and Garden.

Public Law 90–425 approved on July 26, 1968, authorized an appropriation in the amount of $2,000,000 for the first phase of construction of the museum and also authorized the Administrator of the General Services Administration to enter into contracts in an amount not to exceed $14,107,000 for such construction.

ACQUISITION OF A COLLECTION OF GOLD COINS FROM THE ESTATE OF JOSIAH K. LILLY

Josiah K. Lilly died in May, 1966, leaving a substantial estate. Included in his estate is a unique and valuable numismatic collection of approximately 6,125 gold coins. This collection has been described as the greatest gold coin collection ever assembled by one person or ever likely to be assembled again with superb examples of coinage of practically all nations from ancient to modern times. The collection includes the following principal categories of coins:

United States Colonial, Territorial and Confederate items, including examples of every gold coin minted by the United States with the exception of one $3.00 gold piece, of which only one exists. About 1200 individual items.

Central and South American coinage comprising about 1200 items.

Coinage with European origin from the age of Pericles in Greece through the Roman Empire; the British sovereigns, and examples of coinage of other European countries, comprising about 3500 items.

Chinese and oriental coinage consisting of about 300 items.

Private Law 90–250 provides that upon delivery within thirty days following the approval of this Act to the Smithsonian Institution by the executor of the estate of Josiah K. Lilly of the collection of gold coins left by Mr. Lilly and comprising approximately 6,125 coins, the estate shall be entitled to a credit against the obligation for Federal estate tax in the amount of $5,534,508.

After examining the collection, Dr. V. Clain-Stefanelli, Smithsonian curator of numismatics, stated:
"It surpasses any other collection of gold coins ever assembled by one person. The number of coins it comprises is, in itself, extraordinary, but even more significant is the historical and geographical scope of the collection. One of its most important parts is the United States section, which is virtually complete.

"Every part of the collection evidences unusual numismatic knowledge as well as a most discriminating taste. Mr. J. K. Lilly succeeded in assembling a collection which is without any doubt the largest and historically most important of its kind in private hands. Actually, there is no museum in the United States or for that matter in the entire Western World which has a comparable collection of gold coins. The possible dispersal of the Lilly collection may well be compared with the loss of an irreplaceable work of art or historical monument."

Following Mr. Lilly's death in May 1966, discussions of the preservation of the gold coins as a national collection took place among representatives of the executor, the Treasury Department, the Smithsonian Institution, and Congressmen Bray and Jacobs of Indiana. It was suggested that acquisition of the gold coins by the Smithsonian would be most appropriate in view of the national character of its complex of museums, its dedication to the history and scholarship of numismatics, and the millions of citizens who come to its educational and cultural exhibits each year.

The executor had advised that Mr. Lilly's will did not give him discretion to make a gift of the collection to the Smithsonian and that it was his legal duty to liquidate the assets of the estate promptly at their fair value. In these circumstances it was determined that the only feasible means of preserving this unique collection for the Nation would be the enactment of legislation by the Congress to permit the Smithsonian to acquire the collection through a reduction of the estate's Federal estate tax liability in the amount of the fair market value of the collection.

In order to insure that the terms of transfer would be equitable to all parties, an independent appraisal of the collection was carried out by two internationally recognized experts in numismatics who determined the fair market value of the collection to be $5,534,808. The qualifications of these experts have been recognized by the Treasury Department and the instructions given to the appraisers by the estate were in accordance with the principles prescribed by the Internal Revenue Service for determination of the fair market value for estate tax purposes generally.

The curator of numismatics of the Smithsonian examined the appraisal and concluded that the detailed research and methods of evaluation employed by the appraisers support their determinations as to the individual pieces, significant groups, and the collection as a whole. In this connection, it is pertinent to note that the Treasury Department in a report dated March 28, 1968, to the House Committee on the Judiciary stated that "it is virtually certain that the Internal Revenue Service would not accept a value for the coin collection less than $5,534,808."

In summation, Private Law 90-250 provides a credit to the Lilly estate against its obligation for Federal estate tax in the amount of $5,534,808. The Lilly estate will pay a Federal estate tax on the coin collection to the United States Treasury estimated in the amount of $3,376,233, and to the State of Indiana a tax estimated in the amount of $885,569, in all an estimated estate tax of $4,261,802.

The Lilly estate will receive no greater financial return than it could reasonably expect to realize by sale in the open market. The Federal Government will receive, in the form of the gold coin collection, the full value of the estate tax credit. The Smithsonian Institution will receive on behalf of the American people Mr. Lilly's irreplaceable gold coin collection. Note: The collection was transferred to the Smithsonian Institution on June 13, 1968.

The addition of the Lilly collection to the Smithsonian's numismatic displays makes the national collection second to none in the world. The collection will be of the greatest interest and educational value to the millions of citizens who visit the Mall now and in the future. It will also be preserved as an invaluable and irreplaceable part of the scholarly resources which contain the clues to the unsolved mysteries in the history of man in society.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

Enactment of legislation to establish a National Memorial to Woodrow Wilson represents the culmination of an effort which began when Congress, by a Joint Resolution in 1961, established a Commission to recommend a permanent memorial to Woodrow Wilson in the District of Columbia.
Since 1965, President Johnson has supported the efforts of the Smithsonian Institution and of other interested scholarly organizations, universities, and public agencies to establish in the Nation's Capital a great International Center for Scholars.

At the Smithsonian Bicentennial celebration in September of 1965, the President stated: "We must move ahead on every front and every level of learning. We can support Secretary Ripleys's dream of creating a center here at the Smithsonian where great scholars from every nation will come and collaborate."

Encouraged by this support, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution joined with the Secretary of State, the president of Princeton University, and a number of others, in testifying before the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission, and urging that such a Center should be the Nation's memorial to Woodrow Wilson. In 1966, the Commission submitted its final report to the President and the Congress recommending an International Center for Scholars. Following receipt of this report, President Johnson directed the Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue to conduct a study to develop a plan for the Center.

In 1968, at the request of the President, the Smithsonian Institution submitted legislation incorporating the recommendations of both Commissions which would establish within the Smithsonian Institution the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars as a living national memorial to the 28th President of the United States. It provides for the appointment of scholars from the United States and abroad, for fellowships to such scholars, for the operation of the Center, and for the preparation of plans for the development of necessary buildings and other facilities. The bill provides also for the establishment of a 15-member Board of Trustees with authority to plan, maintain, and administer the Center as a suitable memorial to the spirit of Woodrow Wilson, symbolizing and strengthening the fruitful relations between the world of learning and the world of public affairs.

Public Law 90–637 was signed by the President on October 25, 1968.

CONTINUATION OF THE STATEMENT OF S. DILLON RIPLEY, SECRETARY OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION


Mr. Chairman, so much for history and legislation, except to say that I think the history of the Smithsonian in part illustrates the history of all American museums and cultural institutions. By this I mean that through the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early part of this one, museums drifted into two positions which gradually became separate, or almost polarized.

Many museums came to exist purely as storehouses, as catchalls. Their primary duty was conceived to be to guard, to protect, to curate and to exhibit that which they were fortunate enough to acquire.

Others, especially the science museums, understood that they had an obligation to engage in research, research based largely on their collections, which universities were not equipped to carry out.

The Smithsonian took on the latter character from the beginning. It was written into its legislative charter, as we have seen, and research, or the increase of knowledge, was the principal element in the foundations which Secretary Henry laid down for the Institution.

In Henry's view the Smithsonian existed to stimulate research in pursuit of new truths and to make these truths available to both the public and to professionals, in the arts, sciences and cultural history. His favorite phrase to describe the Institution's ultimate aim was a "College of Discoverers".

Mr. Chairman, I think this is the unifying force, the common factor in all the diverse bureaus and museums of the Smithsonian: the Institution as a "College of Discoverers" which:

First, keeps records of knowledge through its collections;
Second, serves as a stimulus to research, largely through its collections;
Third, and perhaps most important, uses the collections and the results of research for public education.

These three elements may be found to a greater or lesser degree in all the bureaus of the Smithsonian, as they are today. I would like to move on at this point to what we are trying to do today—our most recent objectives and our present management program, if you will.
When I returned to the Smithsonian as Secretary in 1964, the Institution was completing a major cycle of facilities development undertaken to increase its capacity as a research institution. The National Collection of Fine Arts and National Portrait Gallery were readying new quarters with ample study space, in addition to new exhibition and storage spaces. A renovation of the historic Smithsonian Institution Building was in prospect. Fourteen floors of modern research and collection storage space were being completed for the National Museum of Natural History. The splendid new National Museum of History and Technology had just opened, with two floors of scholarly studies and collection storage areas. A research building was being considered as a step in the ten-year construction program of the National Zoological Park. The staff of our tropical research laboratory was preparing to move from restricted quarters on Barro Colorado Island onto the mainland and to establish strategically situated marine biology facilities as their sphere of inquiry widened to include the diverse habitats of Panama and the tropics as a whole. But the administrative and fiscal requirements for the expanded research effort allowed by physical expansion had barely begun and there was little understanding within the wider community of the character and extent of the Smithsonian's interests in research. I felt that my first effort should be to deepen the Institution's emphasis on research, in order to attain the advantages of the building program so successfully carried forward by my predecessor, Dr. Carmichael. So our professional research staff on fulltime appointments has grown, from 243 in 1965 to 310 today.

**SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH**

Without strong support from technical assistants and support divisions such an expansion of the research effort could not be effective since all of these necessary functions would otherwise have to be borne on the shoulders of the research staff.

I have been deeply concerned about the scale of services available from the Smithsonian Institution Libraries, an indispensable auxiliary of all of our research. A distinguished librarian, Dr. Russell Shank, was recruited from the forefront of the library profession, given senior standing, and a pledge of continued support until our Libraries could be judged adequate to the needs of the research enterprise. That day still seems far off, for the constriction in federal funding and freezes on employment, worsened by steadily rising costs for subscriptions and monographs, continues to limit severely the service capacity of our Libraries. This must serve only to double our determination, for the Smithsonian Institution Libraries are unique reference systems in specialized areas not duplicated elsewhere, closely related to the national collections which they complement.

We have sought to increase research support in the form of technicians in our research laboratories and support for field investigations. The oceanography support group, ably led by Dr. I. Eugene Wallen, has been notably successful in expanding opportunities for staff members to go to sea, helping to overcome a very serious lack of ship-time which severely hampered our unique effort in marine biology. An automatic data processing support group has been built up in both Washington and Cambridge to meet needs for computation and information storage.

**THE PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITY**

Scientists and scholars must be treated as professionals, accorded the latitude they must have in order to act responsibly as masters of their domains of subject matter knowledge. One of my first aims as Secretary was to provide that department chairmen serve in rotation "from the ranks" so to speak, and for limited terms, in order to minimize the hazard of an internal seniority system that might block initiative and convert scientists into permanent administrators. Research support is made available to staff members in the form of grants, and from appropriated funds, so that they will act responsibly as principal investigators treating scarce resources as wisely as they would funds of their own. I put an end to pre-publication review by the Secretary of professional publications, preferring to read them as reprints from colleagues rather than submissions for administrative clearance. We cancelled a burdensome annual report required of each staff member about his research because it served unnecessary and merely administrative purposes. Burdensome formal reporting can be no substitute for consultation and constant awareness by supervisors.
Evaluation of professional accomplishment is now conducted by committees of peers formed in the major research units, known as “Professional Accomplishment Evaluation Committees”. Staff members were encouraged to teach in universities on official time (without added compensation) and to request changes of their duty stations at intervals so as to be able to spend a year in study and research without the distractions of daily office routine. Travel to professional meetings was encouraged.

The Bicentennial of the birth of James Smithson took the form of an academic convocation, which we still repeat upon convening our occasional international Symposia, conspicuously celebrating our character as a community of scholars. The Smithsonian Institution Press was reconstituted as a scholarly publishing arm for the Institution and more dignified formats were chosen for the serials in which staff members’ papers are published. Most important of all, among our bureau directors and professional staff members, we have sought to maintain shared respect for the individualistic pursuit of excellence, whether in research, collection development, or the presentation of knowledge to the public. The professionalization of our research community is manifested in many ways and, of course, constitutes one of the greatest strengths of the Institution.

COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

In keeping with the professional character of our staff and in a spirit of service to the Nation, we have sought closer ties with the universities. We have inaugurated programs whereby students and other qualified investigators are freely given access to Smithsonian facilities to conduct their own investigations. Younger visitors and Ph.D. candidates receive supervision from professional staff members. Direct budgetary support for stipends for visiting scholars was secured for the first time from federal appropriations to the Institution. An advisory council, drawn mostly from the universities, was constituted to serve as a visiting committee to advise on the development of general Institution-wide policies affecting basic research and higher education. Control of stipend awards was delegated to committees of professional staff members. These efforts, carefully designed to be cooperative rather than competitive, do not duplicate the efforts of universities but serve to make our facilities and staff capabilities available to them to the extent that funding permits. A strong program of higher education contributes to our research environment and invigorates our institutional life through lively exchanges with universities. The specialized areas of knowledge represented by our highly skilled staff are thus guaranteed survival at a time when many of the disciplines of greatest concern to us have been neglected by many colleges and universities.

HIGHER STANDARDS FOR THE EFFECTIVENESS OF EXHIBITS

We have not allowed ourselves to rest with static presentations of objects in our collections. In order to be successful in conveying knowledge to the wider public, exhibits must involve the viewer actively, reward curiosity, invite exploration. We have sought to raise our standards for the effectiveness of exhibits, to guard against being content merely to show an object and to seek instead to elicit from more of our visitors those active responses and attentive regard that betray a more affirmative understanding or comprehension of the context of the object and its meaning for the citizen. Programs of school tours have been expanded. The number of children on escorted tours has grown from less than 25,000 in 1967 to about 75,000 this year and our corps of volunteer docents has tripled in size. The experimental development of a neighborhood museum in Anacostia, in Washington, showed that museum-like operations may be carried out in the crucible of the inner city, that children may learn with delight and advantage, and that the residents of the area will treat with respect what they regard as their own center for learning and recreation.

We have held annual conferences on the use of museums as educational resources. We created a membership organization, the Smithsonian Society of Associates, in order to permit more people to participate more directly in the offerings of our museums such as popular study and craft courses, special events, and guided field trips. We commissioned the first general survey of visitors to our museums. Much more, needless to say, remains to be done, but unless museums ask of themselves what their visitors have learned they will have no way to gauge their effectiveness. Internal dissatisfaction with the educational impact of our exhibits is healthy and serves to increase our determination to improve them.
INFORMING THE PUBLIC ABOUT THE SMITHSONIAN

A well informed public is the best source of constructive criticism, which we encourage to insure that the Institution does not become insulated from the public it serves.

We changed the Annual Report from a collection of articles written by others, often interesting but not informative about the Institution itself, into a full and detailed statement about all of our activities, the publications of staff members, the results of research, and the expenditure of funds—full disclosure, if you will, in a manner intended to allow any reader of the Report to form his own opinion of our effectiveness and objectives. We established a public information office to facilitate inquiries from external sources. We have had numerous activities reviewed by ad hoc committees drawn from outside the Institution. We have encouraged visits by Members of Congress and others to become informed about the Institution. An example that comes to mind was an evening open house to which we invited the entire Congress to view the exhibits presented in the National Museum of History and Technology. Our new magazine, SMITHSONIAN, will function as an educational benefit of membership in the Society of Associates and also serve the vital function of helping to inform the public about the purposes and operations of the Institution.

INCREASE SUPPORT FROM PRIVATE SOURCES

To widen sources of support from private donors has been another aim of management in recent years. We established an Office of Development and have doubled and redoubled our efforts to secure support from commercial sources and major foundations. A contribution of $375,000 from the Ford Foundation in 1965 to buy land for our biological field station in Maryland was a hopeful augury for the future and I am pleased to report that more than one million dollars has been raised from private sources for this purpose. Given the competitiveness of the quest for private support these days, we feel that our success is an endorsement of the timeliness and quality of our endeavors. The funds so raised are a vital supplement to income from endowment which is inadequate to permit the Smithsonian to respond to the many needs of social service, education, and the experimental phase of new program development. One of the reasons for increasing the number of citizen Regents is to enlist their aid in widening support from the private sector.

STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT

With the increase in responsibilities and higher performance standards has come a need for strengthened management. To enter personnel and payroll information or address lists on our computer was an obvious step, but one which took some years of intensive effort. We created an Office of General Counsel for the first time in the Institution's history and constituted the Office of the Treasurer at the senior level. Service divisions have been brought into closer relation with the units they support. Here is another area wherein our own dissatisfaction with ourselves is the surest safeguard of the public interest. In a period of complex growth we may have given insufficient attention to certain kinds of procedures simply because they showed less sign of strain. I have been enormously pleased by the cooperation we have received from the Office of Management and Budget, the Civil Service Commission, the General Accounting Office, the General Services Administration, this and other Committees of the Congress, and a host of helpful advisors. We need all the help we can get.

At the same time, technical procedures are no substitute for a shared and intense dedication to the public good, through a system of management wherein management responsibility is vested in the very best people one can find, operating with clear warrants to seek and produce the best results attainable. We have sought to develop a concept of shared responsibility rather than to second-guess our bureau and program directors on and on up an endless hierarchy. I have been strongly concerned about the quality of our decision-making and have sought ways to create shared judgments through the establishment of our Secretariat (meeting weekly) and council of bureau directors (meeting monthly). But we are still not satisfied and this hearing is a welcome opportunity to pledge a redoubled effort in the improvement of our management systems.
INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Permit me to touch on a very important aspect of all of our programs—their international character. The pathways followed by knowledge and culture do not observe national boundaries. The quality of research, collection development, and education cannot be maintained without regard to the work of kindred institutions overseas, just as our investigations must be prosecuted around the globe. We inaugurated a major program to apply excess currencies to the needs of scholarship and field research. We created an Office of International Activities to foster cooperation with scholars and institutions in other nations, aided by a Travel Services Office to help staff members in their overseas pursuit. The effects of this renewed international emphasis in our programs of education, conservation, and research have been salutary. The establishment of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars is a further realization of the Congress’s recognition of the Smithsonian’s international role. The tragic failures of international understanding which so mar the recent history of our world surely call for a redoubling of effort by all institutions to seek to increase international understanding through scholarly exchanges and cooperation.

SERVICES TO OUR COMMUNITY

We have attempted to be mindful of our responsibilities as an establishment in a troubled urban area, through services to schools and the Anacostia neighborhood experiment. The annual Festival of American Folklife recently served as an example of an inspiring presentation that appealed to young and old alike. Groups that confronted one another angrily in other settings enjoyed the experience of a common heritage side by side. I believe it is incumbent upon the Smithsonian to take seriously its obligations as a good citizen of the District of Columbia and to be increasingly mindful of a public service responsibility to educational and governmental programs underway here.

COOPERATION WITH GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS

Another objective of management which has become increasingly well established is to maintain strong cooperative links to those programs of major government agencies that the Smithsonian can assist as a performer of research or provider of services. The Satellite Tracking Program conducted on behalf of NASA by the Astrophysical Observatory is a noteworthy instance, or the scientific advisory services we provided the Corps of Engineers regarding pollution in New York Harbor. We have assisted the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Sea Level Canal Commission in ecological studies related to plans for a new sea level canal. For many years we assisted the Department of Interior with salvage archeology in the Missouri River Basin. The Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Sport Fisheries, as well as the Geological Survey and etymology division of the Department of Agriculture, are allotted office space and collection storage facilities in the Natural History Building. Cooperative projects offer an excellent format for the attainment of timely or urgent objectives without our having to build a permanent staff which might outlive the aims of the program under which they had been drawn together.

PLANNING

As one last theme in this review of our management program let me mention planning. Growth must be brought into effective relation to the availability of resources, especially for an establishment such as ours with forty line items in the budget, each of which could very readily be expanded to meet some external or internal need. We recently constituted an executive steering committee of our Secretariat to guide the development of the planning function within the Institution and consider ways to maintain a balance between our pattern of commitments and the resources we may expect. It was my judgment in 1964 that the Institution would have to inaugurate some new programs and achieve order of magnitude increases in some support activities in order to function successfully for the 1970’s—in order to be judged worthy of more financial support from the Congress and private sources. While we have had some very considerable success much remains to be done. In 1964, our federal budget was able to meet only 70 percent of basic research and support needs. Now it meets more than 90 percent, but the elimination of remaining shortages is a priority objective in planning.
This concludes a brief review of what might be termed a management program for the Smithsonian, toward which most of my efforts have been directed during my tenure as Secretary. I would now propose to turn, Mr. Chairman, to a sketch, in very abbreviated form, of our objectives for the next six years.

PLANS FOR THE PERIOD 1970–76

One

The central concerns of the Smithsonian represent national needs for the kind of sustained commitment that can be made only by an institution with a strong sense of continuity, tradition, and concentrated purpose. We believe that our first responsibility is to continue the general lines of endeavor to which my predecessors, with the support of the Congress, committed the Institution: basic research in selected areas of national interest; development and maintenance of the national collections in biology, anthropology, history and the arts; and enlightenment of the public through exhibitions and related activities. The fields of primary concentration would continue to be astronomy, biology, anthropology, and the study of American civilization.

Two

An overriding concern should continue to be the quality of the professional staff effort within the Smithsonian and, I cannot too strongly emphasize, the achievement of an adequate level of support of that effort. I have repeatedly appealed to the President and Congress to remedy deficiencies in support of research and scholarly programs. While virtually half of the growth in appropriations since 1964 has been devoted to staffing and operating new facilities authorized by the Congress, an equal effort has been made to sustain the basic scholarly program: support for field work, instruments, libraries and again libraries, automatic data processing, improved personnel procedures, technician support, related higher education activities, better access to colleagues through scholarly publishing, and unremitting emphasis on the professional character of staff appointments, all against a background of increasing costs. Much remains to be done on this score. We are now documenting the character and extent of these support shortages in even greater detail for the President’s budget in the future. Our budget henceforth will proceed on two tracks—the first a phased elimination of these shortages and the second to provide for the continued development of programs entrusted to us by the Congress.

Three

There are a number of courses we should avoid. We repeatedly decline requests to assume responsibilities which we believe to be too extensive. The Institution is an establishment, somewhat akin to a university or research academy, not a public program agency with massive national operations, field offices, or extensive granting programs. It was once suggested that the Institution assume management of international educational and cultural exchanges funded by the Government, for example, but we could not agree. The Board of Regents has followed a consistent policy against distant museum operations such as regional museums or national museums in cities other than the Capital. Professor Henry’s principle, that the Smithsonian should not bear responsibilities that others are willing to assume, still applies today. While cooperating with universities we should not seek to assume their distinctive functions of general instruction or degree-granting. While cooperating with museums elsewhere we should not interpose this Institution in their relations with one another or with the national Government.

Four

Without infringing the autonomy of our bureaus and their distinctive objectives we shall seek the advantages of existence as a community of scholars wherein scientists and scholars learn from one another. Whether by tracing biochemical relations from one group of organisms to another or studying the behavior of a group of vertebrates first in the tropics and then following on with observations in the setting of the zoo and close anatomical and distributional studies in museum collections, we benefit from association with our colleagues. Similarly scholars working with portraits, genre painting, lithographs, and historical objects can pursue together their mutual interests in the documenting of the American past. Our desire to maintain unity of outlook and professional endeavor suggests that the Smithsonian should avoid program developments that do not in some way reinforce some of its other activities.
Five

The museum as an institution in society is one focus for Smithsonian concern; the other focus is on the vigorous prosecution of lines of study which, if left to themselves, would not receive the attention that the national interest requires. Sometimes we move beyond the museum setting to develop laboratory investigations. When we constitute a museum it is with due emphasis upon its scholarly responsibilities in adding to the store of man's knowledge. These two foci of concern should continue to determine the Smithsonian's course, rather as two points generate an ellipse: neither museums without scholarship nor scholarship without concern for communicating with the public at large, but as in the beginning the increase and the diffusion of knowledge.

Six

Beginning this year the observance of the bicentennial of the American Revolution will become a predominant factor in the development of Smithsonian programs. Within the settings of our history and art museums members of the public may seek a reappraisal of our national experience with due reference to its international setting. Fresh insights of historians should be interwoven with superb offerings of objects and art works that portray our Nation's course over the past two centuries and suggest paths for our continued development.

Seven

From the studies of the sources of energy and means for its use by living systems to the explanation of biological diversity the Smithsonian represents an unexcelled multi-disciplinary array of information resources and professional scientists which bear upon critical needs to improve our understanding of the physical environment upon which human society depends. We anticipate increasing demands upon our efforts in systematic biology, anthropology, astrophysics, and environmental studies as important resources in the national effort in environmental improvement.

Eight

One of the most important unfulfilled hopes for the Smithsonian is that a great national museum might be developed on the Mall to recreate the experience of man's greatest adventure: flight and space exploration. We also aspire to present insights about the significance of the space age for everyday life and to communicate an understanding of the scientific discoveries originating from space exploration. Thus we are coming to appreciate that it is not only machines, or relics of the past, or evidences of the skills of craftsmen that concern us, but man himself. Thus we propose also to continue to study the idea of a museum of man which could convey something of the ever-widening insight into man and society that characterizes the progress of knowledge today.

Nine

The birthright of today's citizen is an understanding of the forces shaping himself and his world. It is to museums that many people look for access to the works of artists, an appreciation of the past, an awareness of the scientific view of nature, and for portents of the future. All museums must experiment with new techniques of exhibition and embark upon research aimed at improving their effectiveness in popular education. The quality of our response to this democratic vista will continue to be a matter of overriding concern to the Smithsonian in years to come.

Ten

From the amassing of great national collections will arise difficult questions about how to guarantee access to the information they contain. This will call for innovative designs of indices, catalogues, and ways to manage vast resources of information. Perhaps some of the techniques developed for the management of voluminous flows of data from satellite observations or oceanographic stations may be adapted to the needs of the future. If man is not to be engulfed by a rising tide of reports, paper, data, computer printout, and memorabilia, organizations such as the Smithsonian must pioneer in winnowing and selecting from the spate of messages that now fill the communications channels of our advanced technological civilization. I wonder if the Smithsonian does not occupy a salient or point-of-vantage from which this concern figures very prominently. In our role as custodian of the Nation's collections we must try to serve the public interest in improved management of scientific and scholarly information.
Finally

In eras of decisive historical change all institutions undergo trials: the challenge of changes in purpose, efforts to adapt to changing circumstances, and perhaps even lapses of confidence from within or without. This is a time of testing and of trial for the university, for the museum, indeed, for our society as a whole. The occurrence of this hearing is evidence, if any were needed, that the Smithsonian is not immune from searching inquiry into its objectives and character. Without such inquiry and without audacious questioning of any comfortable presuppositions, the Smithsonian would lose its value to the people and to future generations. Every institution must be receptive to change, to new patterns of communication, to the concerns of new groupings in society, and to new expectations. If the Smithsonian is to deepen its services to our society we must continue to strengthen our administrative structure, to seek new sources of support, to enlist men and women of principle and insight as officers and staff members, and to hold our performance to ever higher standards of quality and meaningfulness. I submit that the Institution must increase its ability to adapt to changing circumstances, shifting patterns of public needs, and widening horizons of leadership within the Congress and the Executive Branch. Without hesitation on behalf of myself and my colleagues I may say that we welcome your interest and concern and that of this Committee. Mr. Chairman, and are confident that the net effect of your deliberations will be to strengthen the Institution to meet the challenges which the future holds for us all.

Mr. Bradley. In this presentation, the Secretary reveals his concern about the scale of service made available by the Smithsonian Institution libraries, and that he succeeded in getting a distinguished librarian, Dr. Russell Shank, to come with us.

We decided that we certainly needed additional technicians as you have heard, in our research laboratories, and we are trying to get those.

We have a wonderful opportunity for the application of automatic data processing, having so many specimens and objects and artifacts in our collections. It seems to be a natural for handling these through automatic data processing.

In order to treat our scientists and scholars as the professionals that they are, the Secretary adopted a way of making the department chairmen serve in rotation, so that they would not become a built-in block to any given individual in his pursuit of his own research.

The Secretary decided to cancel burdensome annual reports that earlier had been required of each staff member about his research.

He provided that the evaluation of professional performances and accomplishments should be conducted by committees of peers formed in the various major research units, known as Professional Accomplishment Evaluation Committees.

The Secretary, starting with the bicentennial of Smithson’s birth, found the value of academic convocations or symposia, and these seem to be in keeping with our character as a community of scholars.

We have inaugurated programs whereby students and other qualified visitors are freely given access to Smithsonian facilities and staff.

The Advisory Council, drawn mostly from the universities, was constituted to serve as a visiting committee to advise on the development of general institutionwide policies affecting basic research and higher education.
A strong program of higher education contributes to our research environment and invigorates our institutional life through lively exchanges and universities.

We have sought to raise the standards for the effectiveness of exhibits.

There has been created a membership organization known as the Smithsonian Associates, in order to permit more people to participate more directly in the programs and offerings of our museum.

Mr. Thompson. Do those who join that subscribe to or receive the new magazine?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. What is the size of their contribution to become an associate? Does it vary?

Mr. Bradley. It varies just a little bit. In my case, I have a husband-and-wife membership and it is $15. For a family group it is $25 [confers with counsel].

The three levels are $10 for an individual, $15 for a couple and $25 for family.

Mr. Bingham. Do you have with you, or could you submit, a copy of the advertisement that appeared in the New York Times on that?

Mr. Bradley. Certainly, sir; if I may submit that.

Mr. Thompson. That will be made a part of the record.

(The document to be furnished follows:)
And I am escaped with the skin of my teeth.

Thus spake Job: the righteous suffereth.

Thus also said Thornton Wilder in his profound and witty play The Skin of Our Teeth (1942). It showed man surmounting all kinds of perils by dumb luck and adaptability.

In this age of doubt about the future of Man we must be able to do better than merely escape by the skin of our teeth.

The Smithsonian Institution mandate is for the "increase & diffusion of Knowledge." Thus the decision to publish SMITHSONIAN, a new national monthly magazine.

A magazine must have a character and coherence of its own so SMITHSONIAN will be a magazine of Man and all that affects him.

Man is, after all, the most plastic of animals. Yet badgered as he is, buffeted and warped by the frequently deteriorating quality of his life, Man himself gets short shrift from fashionable handwringers and naysayers. We at SMITHSONIAN will deal importantly with urban Man, who today represents the majority.

We will tell of Man's staggering problems, his struggles, his search for solutions and his progress in finding them. Through the eye of science we will discern the alternatives in Man's future. From the history of yesterday's events we will fashion guideposts for today and tomorrow. And in the world of art we will discover anew those moments of glory and provocation that still raise man above the level of his environment. In our pages these great fields of interest become the settings for the greater drama of today's Man.

We consider superior writing and photography to be essential. Each month our pages will contain the fresh selected work of the world's top professionals, backed by all the expertise of our remarkable Institution. Our articles will probe Man's disasters, from oil spills to famines; clear his predilections, from overpopulation to pollution; and join battle for his improvement. We will decry the blind growth of technology but never lose sight of the Bad Old Days that technology bettered. Always we will give our readers an acute sense of participation in the areas explored by SMITHSONIAN.

Above all, we will keep our eyes firmly upon this harassed biped, showing how he can reestablish control over his environment. For, in the past, Man has reached peaks of development when his honesty of purpose, his sense of responsibility and his love of beauty combined to create what we call civilization.

We think the book is by no means closed on Man. Here at SMITHSONIAN we are helping write it. We are basically pragmatic yea-sayers.

The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, S. Dillon Ripley, has stated, "We are far more than one of the world's greatest museum complexes. Our charter provides the broadest conceivable base . . . to carry on research and educational programs."

SMITHSONIAN is long overdue. Although the Smithsonian is a national institution, it is known mostly to those Americans who make a brief patriotic pilgrimage to the capital. Only in the Washington area has it been possible, through the activities of the Smithsonian Associates, to widen this acquaintance. Now building on a solid achievement of the Associates, the magazine will enable all Americans to join, if vicariously, in an exciting exploration of subjects in which the Smithsonian is interested. It will speak not only of the Institution, but more frequently, for the Institution on many vital matters.

So, again, Man.

Who is he, what he is, how he got here, where he's going; how he lives and dies; what he does and what is done to him; Man in his present state, untidy, often demoralized, ever hopeful, solving problems and creating new ones, crowding this planet but reaching beyond the moon, both violently destructive and endlessly creative; he is the most interesting subject in the world.

For Man is, as Protagoras said nearly twenty-five hundred years ago, "the measure of all things." All things. We shall use Man as the yardstick to tell about the world as it is, will be or should be.

Edward K. Thompson
Editor, SMITHSONIAN
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C. 20560

Thomas H. Black
Advertising Director
Advising and Circulation offices 420 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017
(212) 532-3526

Subscription circulation guarantee: 175,000
Subscription: $10 a year
First issue: April 1970
And monthly thereafter
Mr. Thompson. What disposition is made from these Smithsonian Associate membership funds?
Mr. Bradley. They are plowed back into Associate activities in order to finance the activities themselves. For example, a bus to go down to the Chesapeake Bay Center for field biology or something of that sort. So they are essentially plowed back into the program, usually the same program that generates the revenue.

SMITHSONIAN ASSOCIATES RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS FROM INCEPTION THROUGH JUNE 30, 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Disbursements</th>
<th>Income (loss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>$50,642.00</td>
<td>$30,854.00</td>
<td>$19,788.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>114,685.87</td>
<td>92,374.26</td>
<td>22,311.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>207,689.22</td>
<td>182,282.93</td>
<td>25,406.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>298,767.72</td>
<td>278,068.56</td>
<td>20,719.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>340,681.64</td>
<td>347,152.10</td>
<td>(6,470.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,012,486.45</td>
<td>930,731.84</td>
<td>81,754.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Smithsonian Associates were established Sept. 18, 1965.

Mr. Thompson. Do these become part of the private funds?
Mr. Bradley. They do.
Mr. Thompson. Who is the fiduciary officer?
Mr. Bradley. Mr. Wheeler, sir.
Mr. Thompson. And these are segregated from the publicly appropriated funds?
Mr. Bradley. They are.
Mr. Thompson. And from the other trust funds?
Mr. Bradley. Yes.
Mr. Thompson. They don’t become a trust fund, do they?
Mr. Bradley. No. They retain their identity.
Mr. Schwengel. How many subscribers have you?
Mr. Bradley. 180,000 subscribers to the magazine.
Mr. Schwengel. That is to the magazine?
Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir.
Mr. Schwengel. It is very good, too. I think I subscribed to the $10 one.
Do you have the number of different categories? Could you give us those from the top of your head, the $10, $15, and $20?
Mr. Bradley. I don’t have those, but I can certainly submit them for the record.
(The information to be furnished follows:)

CATEGORIES AND NUMBERS OF MEMBERS OF THE SMITHSONIAN ASSOCIATES

(1) Resident Members.—(Live in the Washington area, receive invitations to special events and first option and reduced rates to lecture courses, workshops, craft courses and guided tours, for both adults and young. Also have option to subscribe to Smithsonian magazine at reduced rate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Membership fee</th>
<th>Current number of members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>3,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double (husband and wife)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total members (based on average of 3 children in family unit memberships)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Schwengel. I am intrigued with the varied fees. What do the $15 members get that the $10 members do not?

Mr. Bradley. Two people against one. It is for a husband and wife.

Mr. Schwengel. Does it cost any more to serve two people than one?

Mr. Bradley. My wife goes when I don't go. I think it would, yes, sir.

Mr. Schwengel. If your wife goes to the meetings, there would be two people instead of one. But as far as the advantages, there are no other advantages. You get one publication. is that right, for each family?

Mr. Bradley. Yes.

Mr. Schwengel. What is your average attendance at these meetings?

Mr. Bradley. It varies so much, Mr. Schwengel. It may be a small work group of no more than 12 and it might be a lecture or a movie or something with 500.

Mr. Thompson. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. Schwengel. Yes.

Mr. Thompson. Let us assume there was a movie in one of your auditoriums with a capacity of 500. Is this restricted only to subscribers of the Smithsonian fund?

Mr. Bradley. In that particular case it would be, yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. In other words, by joining, either as an individual, a couple or a family, then they have privileges with respect to the Institution that others do not have, is that correct?

Mr. Bradley. That is correct.

Mr. Thompson. So in addition to getting the magazine, they have access to certain lectures and other things that the general public does not have access to?

Mr. Bradley. Sir: I need to say that they have access to some things at a slightly reduced rate. It is possible for a nonmember, let us say, to take the bus trip down to the Chesapeake Bay Center that I was referring to awhile ago, whereas the Smithsonian Associate would get that at a slightly reduced rate.

In other words, the Smithsonian Associate matters are not entirely exclusively for Smithsonian Associates.

Mr. Thompson. Let us set aside the bus trip because that involves the chartering of a vehicle and extraordinary expense. Let us talk about something that a member of the Smithsonian friends would get using the Institution's existing facilities that a nonmember would not be able to go to.

Mr. Bradley. One thing that comes to mind, Mr. Chairman, is we had a "Behind the Scenes" night where the staff volunteered to come to work, and the exhibit workers and technicians showed people around behind the scenes where normally the public is not admitted.

That turned out to be a rather popular thing.

May I ask Mr. Warner to supplement this or to correct me? He is Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs.
STATEMENT OF WILLIAM W. WARNER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY (PUBLIC SERVICE), SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. Warner. Mr. Chairman, the membership of the associates is as Mr. Bradley described it. But just to clear up, we do give some events for the associates which are for associates only and are free of charge. These are most often openings or preopenings of exhibits. Then there are other categories of events which, as Mr. Bradley explained, are offered first to the associates at a reduced rate—these may be classes, field trips, lectures, theatrical performances—and if they do not fill up with our membership at a reduced rate, then we also put them before the public later.

Mr. Thompson. And you have 185,000?

Mr. Warner. We have 180,000 subscribers to the magazine, who are national members of the Smithsonian Associates.

Mr. Thompson. What do they pay?

Mr. Warner. They pay $10 for the membership per year, and that is all. They receive the magazine and certain other benefits, such as discounts to museum shop articles, discounts on press books. Also, we offer study trips. We can't offer all 180,000 members across the Nation everything we offer our resident members here.

Mr. Thompson. Does the resident associate pay more than the nonresident?

Mr. Warner. Yes. He pays $10 for the single membership, $15 for husband and wife, and $25 for a family. They are the ones that go to the openings, for whom we give special classes and so on.

The national members receive only the magazine and a few other small fringe benefits such as I have described.

Mr. Thompson. Have you projected such things as chartered aircraft trips abroad?

Mr. Warner. We have never taken a total charter as yet. We have availed ourselves of group fares and we have conducted foreign study tours. There is one going in Greece right now, for example.

Mr. Thompson. Are invitations to such a trip issued only to those who are associates?

Mr. Warner. That is correct.

Mr. Schwengel. A member who lives in California, would he pay $10?

Mr. Warner. Yes. We do have a few California members, Mr. Schwengel. When the associates were formed, the resident or local associates, that is, 4 years ago, some few people from California chose to join. We didn't return their checks. Obviously, up to the point when the magazine was started, about 95 percent of our membership in the associates was from the Washington area. We didn't refuse out-of-towners, but most of our membership was local.

Then, with the birth of the magazine in April, we created two categories, resident members and national members.

Mr. Schwengel. What does the national member pay?

Mr. Warner. The national member pays only $10, sir; for the magazine, and these other fringe benefits that I described.

Mr. Thompson. And sell advertisements in the magazine?

Mr. Warner. Yes; we do, sir. We have from the beginning.
Mr. Thompson. What is your profit and loss figure on these memberships?

Mr. Warner. The resident associate program has been self-sustaining almost since the beginning and has shown a slight profit. We actually had a small loss this year in the resident program of around $23,000. But most of the years it makes money.

On the returns from national membership, that is, the magazine, I think we project that we will turn the corner and start making a profit in about a year from now.

Mr. Thompson. You have this in a segregated fund, do you?

Mr. Warner. Yes; we keep it in a separate account. Mr. Wheeler, the treasurer, keeps a separate account on the magazine expenditures and how the returns are coming in.

Mr. Thompson. Suppose you were to incur a loss of $50,000 in a year or over a period of 2 or 3 years. How would you recoup that loss?

Mr. Warner. I think probably we would have to take a good look at whatever the activity was, and either cancel it or seek to strengthen it. But so far nothing of this kind has happened with the Associates, sir.

Mr. Thompson. And the Regents decided to embark on this program?

Mr. Warner. Yes; they did. We discussed the magazine over four of the biannual Regents' meetings and they voted decisively to go ahead with it at their meeting of last January.

Mr. Thompson. Yes: I have seen the most recent issue, with the elephants on it, which was very attractive.

Mr. Bingham. This is a tiny point, but do the Regents meet twice a year or every 2 years?

Mr. Warner. Normally, they meet twice a year but lately we have taken to having two regular meetings and one informational meeting.

Mr. Bradley. Last year they met three times and we have a third meeting scheduled for this year so it appears that the answer from here on out will be at least three times a year.

Mr. Bingham. Someone spoke of biennial meetings, which would be every 2 years.

Mr. Warner. I meant to say semi-annually, or twice a year. I beg your pardon.

Mr. Bingham. I am not clear whether the resident associate pays the $10 and gets the magazine or does he pay another $10?

Mr. Warner. He pays another $8. We offered the magazine to our existing resident associates here in Washington who have been with us all along on an option basis. They got it at $8, a $2 reduction, if they wanted it. It was optional.

Mr. Schwengel. How many times a year do you publish the magazine?

Mr. Warner. It is a monthly.

Mr. Schwengel. It is a monthly and goes to 180,000 people?

Mr. Warner. That is the current circulation, yes, sir.

Mr. Schwengel. Who does the printing on this?

Mr. Warner. Sir: the printing is done outside, by Fawcett Press here in Washington.
Mr. Schwengel. Do you have bids on this with other printers?

Mr. Warner. Yes.

Mr. Schwengel. How many pages are in this item?

Mr. Warner. This issue, which is just now in the mail, the fifth issue, has 64 pages.

Mr. Schwengel. What does that cost you?

Mr. Warner. The per issue cost, sir?

Mr. Schwengel. Yes.

Mr. Warner. I would have to break that down for you.

Mr. Schwengel. Do you have a financial statement on this operation?

Mr. Warner. Yes. Mr. Wheeler has a financial statement.

Mr. Schwengel. Is there any objection to having it in the record here?

Mr. Warner. No, sir.

Mr. Schwengel. I ask unanimous consent to have it put into the record, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thompson. Very well.

It is a very exemplary magazine and very interesting.

Smithsonian magazine

Inception to June 30, 1970:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertising income</td>
<td>$67,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions earned</td>
<td>574,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (gifts, etc.)</td>
<td>54,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income</strong></td>
<td><strong>697,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Bradley. That concludes just about everything we wanted to offer.

I do have an organizational chart with me. You said last week we should reduce this photographically. This we shall do.

If you will recall, we emphasized that these are the programmatic efforts of the Institution, broken down into academic programs, public service programs, the field of history and art, science, National Museum and the Woodrow Wilson Center.

Then we have the supporting activities which represent administrative and in some cases technical services.

I don’t know, sir; if you wanted to take a quick look at the Smithsonian in statistical and graphical terms. Starting back in 1957, here it is on this chart, up to 1971. These various symbols represent appropriations—well, this one, for example (indicating), was when Smithsonian first turned the corner with an appropriation for the Museum of History and Technology.

This particular bar, the vertical stripe, represents the growth in the visitor load.
Mr. Harvey. Why would the zoo be included in there?

Mr. Bradley. Sir; the zoo has just this year, for the first time, been included within the budget of the Smithsonian Institution. Starting back in 1962, we had the Capital improvement program under the Smithsonian, but the operating budget was in the District of Columbia budget.

Going back to 1890, the zoo was created under Secretary Langley as a bureau of the Smithsonian but was split for financing, partly Federal and partly by the District of Columbia.

Mr. Harvey. If I can ask one question, I notice on the other chart that you had, the National Gallery of Art and the Kennedy Center were also listed with sort of a dotted line.

What is their relationship here?

Mr. Bradley. Legally, the law says there is created in the Smithsonian the Kennedy Center and the National Gallery of Art. They have identical acts to begin with.

Mr. Thompson. I can perhaps answer that as the author of the Kennedy Center legislation. It had to be put somewhere for housekeeping purposes, and the Smithsonian was most logical and at the time the least controversial.

Mr. Harvey. Is the National Gallery of Art also located in the Smithsonian?

Mr. Thompson. Yes.

Is the Director of the National Gallery selected by the Regents?

Mr. Bradley. No, sir. He is selected by the trustees of the National Gallery.

Mr. Thompson. That is the continuous quasi-thing that you are responsible for, in a sense, for housekeeping purposes?

Mr. Bradley. To some extent; yes, sir.

That concludes what I had to offer, Mr. Chairman, unless there are questions.

Mr. Thompson. I have one or two questions. As I understand the chart, I notice that the level of visitors has sort of evened off since about 1959, is that right?

Mr. Bradley. Well, sir, it continues to climb, really.

Here is the line (indicating), and then we did have trouble in 1968 with the social unrest situation. That curtailed tourism. But now it has gone back up and it looks like it is going as shown here.

There is a leveling off shown.

Mr. Thompson. The blue bar represents the number of permanent positions?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. I notice a rather heavy rise.

Mr. Bradley. This is not entirely, but primarily, weighted by taking the zoo into this appropriation.

Mr. Bingham. What about attendance at the zoo, is that reflected?

Mr. Bradley. That is in here, yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. Is it lumped in with the general attendance?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir; it is lumped in.

Mr. Harvey. Is it only in the last 2 years?

Mr. Bradley. It has been spread back through. The zoo was always legally a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution. It is just that we got the operating money from the District of Columbia Government.
Mr. Thompson. Who appoints the director of the zoo?

Mr. Bradley. The Secretary, with the consent of the regents.

Mr. Thompson. Mr. Bingham.

Mr. Bingham. I would like to pursue a little further this matter of the National Gallery and the Kennedy Center. Frankly, it troubles me a little bit and I would think it would trouble the Smithsonian.

What precise functions do you perform, if any?

Mr. Bradley. For the Kennedy Center there was a requirement in the law that the regents first make a finding—this was critical and this has been done—that there were sufficient funds to go into construction, and on the basis of certified fund availability by the certified public accountant and certified costs by the General Services Administration, the regents made that finding and notified the Speaker and the President of the Senate. They were not responsible after that.

There is also a requirement that a memorial to former President Kennedy be approved in its design by the Board of Regents before it is added to the Kennedy Center. That has not yet been done.

There is a requirement that the Secretary serve ex officio as one of the trustees, as in the past have other members of the Board of Regents served.

There is a requirement that the Kennedy Center make a report, an annual report, to the Smithsonian and it is incorporated in ours and goes in the same report to the Congress. They write the report; we receive it.

Mr. Bingham. If they have budget requests, and I don't suppose they do at the moment, would that go through the Institution?

Mr. Bradley. It would not go through the Institution, no. The Secretary would be exposed to it as a member of the board of trustees, as an individual.

Mr. Bingham. Do they now submit any request for appropriations?

Mr. Thompson. Yes; they do, and they go through, I believe, the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee. We did that as recently as last year.

Mr. Bingham. Does the National Gallery submit a budget request? Do they have an appropriation?

Mr. Bradley. Yes. Every year they obtain an annual operating appropriation from the Congress for the building, the National Gallery of Art on Constitution Avenue. It does not come through the Smithsonian Institution. But, again, the Secretary is exposed to it as a member of the board of trustees.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you very much, Mr. Bradley. That will conclude your testimony, except when you prepare the answers to the questions raised by Senator Goldwater we may need to elaborate, which I hope we don't have to do.

Mr. Bradley. Very good, sir.

Mr. Thompson. Our next witnesses are Dr. Ripley, the Secretary of the Smithsonian, and Mr. T. Ames Wheeler, the Treasurer, who will describe the financial management in general along with regulations and procedures.

Dr. Ripley. My purpose here this afternoon essentially is to introduce Mr. Wheeler as the Treasurer, and to express to you our personal satisfaction that we have been able to lure Mr. Wheeler to work for the Smithsonian.
During the past 2 years of his incumbency as Treasurer, he has performed notably in attempting to bring together problems of audit, of preparation of budget, of planning for the budget, and of the constant supervision, both of the Federal and of the private side.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are very welcome, Mr. Wheeler.

Before going further, I would like to thank Mr. Bradley for his very comprehensive and well done statement. I look forward now to hearing from you.

STATEMENT OF T. AMES WHEELER, TREASURER, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION; ACCOMPANIED BY JOHN JAMESON, DIRECTOR, PROGRAMING AND BUDGET; BETTY J. MORGAN, ASSISTANT TREASURER; AND ALLAN GOFF, CHIEF, ACCOUNTING DIVISION, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. Wheeler. Thank you, sir.

First, may I introduce three members of my staff who will support me, if necessary: Mrs. Morgan, Assistant Treasurer; Allan Goff, our Chief Accountant; and John Jameson, behind me, head of our Office of Programming and Budget.

Mr. Chairman, I have a prepared statement.

If possible, I would like to have it printed in the record.

Mr. Thompson. Without objection, it will be printed in full at this point and you may proceed.

(The document referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF T. AMES WHEELER, TREASURER OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SMITHSONIAN FINANCES AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee, as the Committee already knows, the Smithsonian Institution is supported by both private and federal funds. The origin of the private funds and the circumstances leading to the initiation of and growing support from federal appropriations have already been outlined by Secretary Ripley. In order to discuss the finances and financial management of the Institution, however, I would first like to present a more definite and comprehensive picture of sources of current support for the Institution.

For this purpose there is submitted herewith a table of the sources of financial support for the fiscal year 1970.

For operating purposes

Federal appropriations:

Salaries and expenses—operating funds.............................................. $20,965,000
Special foreign currency program...................................................... 2,316,000
District of Columbia—operations of the National Zoo.......................... 2,502,000
Research grants and contracts (Federal and private)............................. 10,600,000

Private funds:

Gifts—excluding gifts to endowment funds (entire amount restricted to specific projects and hence unavailable for general operating expenses).................................................. 2,000,000
Income from endowments and current fund investments......................... 1,400,000

Total support for operations......................................................... 49,083,000

In addition, Federal appropriations to finance construction projects were received as follows:
For construction

National Zoological Park.................................................. $600,000
Restoration and renovation of buildings.............................. 525,000
Toward construction of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and
sculpture garden.................................................................. 3,500,000

Total construction................................................................ 4,625,000

Concerning the above FY 1970 construction appropriations, the $3,500,000 for the Hirshhorn Museum was an addition to the total of $2,503,000 already appropriated in FY 1968 and FY 1969 for this project; for FY 1971 an additional $5,200,000 has been voted by both the House and the Senate toward continuation of construction. The $600,000 appropriation for the Zoo provided for essential modernization, safety and preventive maintenance projects of its heating plant and other structures. The remaining $525,000 appropriation was principally for relocation of our Radiation Biology Laboratory and continued renovation of the old Court of Claims building for the Renwick Gallery.

For operating purposes, federal appropriations for FY 1970 totalled $29,955,000, including supplemental appropriations toward the cost of federally legislated wage and salary increases during the year. In addition, $2,802,000 was received through the District of Columbia to provide for operations of the National Zoo. In the current FY 1971 this financial support for Zoo operations is being incorporated in the regular Smithsonian appropriation from Congress rather than being provided by the District of Columbia. Thus the total of these federal appropriations for salaries and expenses amounted to $32,730,000 in FY 1970. It appears that for current year FY 1971 the corresponding figure may approximate $30,750,000, again including assumed supplemental appropriations for wage and salary increases.

In addition to this support, Congress provided $2,316,000 for implementation of the Smithsonian Foreign Currency Program under which we administer a program of grants in U.S.-owned "excess" foreign currencies to more than fifty museums and universities in the United States for the purpose of carrying on research in the "excess" currency countries.

As has been mentioned by Secretary Ripley, the Smithsonian receives a substantial amount of research grants and contracts, which in FY 1970 totalled about $10,600,000. This type of support has been reduced in the past year, reflecting primarily cutbacks by NASA for the Satellite Tracking Program at our Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory. The full extent of these cutbacks will not be realized until FY 1971, and the total of this type of support will therefore be lower in the current year, more like $8,000,000. These cutbacks have caused a drastic reduction in forces at our Astrophysical Observatory in Cambridge, Mass.

Private funds support comes from two sources. One source is current contributions. In recent years these have been made almost entirely for specific current projects such as the purchase of additional land for our Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Sciences or the installation of the Calder Stable at the Museum of History and Technology. Such gifts do not become a part of our endowment funds, nor are they available, of course, for the general operating expenses of the Institution. In FY 1970 these contributions totalled about $2,000,000.

The other source of private support is the income from our endowment fund investments and certain additional investments included in our current funds. Both of these have been built up over a long period of years, principally from gifts to the Institution, including, of course, Mr. Smithsonian's original bequest.

The largest single endowment fund is the Freer Fund. As originally received from Mr. Freer in 1915, this fund had a value of just under $2,000,000. The Freer Fund, which is maintained separately both for investment and accounting purposes, and whose income is restricted to the support of the Freer Gallery, now has a market value of about $16,000,000, despite recent severe declines in bond and stock prices.
Another large endowment fund dedicated to underwater research and exploration has been established within the past year from two related contributions totalling about $6,000,000. A few of the earlier important contributions making up our overall endowment funds include the Charles D. and Mary Vaux Walcott Funds for geological research; the Sprague Fund for studies of the physical sciences; the Admiral and Mrs. DeWitt Clinton Ramsey Fund for research and education relating to U.S. Naval flight history in the United States. The two Roebling Funds, incidentally, which were referred to previously by Mr. Ripley, are now valued at approximately $220,000 and $45,000 respectively. The total value of all of our endowment funds as of June 30, 1970 was approximately $33,000,000.

By Congressional legislation it is provided that $1,000,000 of these funds, known as the Permanent Fund, is maintained in the U.S. Treasury at 6% annual interest, while additional monies are invested as directed by the Institution itself.

The total income received by the Institution from these $33,000,000 of endowment funds, and from some $2,500,000 of investments included in our current fund accounts, was $1,400,000 in FY 1970. All of these funds, whether designated by the donor to support restricted or unrestricted purposes of the Institution, are of tremendous benefit. It should be noted, however, that of the total annual investment income of $1,400,000, only about $440,000 in FY 1970 was for unrestricted purposes—a pitifully small amount in relation to our needs. It is our hope that this type of income can be increased substantially over the next few years.

As has been stated before this Committee, the private funds of the Institution are audited annually by independent public accountants. Prior to 1909, the Executive Committee of the Smithsonian Board of Regents performed this audit; from 1909 to 1947 the audits were conducted by Mr. William L. Yaeger, CPA. Since 1947 these audits have been performed regularly by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co., one of the largest and best known auditing firms, not only in this country but also the world over. These audit reports are, of course, presented regularly to our Board of Regents along with semiannual explanations of current financial developments. A somewhat condensed version of the Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. report is included regularly in our Smithsonian Yearbook, which is distributed quite widely and of which I hope you have already received copies. I would like to submit to this Committee at this time a copy of the latest complete report of the auditors, namely, for FY 1969. It includes, of course, complete financial balance sheets and statements of changes in fund balances during the year for both current funds and endowment funds, with detail as to the breakdown of the restricted funds and the endowment funds. We shall, of course, be glad to answer any questions you may have with respect to these statements.

I believe it is evident from this broad picture of the Smithsonian's finances that the accounting problems of the Institution are indeed complicated. We operate, in effect, with six different kinds of monies, namely:

- Federal funds for current operating purposes.
- Federal funds for construction projects.
- Private unrestricted funds.
- Private restricted funds.
- Grant and contract moneys.
- Foreign currencies.

At the same time, our activities are spread over some forty different bureaus, offices and activities of the Institution. These operations are carried out in six different locations in the United States as well as in Panama, with additional research projects being conducted under grants and contracts in many foreign countries. Many of the most diversified of these operations have come into being in fairly recent years. The result from a financial and accounting standpoint is that we have outgrown our previous relatively simple accounting system.

To meet this situation the Smithsonian has been striving with the utmost vigor over the past two years or more to revise its financial and accounting methods so as to provide the modern management information and control system needed to give proper guidance for the direction of this diversified Institution. Allow me to outline these for you briefly.
For management control purposes we must, from a financial standpoint, be able to answer three questions: Where have we been? Where are we now? And where are we going?

On the private funds side we have accomplished the following improvements in order to achieve these goals:

Completely revised the previous form of balance sheet and statement of changes in fund balances to supply more meaningful and more easily understood financial facts.

Designed and installed a new system of monthly reports of income and expenditure for all of our offices or activities for which we budget private funds. These also give us monthly our overall financial results for our unrestricted funds and the status of our various current restricted funds and endowment funds.

Established annual budgets for these individual offices and activities, which are then monitored on a monthly basis with the division heads.

Established 12-months' forecasts of cash flow, thereby enabling us to do a more intelligent job of investing any available surplus private cash balances.

On the federal funds side we have been providing regularly to each of our bureaus and offices a statement of disbursements, monies obligated against allotments, and remaining balances of federal appropriations. Our system provides for certification by the fiscal and supply departments, prior to issuance of purchase orders, that the necessary funds are both available and properly chargeable to the related appropriation allotment. With these reports and controls, we have, to the best of my knowledge, never overspent or overobligated any of our annual federal appropriations. Nevertheless, we are making improvements in the area of federal fund accounting as follows:

The form of these monthly reports of federal disbursements, obligations, and fund balances is being revised, effective July 1970, to improve their clarity and timeliness.

Our annual budgetary requests to Congress for federally appropriated monies have been vastly improved to the point that we have been complemented by the Appropriations Subcommittees of the Senate and the House upon the current type of presentation.

During the past year we have begun placing greater emphasis upon identification of the relative priorities of the Institution's already-established activities with the objective of minimizing or eliminating support to low priority programs and thereby making possible more worthwhile projects with minimum additional support from Congress.

In the process of implementing these new and improved procedures, we have also undertaken some fundamental revisions necessary to accomplish the changes listed above and at the same time introduce greater efficiency in our accounting practices. These include:

Reorganization of the Fiscal Division. The previous separate "Federal" and "Private" fiscal departments were merged in May 1969. By this action it has been possible to eliminate duplicate supervision of certain accounting sections, achieve better cooperation between the two sides of our financial house, introduce better opportunities for advancement of our employees, and generally upgrade the calibre and training of our employees.

A comprehensive new uniform coding system for all accounting transactions, both federal and private, has been adopted.

A new computer program for the combined requirements of our Payroll and Personnel departments has been designed and installed, thereby providing substantially more useful information while eliminating duplication of effort.

New procedure manuals have been issued governing our procurement practices and the control of property items acquired by the Institution.

With the assistance of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.'s advisory services, we are just completing a survey of the fundamentals of our accounting system in which we have obtained a complete revision of the fundamental Chart of Accounts, which will eventually make it possible to obtain automatically from the computer our regular monthly management control reports as
opposed to the present difficult and time-consuming manual preparation. From this consulting study we are also able, beginning July 1, 1970, to initiate a full system of accrual accounting, for both private and federal funds, which the Federal Government has been promoting for a number of years. Finally, this survey will give us the framework for further improvements in our procedures, which will lead to complete modernization of our accounting system over the next year or two.

Finally, I should mention that in July 1969 we reinstituted internal auditing procedures, although on a minimum basis dictated by limited funds and authorized number of positions. As of July 1970 this internal auditing department, which will provide continuing surveillance of federal and private activities alike, has been expanded to four internal auditors and a secretary.

In summary, then, it can fairly be stated that our financial and accounting controls have been adequate to prevent overspending or misspending of the Institution's federal appropriations. Our private funds are independently audited each year and disclosed fully to the Institution's Board of Regents at the Board's regular meetings, with further annual disclosure to the public in the Smithsonian Yearbooks. At the same time, it has been fully recognized that by reason of the rapid growth of the Institution, improvements were needed both in our accounting operations and in our codification of internal procedures. Strenuous efforts to achieve these improvements have been underway for over two years, with major segments of the program already accomplished and the remaining portion scheduled to be completed as rapidly as possible in the next year or so.

Mr. Wheeler. In order to introduce this subject, I have included in this statement a table showing a comprehensive picture of our financial support in the fiscal year 1970.

Some of these figures will duplicate some you have already heard from Mr. Bradley and perhaps others, so I will try and keep them short.

It shows in this table that our total support for operations was just over $49 million in fiscal year 1970, and that in addition, we received $4,625,000 of Federal appropriations for construction.

The construction moneys are totally Federal—$4,600,000 included about $3.5 million for continuing the construction of the Hirshhorn Museum, $600,000 for the zoo, and $525,000 principally for the relocation of our Radiation Biology Laboratory and for continued renovation of the old Court of Claims building for the Renwick Gallery.

Included in the $49 million of operating funds is a total of Federal appropriations for salaries and expenses of $32,800,000. That indicates the money for the zoo.

I have put it together with the Federal appropriation, even though it came through the District of Columbia, because I would like to make a comparison that this year, I believe, the corresponding figure for 1971 will rise to about $36,750,000. That is a little more than Mr. Bradley's figure because it includes assumed supplemental appropriations for the continued salary and wage increases that will be continuing on a full year basis in 1971.

Mr. Thompson. That was made necessary by statutory enactment.

Mr. Wheeler. That is correct.

Mr. Thompson. And they apply, I would assume, only to the Federal employees, is that correct?

Mr. Wheeler. That is correct, yes, sir. Private salaries went up, too, but they are not in that figure.

Mr. Thompson. In connection with the two, as the treasurer, are you responsible at once not only for the handling and disposition of the Federal monies, but those of the private funds as well, all of the trust funds and so on?
Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.
In addition to those figures which I have cited, Congress provided the $2,316,000 which was discussed in the foreign currency program, and I believe the figure this year will be about $2.5 million.

As has been mentioned, we also receive a substantial amount of research grants and contracts, and in fiscal 1970, that totaled $10,600,000.

This type of support has been reduced in the past year, primarily reflecting the cutbacks by NASA in our satellite tracking program up at the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory in Cambridge.

The full extent of these cutbacks will not be seen until the current fiscal year, and the support from grants and contracts will probably be closer to $8 million this year, down from $10.6 million.

These cutbacks, incidentally, have caused a very drastic reduction in the forces at our atrophysical observatory in Cambridge.

Mr. Thompson. Were they temporary forces needed because of the tracking programs?

Mr. Wheeler. Well, they had been on that program so long that they really didn't feel they were temporary, no, sir.

Now turning from Federal to private fund support, the private fund support comes from two sources. The first one I will mention is current contributions.

In recent years these have been almost entirely for specific projects, such as funds to acquire additional lands out at our Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Sciences. These gifts do not become a part of our endowment funds and they are not available for the general operating expenses of the Institution.

They are available only for the specific purpose for which they were given.

In fiscal year 1970, these contributions totaled about $2 million.

The other source of private support in income from our endowment fund investments, which has been mentioned here. These endowment funds and certain investments included also in our current funds both have been built up over a long period of years, principally from contributions.

They include, of course, Mr. Smithson's original bequest, also.

The largest single endowment fund is the Freer Fund. This was originally received from Mr. Charles Freer in 1915. At that time, it had a value of just under $2 million. This fund is maintained separately for investment and accounting purposes, and the use of its income is restricted entirely to the support of the Freer Gallery.

Mr. Schwengel. To pursue that investment, I wasn't here but I understand some questions were answered on investment and the funds, the private foundation funds, are handled largely by Riggs Bank, is that right?

Mr. Wheeler. The holding of the securities? They are held by Riggs in a depository account over there, yes, sir, but the investment is managed by Scudder, Stevens & Clark in New York.

Mr. Schwengel. What is your investment policy? What kinds of things do you invest in?

Mr. Wheeler. The investment policy is one, I should say, that is approved by the Board of Regents, or at least by the executive committee. They authorize Scudder, Stevens to recommend investments in both stocks and bonds pretty much at their discretion now—no, it is within limits generally set by the executive committee.
But there are growth stocks included in their selection as well as income stocks.

**Smithsonian Institution—Endowment Funds**

**Statement of Investment Policy**

**Objective**

The objective of the investment assets of the Smithsonian is to provide important financial support to the Institution to assist it in its efforts to obtain its goals. In view of the substantial and expanding responsibilities of the Institution, its investment assets must serve not only current but inevitably larger future needs. This will require that all capital, other than that needed for short-term working capital purposes, be invested to:

1. Preserve principal in terms of purchasing power and achieve long-term capital appreciation.
2. Earn a reasonable but growing income.

**Policies**

Long-term investment results are more important to the Institution than immediate income or near-term market price changes. Investments should seek to emphasize those securities which are likely to produce an above average return over a long period of time as measured by cumulative income payments and future market valuations.

In order to achieve the objectives outlined above, the permanent funds of the Institution will use the following guidelines:

1. Equity investments will normally account for the major portion of investment holdings. Equities at market value presently account for between 60% and 65% of the total and they might range as high as 80% under conditions favorable for their purchase and retention.
2. In the selection of investments emphasis will be placed on basic merits and long-term value at current prices rather than upon current yield or past performance. The major portion of investments should be of generally high quality and marketability with a reasonable, but not extensive, diversification among selected industries and companies. Investments may include a prudent participation in smaller and newer companies of outstanding investment attraction, and it is desired that investments be oriented toward those industries which are judged to have the potential of participation effectively in our growing economy.
3. Fixed income investments will be acquired for purposes of investment reserves, current income and occasionally for possible conversion into common stocks.
4. Investment guidelines will be subject to continuing review by the investment counsel which shall report to the Investment Committee of the Institution.

Mr. Schwengel. The Board of Regents, you say, sets the policy. Do you have people who are knowledgeable and experienced in investments on the board that have special talents for this that can be helpful in guiding your investment policy?

Mr. Wheeler. We do have such people on the board, sir. Actually, we have this whole question under review right now. At Mr. Ripley’s request, at the last meeting of the Board of Regents, the Board appointed a small ad hoc subcommittee which will meet in September and review a number of suggestions for procedures for our investing of funds, the endowment funds, and I hope it will cover any questions that they themselves may have in mind about these funds.

Mr. Schwengel. Do you have a committee, or does Mr. Ripley or anybody have the assignment, for seeking out additional funds that might be available for the Smithsonian to add to your endowment from year to year or from time to time?

Mr. Wheeler. Your committee will be hearing shortly from Mr. Kautz, who is head of our newly formed development office. It is his
function to engage in this business of helping us gain additional private funds. [Mr. Kautz did not testify in person, but did submit a statement.]

Mr. Schwengel. I think this is a good idea. I want to pursue this. Have you done this before? Have you just gotten money because somebody gave it to you or did you pursue it or seek it?

Do you have any plans, for instance, that you can present to a possible donor?

Mr. Wheeler. There have been somewhat abbreviated steps taken in the past by previous Secretaries to get this sort of work started, but there was not much done about it until very recently when Mr. Ripley has again initiated this and, as he said in his testimony, has written a few letters.

Well, he has done more than that. Mr. Kautz will outline for you his program, which is a fairly extensive one.

Mr. Schwengel. On investment policy, do you deal with one firm or do you deal with a number of firms?

Mr. Wheeler. Do you mean as far as brokers are concerned?

Mr. Schwengel. Yes.

Mr. Wheeler. We deal with a number of firms.

Mr. Schwengel. You deal with several firms?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes.

Mr. Schwengel. Has that always been the policy?

Mr. Wheeler. I am not too familiar with what the policy was before I came here. I think there was somewhat more concentration.

Mr. Schwengel. Are those firms that you deal with local firms?

Mr. Wheeler. A good many of them, yes. It depends on the security and on the state of the market as to which firm is selected by Scudder, Stevens, because they placed these orders now under some general policy instructions from me as to some firms that we would like to see get some of the business because they have given us some assistance.

Mr. Schwengel. If you buy the same stock, it doesn't really make any difference where you buy it.

Mr. Wheeler. It does in some instances. If it is a large block of stock, then it does make a difference these days. In bonds, in some cases bonds, or stocks, even, are traded on a net basis without commission. That is the kind of special instance where it does make a difference. Or some bonds are on sort of an arbitrage basis and may only be basis for 20 minutes at a time when you could make an advantageous switch.

In that case, you deal with the people who have the securities.

Mr. Schwengel. Do you ever buy government bonds on short term?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes. Particularly for what we call our general fund. It is part of our current investments. We have currently about $1 million worth.

Mr. Schwengel. I will not pursue it any further, but I think it might be well, because certain things have been said, that you list the names of the firms you have been doing business with in recent years.

Mr. Bingham. (presiding). Without objection, that may be done.

(The information to be furnished follows:)}
Memorandum


Subject: Brokers with whom the Smithsonian Institution has done business during the past two years.

Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.—NYC.
H. C. Wainwright & Co.—NYC.
J. W. Redmond & Co.—Wash., D.C.
Mason & Co., Inc.—Wash., D.C.
The First Boston Corp.—NYC.
N. Y. Hanseatic Corp.—NYC.
American Securities Corp.—NYC.
Hoppin Bros. & Co.—NYC.
Haas Securities Corp.—NYC.
Piper, Jaffray & Hopwood—NYC.
Levien, Greenwald & Co.—NYC.
John Nuveen & Co.—NYC.
Rand & Co., Inc.—NYC.
The Dominion Securities Corp.—NYC
Spencer Trask & Co.—NYC.
Laird, Inc.—NYC.
Burnham & Co.—NYC.
Hornblower & Weeks—Hemphill, Noyes—Wash., D.C.
Weeden & Co., Inc.—NYC.
Folger, Nolan, Fleming & Co.—Wash., D.C.
Reynolds & Co.—Wash., D.C.
Eastman Dillon, Union Securities & Co.—Wash., D.C.
White, Weld & Co.—NYC.
Salomon Bros. & Hutzler—NYC.
Stuart Bros.—NYC.
L. Greenwald & Co.—NYC.
Smith, Barney & Co.—NYC.
Pipen, J. & H.—NYC.
Goodman & Son.—NYC.
Evans & Co., Inc.—NYC.
Mason & Co., Inc.—NYC.
Goldman, Sachs Co.—NYC.
Glore Forgan, Wm. R. Staats, Inc.—NYC.
Loeb, Rhoades & Co.—NYC.
Equity Research Associates, Inc.—NYC.
William Hutchinson & Co., Inc.—NYC.
H. N. Whitney, Goadby & Co.—NYC.
W. E. Hutton & Co.—NYC.
Shields & Company—NYC.

Mr. Bingham. Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bingham. Would you like to comment on the broad program of grants and contracts that you have? I notice a reference here to apparently a large contract with NASA.

Could you give us some idea of the programs in a general way and submit a comprehensive list to us?

Dr. Ripley. I would be happy to, such as the program which NASA essentially initiated, following the emphasis by the Congress that appropriations to NASA should attempt to match the space applications being made abroad, particularly in Russia in the post-Sputnik years.

At that time, NASA realized very sensibly that the Smithsonian had, for many years, a primacy in two particular areas, one in geodetics, attempting to derive accurate measurements of the size of the earth, and the other in meteoritics.
They asked us to undertake a program with a camera, known as the 
Baker-Nunn camera, which the Institution had been instrumental in 
performing research on, which would not only be able to make accurate 
observations on meteorites, but also would be able to clock the passage 
of satellite or satellite fragments.

For some years subsequently we have maintained a running census 
of all objects introduced from the earth floating about in space. It is 
quite possible to see this running census ticking off in our observatory 
in Cambridge, Mass. This work was expanded as the needs of NASA 
required and our contract, therefore, was expanded, in order to service 
this.

We have some 12, or have had some 12, orbital tracking stations 
around the world maintained on a contract basis through NASA with 
our contract employees servicing them. These are optical, and the de-

vices are optical devices, the Baker-Nunn camera, essentially.

More recently we have begun to go into developing a laser technique, 
using laser beams which we have been working on in connection with 
the inventors of lasers, who, as you know, were at Stanford and MIT.

We have supplemented some of the optical tracking devices with 
the laser tracking devices. It was thought from the beginning that 
the chronometric analysis capable by the use of these cameras would 
be a kind of assay or technical stopwatch system to check variations 
in the radar observatory, which was also going on, the radar tech-

niques of monitorings satellites.

So it has been very effective.

That is the nub of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory con-
tact situation with NASA.

Mr. Bingham. Are there other grants and contracts of a size within 
this figure?

Dr. Ripley. There are essentially NASA ones in this case, and have 
to do with the geodesy program, the accurate measurements of the 
earth. We have produced a geodesic series of measurements by geodyssey 
which are now producing the standard earth, on which we hope to 
eventually come down to variations as critical as the 1 meter range.

We have in addition, of course, some programs still remaining in 
spite of the restrictions which came into effect with the Appropriations 
Act of 1963 with NSF for contract work. NSF is our principal 
contracting grantor. That is the National Science Foundation. This 
has to do with the maintenance of the Science Information Exchange 
which was developed by the Smithsonian in the 1940’s, just at the end 
of the war, and which, since the early 1950’s, has been administered 
first under a committee of grant agencies, and more recently, since 
the late 1950’s, under NSF directly by delegation of the Federal Coun-
cil on Science and Technology.

Mr. Thompson. Do you have any defense contracts?

Dr. Ripley. We don’t have any specific defense contracts as such. 
We have from time to time undertaken contracts which involve things 
like migratory bird studies.

Mr. Thompson. That was called the Pacific Oceanic Laboratory?

Dr. Ripley. That is right.

Mr. Thompson. Didn’t that involve some studies relating to germ 
warfare?

Dr. Ripley. Not as far as we were concerned.
Mr. Thompson. It did not, in fact, as alleged?

Dr. Ripley. As far as we know, we had no access to any such activities of this sort at all, and we specifically explained at the time that—I think it was the television or someone brought this issue up—this was not part of the mandate of the Smithsonian for the increase and diffusion of knowledge.

We were not active in warfare research and this was not our concern.

Mr. Thompson. Was anyone associated with that grant activity in such studies?

Dr. Ripley. A young man testified over the television, much to the surprise of all of us, that he was actually a cryptic operative for some kind of organization of this sort, but it was news to us.

Mr. Schwengel. Will the chairman yield?

Dr. Ripley, you once did research for the Defense Department, didn't you?

Dr. Ripley. I once worked for OSS. [Office of Strategic Services.]

Mr. Schwengel. No; I mean the Smithsonian did.

Dr. Ripley. When was that, Mr. Schwengel?

Mr. Schwengel. In 1963. That was when you tested the balloon.

Dr. Ripley. You mean Thaddeus Stevens' experiments. Yes, indeed, of course we did.

Mr. Schwengel. And the President was the recipient of the first wire message sent from the balloon.

Dr. Ripley. That is right.

Mr. Schwengel. What I would like to have you establish and I would like to be able to prove is the New York Times article saying that President Lincoln took a ride in a balloon. It would be very interesting if we could prove that Lincoln was the first astronaut President.

Mr. Thompson. I think every President, even before Lincoln, was expert in floating balloons at some point. I think we can take judicial notice of that. Whether they rode in them or not is another question.

Do you want to proceed?

Mr. Wheeler. I was discussing the Freer Fund. I would like to make the final point that whereas the value started at just under $2 million in 1915, it currently has a market value of about—$16 million despite the recent severe declines both in the bond and the stock markets.

Another large endowment fund that we received in the last year is one dedicated to underwater research and exploration. That is about $6 million, a very substantial addition to our endowment funds.

I won't mention the other many funds we have except the two Roebling funds were mentioned in testimony the other day. They are now valued at approximately $220,000 and $45,000 respectively.

The total value of all our endowment funds as of June 30 was approximately $33 million.

Mr. Thompson. You must have quite a number of relatively small ones.

Mr. Wheeler. Yes; that is true.

Mr. Thompson. $16 million is your largest.

Mr. Wheeler. That is right.

Mr. Thompson. These are funds which accompany specific gifts to endow the gifts, as Dr. Ripley said the other day.
Mr. Wheeler. They are not all restrictive, but most are. About $6 million is unrestricted, of the total.

By congressional legislation, it is provided that $1 million of these funds, known as the permanent fund, including the original Smithson gift, is invested in U.S. Treasury and we receive 6 percent annual interest on that.

It has been mentioned that the total income from the $33 million of endowment funds and from some $2.5 million of investments included in our current fund accounts was $1,400,000 in fiscal year 1970.

The observation was quite properly made that that is not a very large return on that amount of money.

I should point out that the $33 million includes the $6 million we just received, and we did not get the income from that.

I think it was $7,000 we received in fiscal year 1970. Furthermore, those funds are invested entirely in a very high multiple low dividend, low yield growth stock, so that that particular income is quite low.

Mr. Schwengel. I think the record ought to show the reason for this. Can you tell us? Tell us why you didn't buy securities with higher income.

Mr. Wheeler. The gift was given to us in this form, sir. We received many thousands of shares of stock in this particular company. That is why it is still in that form.

Mr. Schwengel. You don't have the privilege of cashing and reinvesting?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes; we do, for a portion of it, but only a portion. I think around three-quarters of it we can reinvest. But I think we received the shares yesterday in the bank.

Mr. Schwengel. What is your average income on the funds that you control?

Mr. Wheeler. The total here is a little less than 5 percent, based on current values.

Mr. Thompson. That isn't bad for the last year.

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir. The yield is higher now than it was.

Going on, naturally the income that we get from these private funds, both restricted and unrestricted, is of tremendous benefit to the Institution. It should be noted, though, that of that total of $1.4 million, only about $340,000 in 1970 was for unrestricted purposes, and I might say that is a pitifully small amount in relation to our need for such funds.

It is our hope, as has been mentioned here, that this type of income can be increased substantially over the next few years.

It has been stated to this committee also that the private funds of the Institution are audited annually by independent public accountants.

Prior to 1909, this was done by the executive committee of the regents. From 1909 to 1947, it was done by a Mr. William L. Yeager, a C.P.A., and since 1947, these audits have been performed annually by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Co., one of the largest and best known auditing firms, not only in this country, but the world over.

Representatives of that firm are in the audience in case you wish to speak to them at any time.
These audit reports are presented regularly to our Board of Regents with semianual explanations about current financial developments, and a somewhat condensed version is published every year in our Smithsonian Yearbook.

This is distributed quite widely, and I hope that the members of this committee have already received copies.

I would like to submit to you at this time a copy of the latest complete report of the auditors. This is the complete report, not the condensed version. This is for the year 1969, the latest one available.

Mr. THOMPSON. Without objection, that will follow your testimony. [See testimony of Anthony Natelli of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co., CPA's.]

Mr. WHEELER. If you have any questions on those statements, of course, we would be glad to answer them.

I believe it is evident from this broad picture of the Smithsonian financing that the accounting problems of the Institution are indeed complicated.

We operate, in effect, with six different kinds of moneys; namely, Federal funds for current operating purposes, Federal funds for construction projects, private unrestricted funds, private restricted funds, grants and contract moneys and foreign currencies.

At the same time we spread these over 40 different bureaus, offices and activities, and we operate in six different locations in this country as well as in Panama, and at the same time have many grants and contract operations all over the world.

The result from a financial and accounting standpoint is that we have outgrown our previous relatively simple accounting system.

To meet this situation the Smithsonian has been striving with the utmost vigor over the past 2 years or more to revise its financial and accounting methods so as to provide the modern management information and control system needed to give proper guidance for the direction of this very diversified institution.

Let me outline briefly what we have been trying to do. First, from the management control standpoint we have to answer three questions: Where have we been? Where are we now? Where are we going?

To meet these goals on the private side, we have done the following things: We have completely revised the form of this statement so as to make it simpler to understand and more meaningful.

We have designed and installed a new system of monthly reports of income and expenditure for all of our offices and activities for which we budget private funds.

This also gives us monthly the picture of our overall financial results for both unrestricted funds and the status of our current restricted funds and the endowment funds.

We have established annual budgets for each of these individual offices and activities which are then monitored on a monthly basis by the division heads.

Finally, we have established a 12-month forecast of our cash flow with the results of which we are able to do a more intelligent job of investing any surplus cash we may have available.

Mr. THOMPSON. These reforms, I gather, have taken place in the last 2 years?
Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.
Mr. Thompson. How many accounting firms were involved before this?
Mr. Wheeler. In auditing?
Mr. Thompson. Internal accounting of the various funds.
Mr. Wheeler. Well, we always did our own accounting. We had certain help in making surveys, but mostly from Peat, Marwick, Mitchell, I believe.
Mr. Thompson. Since 1947, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell has done it?
Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.
On the Federal side, we have been providing right along to each of our bureaus and offices statements of disbursements of the moneys they have obligated against their allotments and the remaining balances of Federal appropriations.
Our system provides for certification by the fiscal and supply departments prior to the issuance of purchase orders that the necessary funds are both available and properly chargeable to the related appropriation allotment.
As a result, we have never overspent or overobligated any of our Federal appropriations.
Nevertheless, we recognize the need for improvements and we are making these on the Federal side.
The form of our monthly reports of Federal disbursements, obligations, and so forth, is being revised effective this month, to improve clarity and timeliness.
Our annual budgetary requests to Congress for federally appropriated moneys have been vastly improved, thanks principally to Mr. Jameson. I might say, to the point where we have been complimented by the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and the House upon the presentation.
During the past year, in our budgetary process we have begun placing greater emphasis upon identification of relative priorities of the Institution’s already established activities, with the objective of eliminating support for lower priority programs and making possible more worthwhile projects with minimum additional support from Congress.
In the process of making these improvements on both the Federal and private side it has been necessary also to make some fundamental changes.
The first of these is that we completely reorganized the fiscal division and eliminated the separation between private and Federal. This made it possible to eliminate some duplicate supervision. It eliminated the conflict between the two sides of our own fiscal house and made better cooperation.
It gave better opportunities for advancement and generally resulted in upgrading the training of our employees.
We also put into effect a comprehensive new uniform coding system for all accounting transactions, both Federal and private.
We have a new computer combined payroll-personnel program. With the personnel department it has been worked out so that we have just one program for payroll and personnel, thereby eliminating duplication of effort and getting much more useful information.
We have issued new procurement manuals and property administration manuals, which I have with me. We are just now with Peat, Marwick completing a very important survey of our fundamentals of accounting whereby we are obtaining a complete new chart of accounts. If that is a term that is not familiar to you, it is the designation of the fundamental accounts and how they fit together in your accounting system.

With this new chart of accounts, it will eventually be possible to obtain automatically from the computer our regular monthly management control reports, instead of doing them manually on a very time-consuming and difficult basis.

Furthermore, we will get on to a full system of accrual accounting beginning this month.

As you may recall, this is something that the Federal Government has been pushing very vigorously for several years.

Finally, it will give us a framework for further improvements that will completely modernize our accounting system within the next year or two.

Finally, I should mention that in July of 1969 we reinstituted internal auditing procedures, originally on a very minimal basis because of the lack of money and the lack of authorized positions. But as of this month, this has been expanded to four internal auditors and one secretary.

To summarize, I think it can be fairly stated that our financial and accounting controls have been adequate to prevent overspending or misspending of the Institution’s Federal appropriations.

Our private funds are independently audited each year and disclosed fully to the Institution’s Board of Regents at the Board’s regular meetings, with further annual disclosures to the public in the Smithsonian Yearbooks. [See statement of Peat, Marick, Mitchell & Co.]

From a management standpoint, I can assure you that we can now answer those three questions of where we have been, where we are, and where we are going.

At the same time, it has been fully recognized that by reason of the growth of the Institution, improvements were needed in our accounting operations and in our codification of internal procedures.

Strenuous efforts to achieve these have been underway for two years and major segments of the program have already been accomplished.

The remaining portion is scheduled to be completed as soon as we can.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you very much. This is very illuminating testimony, from which I have learned a great deal. I think it is extremely valuable that we learn your methods of operation. I commend your recent efforts at reorganization.

Have you your own computer?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.

Mr. Schwengel. I am impressed with your comprehensive report. It will be of assistance to us.

The Smithsonian is a great educational institution that helps us understand where we came from, how we developed, with the sinews of industry and so forth. I am very proud of the Institution.
Mr. Thompson. Thank you very much, Mr. Wheeler.
At this time we will hear from Mr. Anthony Natelli and Peter Gates of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.
Without objection, we will put Mr. Kautz’s statement into the record. If any questions arise subsequently, we will call him back.
(The document referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF LYNFORD E. KAUTZ, DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SMITHSONIAN ENDOWMENTS

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee, as far back as 1926, under the then Secretary Charles D. Walcott, the need for additional private endowments and operational funds to support the growing responsibilities of the Smithsonian was considered by the Regents. Secretary Walcott proposed, for this purpose, the creation of a society “to befriend the Institution.” Secretary Walcott died before the farsighted proposal could be placed in effect. He had, however, set up a Special Committee to seek general endowment funds. The Committee, in 1927, reported that the Institution should emulate the universities by driving hard for a central endowment and, like any university president, the Secretary should have an appropriate staff.

The efforts of this Special Committee were, in large part, frustrated by the hard times following 1929. However, the Institution has continued this effort, and a few substantial capital gifts have been received such as the Forrest bequest (1964) and the Sprague bequest (1965) amounting to approximately $2,000,000 each.

In 1965, Secretary Walcott’s “Society of Friends” became a reality in the form of the Smithsonian National Associates when approved by the Board of Regents. At the same time, the Regents approved the recommendation of the Secretary to organize the Development Office of the Smithsonian Institution. As Secretary Ripley reported on the first day of testimony: “It seemed to us that the original concept of the Smithsonian embodied the thought that we would not only come to the Federal Government annually for appropriations for the support of the museum-like facilities, but we would also seek to interest the American public in supporting this valuable Institution.”

The Development Office views the National Associates organization as a significant opportunity to inform the American public of the many projects and programs underway at the Smithsonian. Visitors see the Museums but cannot see our research. There is the misconception that the Smithsonian is completely dependent upon Federal funds. In fact, some people are not aware that the Institution even qualifies for private funds. It is expected, through the National Associates, that key donors will be developed and a new financial interest in the total Institution will ensue.

Recent Development Office activity has been to assist the Secretary in his quest to increase the endowment. Over the past fiscal year $6,000,000 has been contributed for Oceanography. In another priority area, more than a million dollars has been contributed to the Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies. Participating foundations included the Ford Foundation, the Fleischmann Foundation, the Old Dominion Foundation, the Scaife Foundation, the R. K. Mellon Foundation, the Prospect Hill Foundation, the Laurel Foundation, and the A. W. Mellon Foundation.

It appears that the Smithsonian can be a prime example of good Institutional funding through the combination of Federal Appropriations, research grants (both Federal and private), and private trusts. At present an imbalance is created by too little on the private side.

There is a definite need for unrestricted money to fund projects that are Smithsonian priorities and not the priority of the donor. Towards this end, the Development Office has assisted the Secretary with meetings in two cities to promote funds of a general nature from corporations as well as individuals. It is anticipated that other cities will be visited where the Smithsonian story can be told to key community leaders. The goal of the Development Office is to assist the Secretary in obtaining private funds over a broad sector, creating a better balance among the major funding sources available.
STATEMENTS OF ANTHONY NATELLI AND PETER GATES, OF PEAT, MARWICK, MITCHELL & CO., CPA'S, AUDITORS OF PRIVATE FUNDS

Mr. Natelli, I have been requested in the letter I received from you yesterday, Mr. Chairman, to present a brief statement in several copies regarding our association with Smithsonian and to describe our procedures in auditing private funds.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you.

Mr. Natelli. I am partner in charge of the Washington office of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell, and I am here kind of pinchhitting with the short notice that we did have.

We were advised the latter part of last week of your desire that we be present today. It was not possible for me to have here the partner who is the client partner and has been for a number of years on the Smithsonian engagements, as he is out of the country on vacation and will not be returning until next week.

I spoke to Mr. d'Amecourt about this, suggesting that we could appear at a later date. But it was the desire to keep within the context of today's session that someone be here, so I am pinchhitting.

Mr. Thompson. It may or may not be necessary.

At this point, your letter will be made a part of the record. I don't think it is necessary to read it, except that it does identify your firm's association, that you are public accountants independent of the Smithsonian Institution, and your procedures are those generally accepted auditing standards, including tests of the accounting records and such other procedures as you consider necessary.

(The document referred to follows:)
The Board of Regents
Smithsonian Institution:

We have examined the balance sheet of private funds of Smithsonian Institution as of June 30, 1969 and the related statement of changes in fund balances for the year then ended. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

In our opinion, the accompanying statement of changes in fund balances presents fairly the operations of the unrestricted funds of Smithsonian Institution for the year ended June 30, 1969, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles; and with respect to all other funds, subject to the matters referred to in note 1, the accompanying balance sheet of private funds and the related statement of changes in fund balances present fairly the assets and fund balances of Smithsonian Institution at June 30, 1969 and changes in fund balances resulting from cash transactions of the private funds for the year then ended, all on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

October 27, 1969
### Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current funds:</th>
<th>Liabilities and Fund Balances:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash:</td>
<td>Current funds:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In U. S. Treasury</td>
<td>$ 492,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In banks and on hand</td>
<td>$ 277,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cash</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,070,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables:</td>
<td>Unrestricted fund balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts</td>
<td>$ 268,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restricted fund balances:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,074,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursements - grants and contracts</td>
<td>$ 1,686,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,034,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories at net realizable value</td>
<td>$ 618,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments - stocks and bonds at cost (market value $3,030,124)</td>
<td>$ 3,250,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expense</td>
<td>$ 19,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment - museum shops (less accumulated depreciation of $26,607)</td>
<td>$ 86,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current funds</strong></td>
<td>$ 6,732,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment and similar funds:</td>
<td>Total current funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$ 98,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note receivable</td>
<td>$ 99,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments - stocks and bonds at cost (market value $28,281,837)</td>
<td>$ 23,955,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan to U. S. Treasury in perpetuity</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate (at cost or appraised value at date of gift)</td>
<td>$ 1,326,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total endowment and similar funds</strong></td>
<td>$ 26,489,912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying notes to financial statements
## Statement of Changes in Fund Balances

**Year ended June 30, 1969**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current funds</th>
<th>Restricted funds</th>
<th>Unexpended income</th>
<th>Endowment and similar funds</th>
<th>Current funds reserved as an endowment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gifts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at beginning of year</td>
<td>5,491,751</td>
<td>3,078,671</td>
<td>7,482</td>
<td>315,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to reflect unexpended funds held by principal investigators</td>
<td>220,117</td>
<td>6,588</td>
<td>6,130</td>
<td>56,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted balance at beginning of year</td>
<td>5,711,868</td>
<td>3,085,259</td>
<td>13,612</td>
<td>372,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts, net of refunds</td>
<td>11,398,918</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>1,302,532</td>
<td>379,150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts and bequests</td>
<td>1,986,830</td>
<td>161,164</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross profit on sales</td>
<td>413,561</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>1,118,951</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues and fees</td>
<td>904,957</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement from grantees or contractors</td>
<td>16,632</td>
<td>(109,989)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>503,813</td>
<td>275,792</td>
<td>28,210</td>
<td>99,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gains on sales and exchanges of investments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total additions</td>
<td>17,708,292</td>
<td>789,504</td>
<td>2,564,369</td>
<td>1,905,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deductions (additions):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>3,138,543</td>
<td>1,986,401</td>
<td>1,154,142</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>6,069,693</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases for collection</td>
<td>786,833</td>
<td>210,175</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and transportation</td>
<td>689,020</td>
<td>59,353</td>
<td>72,921</td>
<td>91,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and facilities</td>
<td>733,286</td>
<td>11,637</td>
<td>51,881</td>
<td>83,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and materials</td>
<td>668,176</td>
<td>89,314</td>
<td>178,927</td>
<td>43,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents and utilities</td>
<td>918,668</td>
<td>163,862</td>
<td>155,724</td>
<td>1,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>297,243</td>
<td>72,031</td>
<td>30,385</td>
<td>6,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual services</td>
<td>3,118,826</td>
<td>300,755</td>
<td>963,737</td>
<td>411,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer rental</td>
<td>918,039</td>
<td>20,472</td>
<td>19,596</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>21,462</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,462</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenditures applicable to other funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,388,514)</td>
<td>197,245</td>
<td>46,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditures, carried forward</td>
<td>17,328,289</td>
<td>526,696</td>
<td>2,845,215</td>
<td>1,262,233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit B

**SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION PRIVATE FUND**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current funds</th>
<th>Restricted funds</th>
<th>Unexpendable income</th>
<th>Endowment and similar funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Endowment</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted balance at beginning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unrestricted funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>Restricted funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endowment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of year, brought forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,711,868</td>
<td>1,083,259</td>
<td>13,612</td>
<td>375,027</td>
<td>870,706</td>
<td>674,510</td>
<td>588,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total additions, brought forward</strong></td>
<td>17,708,292</td>
<td>789,054</td>
<td>2,466,369</td>
<td>1,905,005</td>
<td>3,581,332</td>
<td>3,053,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total deductions, brought forward</strong></td>
<td>17,429,369</td>
<td>526,906</td>
<td>2,485,715</td>
<td>1,262,235</td>
<td>5,075,290</td>
<td>6,148,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfers to (from):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income added to principal</td>
<td>(49,614)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(8,919)</td>
<td>(100,458)</td>
<td>59,700</td>
<td>57,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers for designated purposes</td>
<td>(17,545)</td>
<td>(17,545)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to endowment funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer in support of activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(468,192)</td>
<td>(468,192)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total transfers to (from)</strong></td>
<td>(67,159)</td>
<td>(494,650)</td>
<td>267,236</td>
<td>59,700</td>
<td>57,818</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance at end of year</strong></td>
<td>$6,024,712</td>
<td>2,051,441</td>
<td>1,074,983</td>
<td>1,035,867</td>
<td>720,097</td>
<td>517,222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 1969

(1) Basis of Accounting

The accounts for unrestricted funds are maintained on the accrual basis of accounting. Accounts for other funds are maintained on the basis of cash receipts and disbursements, except that reimbursements for work performed pursuant to a grant or contract are accrued and certain real estate is carried at cost or appraised value as explained below.

Except for certain real estate acquired by gift or purchased from proceeds of gifts which are valued at cost or appraised value at date of gift, land, buildings, furniture, equipment, works of art, living and other specimens, and certain other similar property, are not included in the accounts of the Institution; the amounts of investments in such properties are not readily determinable. Current expenditures for such properties are included among expenses. The accompanying statements do not include the National Gallery of Art, the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, nor other departments, bureaus and operations administered by the Institution under Federal appropriations.

(2) Commitment

Pursuant to an agreement, dated October 9, 1967, between the Institution and The Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art, the Institution acquired, on July 1, 1968, all funds belonging to The Cooper Union for use exclusively for museum purposes, and certain articles of tangible personal property as defined in the agreement.

The agreement provides, among other covenants, that the Institution will maintain a museum in New York City and has pledges in excess of $800,000 for the support of such a museum. During the year pledges of $200,000 were collected.
ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

The Board of Regents
Smithsonian Institution:

We have reported separately herein on the basic financial statements of private funds of Smithsonian Institution. The current year's supplementary data included in Schedules 1 through 6 were subjected to the same auditing procedures and, in our opinion, subject to the same exceptions as stated in our opinion to the basic financial statements, are stated fairly in all material respects when considered in conjunction with the basic financial statements taken as a whole.

October 27, 1969
### Summary of Investments - Stocks and Bonds

**Year ended June 30, 1969**

#### Current funds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bonds:</th>
<th>Book value</th>
<th>Market value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>$1,521,672</td>
<td>1,422,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public utility</td>
<td>201,500</td>
<td>150,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>742,925</td>
<td>703,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total bonds</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,466,097</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,276,975</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stocks:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>52,586</td>
<td>49,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total stocks</strong></td>
<td><strong>784,208</strong></td>
<td><strong>753,949</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total current funds investments** | 3,250,305 | 3,030,124 |

#### Endowment and similar funds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bonds:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>4,140,693</td>
<td>3,570,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public utility</td>
<td>3,652,233</td>
<td>2,636,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>4,750,091</td>
<td>3,755,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total bonds</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,543,017</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,962,317</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stocks:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>878,151</td>
<td>586,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>10,534,534</td>
<td>18,732,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total stocks</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,412,685</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,319,520</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total endowment and similar funds investments** | 23,955,702 | 29,281,837 |

<p>| <strong>Total investments</strong>       | <strong>$27,206,007</strong> | <strong>$32,311,961</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Fund</th>
<th>Additions (Deductions)</th>
<th>Unexpended Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance at beginning of year</td>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$13,170,032</td>
<td>Gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freer Gallery of Art</td>
<td>$12,958,167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other endowment funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott, W. L.</td>
<td>180,767</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong, Edwin James</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur, James</td>
<td>65,533</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon, Virginia Purdy</td>
<td>150,356</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird, Lucy H.</td>
<td>63,493</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barney, Alice Pike</td>
<td>48,753</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barney Studio House</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barstow, Frederick D.</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Roland W.</td>
<td>55,989</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfield collection</td>
<td>66,878</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey, Thomas Lincoln</td>
<td>21,736</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain, Frances Lee</td>
<td>68,831</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of mammals curators</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of reptiles and amphibians</td>
<td>105,746</td>
<td>235,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake estate</td>
<td>74,662</td>
<td>6,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dykes, Charles</td>
<td>18,848</td>
<td>1,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eickemeyer, Florence Brevoort</td>
<td>37,483(3)</td>
<td>13,784(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleurie</td>
<td>102,273</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guggenheim, David and Florence</td>
<td>15,416</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson</td>
<td>20,334(3)</td>
<td>14,933(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewitt, S. C.</td>
<td>15,262</td>
<td>85,232(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiller, Virgil</td>
<td>11,397</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitchcock library</td>
<td>2,739</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgkins</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodick's research</td>
<td>104,317</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, Bruce</td>
<td>31,196</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>24,398</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay, Jesse M. B.</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loe, Morris</td>
<td>151,231</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>96,300</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell, Mary E.</td>
<td>3,016</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers, Catherine M.</td>
<td>35,025</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
## SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
### PRIVATE FUNDS

**Schedule of Change in Fund Balances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endowment and Similar Funds, and Unexpended Income, Continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of fund</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other endowment funds, continued:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, E. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noyes, P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouthou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battam memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowling collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries' retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprague, Joseph W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson, John A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical fish hobbies publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcox research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarbee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total other endowment funds**

| 6,995,225       | 619,507                      | 98,614                          | 126,038   | 17,468                                      | 6,905,452| 608,138                     | 282,003   | 350,513        | 57,736                      | 321,092               |

**Current funds reserved as an endowment:**

| Abbott, W. L.   | 25,860                       | -                               | 1,607     | -                                           | 27,467   | -                           | 1,331     | -              | -                            | 1,331                 |
| Avery           | 82,496                       | -                               | 1,190     | -                                           | 83,686   | -                           | 4,311     | -              | -                            | 4,311                 |
| Belmont House   | 500,000                      | -                               | -         | -                                           | 500,000  | -                           | -         | -              | -                            | -                      |
| Endowment       | 485,444                      | -                               | 29,479    | -                                           | 513,927  | 24,416                       | -         | -              | 24,416                      | 24,416                |
| Goddard, Robert | 15,304                      | 706                             | 16,010    | 585                                         | -        | 585                        | -         | -              | -                            | -                      |
| Habel           | 500                         | -                               | 500       | 30                                          | 500      | 30                          | -         | -              | -                            | -                      |
| Hackensburg     | 6,926                       | 656                             | 7,582     | 376                                         | -        | 376                        | -         | -              | -                            | -                      |
| Hamilton        | 3,247                       | 43                              | 3,290     | 187                                         | -        | 187                        | -         | -              | -                            | -                      |
| Hart, Gustavian E. | 845                        | -                               | 897       | 43                                          | 897      | 43                          | -         | -              | -                            | -                      |
| Henry           | 2,099                       | 131                             | 2,230     | 108                                         | 2,338    | 431                        | -         | -              | 4,319                      | 4,319                 |
| Henry, Joseph and Harriet A. | 85,021        | 5,215                           | 90,236    | 4,319                                       | -        | 4,319                      | -         | -              | -                            | -                      |
| Heys, Mandie C. | 186,717                     | 6,290                           | 193,007   | 9,710                                       | -        | 9,710                      | -         | -              | -                            | 9,710                 |
| Higbee, Harry   | 22,548                      | 1,066                           | 23,614    | 883                                         | -        | 883                        | -         | -              | -                            | 883                   |
| Hodgkins        | 144,537                     | -                               | 121,254   | 9,462                                       | -        | 9,462                      | -         | -              | -                            | 9,462                 |

(Continued)
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
PRIVATE FUNDS
Schedule of Changes in Fund Balances
Restricted Funds = Gifts, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of fund</th>
<th>Balance at beginning of year (as adjusted)</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Transfers out (in)</th>
<th>Balance at end of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diatom studies fund</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of archeology fund</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of botany</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of electricity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,672</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of physical sciences (section of mathematics)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Bird mural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth science imports</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education program fund</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>50,186, 2,820</td>
<td>40,386 (228)</td>
<td>15,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwell fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition of early French silver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,025</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorers Research Corporation fund</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora of Okinawa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk art fund</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Foundation:</td>
<td>8,718</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66 (126)</td>
<td>8,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of the United States flag</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967 symposium - &quot;The Quality of Man's Environment&quot;</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Christian Leadership Conference</td>
<td>7,693</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,002</td>
<td>1,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and study grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Motor Company</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardener - Miller Ceramics and Glass</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>45,725, 100</td>
<td>48,455</td>
<td>- (2,001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geodesy (Whipple)</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey, Ben and Abby, Foundation</td>
<td>4,346</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,942</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guggenheim, Daniel and Florence, Foundation</td>
<td>5,025</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>7,452 (8)</td>
<td>9,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guggenheim memorial</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriman trust</td>
<td>12,220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron, S. D., memorial</td>
<td>2,301</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles, Susan Morse, fund - George Rickey sculpture for National Collection of Fine Arts</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>13,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic dresses</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of agriculture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of American ceramics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of photography purchase</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>(148)</td>
<td>1,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, Milton A., memorial: Numismatics</td>
<td>9,383</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>9,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philately</td>
<td>8,755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>7,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of insect collection</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>62, 116</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International artists project</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Astronomical Union Central Bureau</td>
<td>5,079</td>
<td>11,187</td>
<td>8,807</td>
<td>7,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International toy exhibit</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Means and the problem of manlight</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of fund</td>
<td>Previous balance at end of year</td>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>Gifts and bequests</td>
<td>Other income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior League volunteer fund</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior natural science library in natural history</td>
<td>5,692</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior foundation for arts and letters</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,914</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape foundation</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library foundation</td>
<td>5,010</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library association</td>
<td>13,646</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>13,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library association, Inc.</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>2,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library association, Inc. (highly rated)</td>
<td>2,219</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>2,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library association, Inc. (highly rated)</td>
<td>5,010</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library association, Inc. (highly rated)</td>
<td>13,646</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>13,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library association, Inc. (highly rated)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>2,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library association, Inc. (highly rated)</td>
<td>2,219</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>2,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library association, Inc. (highly rated)</td>
<td>5,010</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library association, Inc. (highly rated)</td>
<td>13,646</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>13,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library association, Inc. (highly rated)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>2,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library association, Inc. (highly rated)</td>
<td>2,219</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>2,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library association, Inc. (highly rated)</td>
<td>5,010</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library association, Inc. (highly rated)</td>
<td>13,646</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>13,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library association, Inc. (highly rated)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>2,455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
### PRIVATE FUNDS
#### Schedule of Changes in Fund Balances
##### Restricted Funds - Gifts, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of fund</th>
<th>Balance at beginning of year as adjusted</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Transfers out (in)</th>
<th>Balance at end of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Geographic Society, continued:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedimentation patterns</td>
<td>$ 5,694</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>4,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of skarns in the Copper Mountain mining district of Alaska</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian meteorites</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bongo antelope</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian valley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,256</td>
<td>(4,256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine mollusks of the Marquesas Island</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable meteorite craters - Mauritania</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,778</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of eruptions dynamics and petrology of volcano - Costa Rica</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,861</td>
<td>3,919</td>
<td>1,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of prehistoric cultural development in Peru</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,264</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconnaisance study of volcanos of Tonga</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>3,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Home Fashions League</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>(1,245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Portrait Gallery contingency fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation - the papers of Joseph Henry</td>
<td>(29,564)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,941</td>
<td>(60,505)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhein land fund</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuyler Island survey</td>
<td>5,953</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science program - surgical biopsy program</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCR anniversary fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,204</td>
<td>26,085</td>
<td>4,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York pottery fund</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American cyprinid fishes</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American wildflowers fund</td>
<td>(213)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numismatic fund</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of anthropology</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>(172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of director</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of exhibits</td>
<td>8,544</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>7,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake Bay Center for field biology</td>
<td>15,164</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,531</td>
<td>(367)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake Bay Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Museum - Smithsonian Institution Kalakai expedition</td>
<td>2,909</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsi Cola gift for performing arts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum booklet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philatelic</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PING Foundation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>13,861</td>
<td>6,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitney-Bowe, Inc. - development and improvement of philately</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polynesian mollusks research</td>
<td>4,985</td>
<td>16,503</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>5,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post, Marjorie Merriweather - photographing objects by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madame Rosso</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Grant carriage restoration fund</td>
<td>3,191</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The&quot; restoration of Commodore Perry’s diary</td>
<td>3,191</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,404</td>
<td>(2,213)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of fund</th>
<th>Balance at beginning of year as adjusted</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Balance at end of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>12,705</td>
<td>32,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth advisory committee of the neighborhood museum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo animal conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo park animal fund</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>4,162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total gifts                                      | $377,423                                | 1,805,687 | 99,408    | 1,262,235 (59,700)    | 1,074,983  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Balance at beginning of year as adjusted</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Deductions</th>
<th>Prior year reimbursement from grantees</th>
<th>Balance at end of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atomic Energy Commission</td>
<td>$4,122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Haze Marine Laboratory</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary American art</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia Commission on the Arts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation on Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>19,680</td>
<td>18,993</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Education and Welfare</td>
<td>42,790</td>
<td>162,549</td>
<td>203,908</td>
<td>68,489</td>
<td>3,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monographic studies of the world</td>
<td>6,018</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,797</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Academy of Science</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</td>
<td>718,637</td>
<td>5,104,489(1)</td>
<td>67,377</td>
<td>3,955,047</td>
<td>945,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Collection of Fine Arts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8,873)</td>
<td>5,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institutes of Health</td>
<td>3,797</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td></td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>186,735</td>
<td>115,898</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources of the Future, Inc.</td>
<td>5,734</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,423</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undersea Archeological Conference</td>
<td>529</td>
<td></td>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Air Force</td>
<td>25,693</td>
<td>18,484</td>
<td>20,621</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>17,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Army</td>
<td>50,515</td>
<td>25,088</td>
<td>20,152</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>53,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Information Agency</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Navy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetlesen, G. Unger, Foundation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Wildlife Fund</td>
<td>5,953</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,915</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>2,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>83,389</td>
<td>37,465</td>
<td>93,062</td>
<td>27,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total grants</td>
<td>$870,704</td>
<td>5,615,216</td>
<td>175,196</td>
<td>3,444,120</td>
<td>8,608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes $57,818 of computer rental income from outside customers added to NASA Grant NSG-87 per agreement.
### Schedule 5

#### SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

PRIVATE FUNDS

#### Schedule of Changes in Fund Balances

**Restricted Funds - Contracts**

Year ended **June 30, 1969**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Balance at beginning of year as adjusted</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Reimbursement due from contractors</th>
<th>Indirect cost recoveries earned</th>
<th>Prior year reimbursement from contractor</th>
<th>Balance at end of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atomic Energy Commission</td>
<td>9,135</td>
<td>57,887</td>
<td>11,543</td>
<td>54,235</td>
<td>14,459</td>
<td>3,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Mines</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,312</td>
<td>19,766</td>
<td>39,580</td>
<td>4,087</td>
<td>11,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,408</td>
<td>2,974</td>
<td>6,436</td>
<td>2,716</td>
<td>1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td>644</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>6,776</td>
<td>75,457</td>
<td>22,919</td>
<td>47,120</td>
<td>20,017</td>
<td>18,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Interior</td>
<td>10,623</td>
<td>64,687</td>
<td>4,515</td>
<td>35,883</td>
<td>7,709</td>
<td>30,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of State</td>
<td></td>
<td>55,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,720</td>
<td>8,944</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>1,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia Government</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,839</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,552</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Kraft</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Services Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td></td>
<td>524</td>
<td>7,705</td>
<td>3,588</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>3,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</td>
<td>182,586</td>
<td>2,300,919</td>
<td>458,331</td>
<td>1,871,003</td>
<td>493,108</td>
<td>462,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Capital Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>118,632</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>100,019</td>
<td>20,004</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council on Marine Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institutes of Health</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>64,584</td>
<td>59,894</td>
<td>76,279</td>
<td>22,494</td>
<td>26,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>199,280</td>
<td>1,912,998</td>
<td>33,835</td>
<td>1,819,010</td>
<td>15,866</td>
<td>36,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozarks Regional Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>3,371</td>
<td>6,252</td>
<td>3,369</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
<td>275</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Air Force</td>
<td>7,542</td>
<td>125,800</td>
<td>46,487</td>
<td>90,119</td>
<td>24,636</td>
<td>60,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Army</td>
<td>54,881</td>
<td>814,445</td>
<td>294,195</td>
<td>701,706</td>
<td>208,104</td>
<td>253,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Navy</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>164,348</td>
<td>102,465</td>
<td>158,341</td>
<td>46,525</td>
<td>62,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Post Office</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17,313</td>
<td>3,887</td>
<td>16,970</td>
<td>3,519</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>615</td>
<td></td>
<td>498</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total contracts</strong></td>
<td>474,510</td>
<td>5,868,128</td>
<td>1,080,673</td>
<td>5,106,092</td>
<td>1,042,275</td>
<td>990,863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

474,510 5,868,128 1,080,673 5,106,092 1,042,275 990,863 270,067
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income:</th>
<th>Smithsonian</th>
<th>Smithsonian</th>
<th>Smithsonian</th>
<th>Museum of</th>
<th>Anacostia</th>
<th>Ladies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Astrophysical</td>
<td>Astronomical</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Com-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>observatory</td>
<td>observatory</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>Photog-</td>
<td>mittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shops</td>
<td>center</td>
<td>center</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>raphic</td>
<td>travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>sales</td>
<td>tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net sales</td>
<td>$983,917</td>
<td>796,434</td>
<td>187,463</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less cost of goods sold</td>
<td>572,356</td>
<td>277,388</td>
<td>147,966</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross profit</td>
<td>413,561</td>
<td>519,046</td>
<td>39,515</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>1,118,951</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>274,680</td>
<td>846,271</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues and fees</td>
<td>903,647</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>153,202</td>
<td>56,962</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28,210</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>4,304</td>
<td>4,369</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total income</td>
<td>2,666,369</td>
<td>775,127</td>
<td>53,829</td>
<td>288,540</td>
<td>1,557,131</td>
<td>3,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General and administrative expenses:

| Salaries and benefits | 1,154,142 | 282,599 | 106,574 | 57,781 | 82,515 | 77,845 | 338,783 | 36,856 | 38,696 | 11,517 | 16,301 | 81,716 | - | 2,699 |
| Transportation | 172,921 | 3,266 | 310 | 5,966 | 29,326 | 77 | 9,661 | 403 | 779 | 24 | 16,091 | 1,947 | - | 6,900 | 139 |
| Equipment and facilities | 91,881 | - | - | 992 | - | - | 818 | - | - | - | 46,240 | 3,176 | - | 506 | 149 |
| Supplies and materials | 176,922 | 19,498 | 169 | 26,677 | 2,395 | 4,313 | 88,867 | 14,341 | 6,961 | - | 3,266 | 9,603 | - | 15 | 2,764 |
| Rent and utilities | 155,724 | - | - | 2,874 | - | - | 133,286 | 2,964 | - | - | 1,923 | 14,657 | - | - | - |
| Communication | 30,385 | 1,745 | 58 | 7,511 | 3,615 | 716 | 9,052 | 5,296 | 171 | 62 | 190 | 1,097 | - | 92 | - |
| Contractual services | 967,737 | 32,132 | 48,600 | 154,501 | 49,427 | 169,670 | 120,656 | 36,109 | 19,854 | 6,152 | 209,189 | 19,750 | 1,166 | 63,256 | 37,049 |
| Computer rental | 19,596 | - | - | 30 | - | 9,382 | 10,164 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Depreciation | 21,462 | 21,462 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Administrative expenditures | 192,965 | 39,100 | 16,900 | 12,800 | 8,900 | - | 75,606 | 5,900 | 3,200 | 1,300 | 24,639 | 6,600 | - | - | - |
| Total general and administrative expenses | 2,845,272 | 399,620 | 174,031 | 267,969 | 176,968 | 265,283 | 786,453 | 121,662 | 69,964 | 19,271 | 317,999 | 139,246 | 1,166 | 21,666 | 50,101 |

Net income (loss): Before transfers | (381,345) | (24,693) | (127,192) | 20,574 | (19,397) | 12,397 | 57,818 | (64,900) | (69,661) | (16,683) | (59,416) | (101,752) | 12,334 | 36,956 | (37,733) |

Transfers:

| Computer services to commercial users transferred to grants | (57,818) | - | - | - | - | (57,818) | - | - | - | - | - | - | (100) | (57,340) | - |
| Transferred to gifts | (62,640) | - | - | - | 10,000 | - | (57,818) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Net income (loss) after transfers | $ (481,006) | (24,693) | (127,192) | 20,574 | (9,397) | 12,397 | (56,900) | (69,661) | (16,683) | (59,416) | (101,752) | 12,334 | 31,956 | (37,733) |
Mr. Thompson. I have several questions to ask you and, if necessary, later by correspondence we could ask you other questions, especially when the gentleman who is generally responsible for this is here.

Mr. Natelli. Certainly.

Mr. Thompson. What is the scope of the public accounting audits of the Smithsonian's activities?

Mr. Natelli. We are engaged to examine and report upon the private funds of the Smithsonian Institution. This does involve examination on test basis in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards of the private fund balances and transactions and, of course, culminates in a report, which I believe you have been given a copy of.

The primary purpose of the work is to form an opinion on the fairness of presentation in the balance sheets and statement of fund transactions as developed by the Treasurer of the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. Thompson. I gather that you are involved only with the private funds and not with all of the Smithsonian's operations, is that correct?

Mr. Natelli. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thompson. So that internally they do their own auditing work with respect to the Federal funds, and you do the private funds.

Mr. Natelli. I believe it might be correct to state there is internal audit of both the private and Federal funds internally.

Mr. Gates. Yes; as far as the internal audit is concerned.

Mr. Thompson. But your company doesn't involve itself at all with the auditing of the public funds.

Mr. Natelli. That is correct. I was simply clarifying that internal auditors, within the Smithsonian, not our firm, as Mr. Wheeler just explained, with a recently expanded staff audit internally the private and Federal funds.

Mr. Thompson. Does your work include any recommendations with respect to the prices paid by the Smithsonian for goods and services? Do you advise as to whether or not they are getting the most for their money? Or do you simply review what they have done with the private funds?

Mr. Natelli. We simply review by various test procedures and examination what has transpired. We attest to what has transpired.

We do not, in a sense, second-guess management as to whether they should or should not have made certain purchases.

Mr. Thompson. You have nothing to do with efficiency controls within the Institution itself?

Mr. Natelli. Not directly. I would say that as a normal course of our work, of course, we do generally make observations on matters of accounting procedures and, therefore, would discuss them with the Treasurer. But not in the sense, I think, in which you are directing the question to.
Mr. Thompson. Are you familiar with the efforts that the Institution is making internally to computer program its accounting procedures?

Mr. Natelli. Yes, I am.

Mr. Thompson. Do you consider them to be modern and sound procedures?

Mr. Natelli. Very much in tune with the Institution’s needs as it grows, right.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you very much. I think that is all we need to know from you for the moment. Thank you very much for coming on such short notice.

Mr. Natelli. My pleasure, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thompson. With that, I think we will conclude for the day, the subcommittee to meet Thursday next in this room at 10 a.m.

Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 3:55 p.m. the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Thursday, July 23, 1970, in room 2257.)
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The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 2257, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Frank Thompson, Jr. (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Thompson, Bingham, and Harvey.
Staff member present: John d’Amecourt, staff director.
Mr. Thompson. The subcommittee will be in order.
Other members have other committee commitments and will be coming in and out.

Our first witness this morning is Mr. Allen R. Voss, the regional representative of the General Accounting Office, to discuss with us the management of Federal funds and the GAO’s report of July 1, 1970. He is accompanied by John Moore, the Assistant General Counsel. Also present are other representatives of the General Accounting Office; Mr. Eugene L. Pahl, Mr. Donald Scantlebury, and Mr. Owen Kane.

STATEMENT OF ALLEN R. VOSS, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, CIVIL DIVISION, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE; ACCOMPANYED BY JOHN MOORE, ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL; EUGENE L. PAHL, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, CIVIL DIVISION; DONALD SCANTLEBURY, WASHINGTON REGIONAL OFFICE MANAGER; AND OWEN A. KANE, LEGISLATIVE ATTORNEY, OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE LIAISON

Mr. Thompson. Good morning, Mr. Voss.
Mr. Voss. Good morning, Mr. Chairman.
I have a prepared statement, if I may read it for the record. It is very short.

Mr. Thompson. Please do. Proceed as you wish.
Mr. Voss. Mr. Chairman, we are pleased to appear before this subcommittee today to discuss the work of the General Accounting Office at the Smithsonian Institution.
Our work at the Smithsonian has consisted primarily of audits of activities financed with appropriated funds. Our authority to perform this work stems from the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 which requires the General Accounting Office to settle the appropriated fund accounts.

While we have issued a number of audit reports relating to the settlement of the Smithsonian's accounts, we recently issued one report which was concerned with the need for improvements in the financial management activities of the Smithsonian Institution and a second report which was concerned with the control over, and disposition of, art works at the National Collection of Fine Arts. [See Charles Blitzer testimony, July 28.]
REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

Improvement Needed In Financial Management Activities Of The Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 1, 1970
To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives

This is our report on the need for improvement in financial management activities of the Smithsonian Institution. Our review was made pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67).

Copies of this report are being sent to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and to the members of the Board of Regents and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

Comptroller General of the United States
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The Smithsonian Institution is financed principally from Federal appropriations but also receives substantial funds from private sources.

Because of its statutory responsibilities, the General Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed, on a test basis, the receipt and use of these public funds, compliance with laws and regulations, and the effectiveness of the Institution's internal financial controls.

The Smithsonian used $40,095 of an appropriation intended for constructing additions to the Natural History Building to pay for alterations to the Arts and Industries Building. (See p. 8.)

The Smithsonian also used $3,835 of this appropriation for supplies and equipment which, it acknowledged, were charged incorrectly to the appropriation. (See p. 8.)

GAO believes that the Smithsonian had no legal authority for using the appropriation for either purpose. A Federal law provides that appropriations are to be used solely for the purposes for which they are made except as otherwise provided. (See pp. 9 through 12.)

The Smithsonian used an additional $336,000 of the same appropriation for the purchase of furniture and equipment, including storage cases, drawers, trays, book stacks, shelving, typewriters, calculators, and laboratory equipment. Although the Smithsonian's budget estimate for the construction project included a provision for furniture and equipment, information submitted to the Congress and the related record contain no explanation of the specific nature of such furniture and equipment. Thus GAO could not determine whether the Congress intended for the Smithsonian to pay for these items from the construction appropriation. (See pp. 9 and 10.)

The Smithsonian's instructions on purchase of goods and services require its organizational units to submit purchase requisitions to the Supply Division, which is responsible for buying, after determination by the Fiscal Division that funds are available.
In many instances, these procedures have not been followed and staff members have often placed orders directly with vendors and notified the Fiscal and Supply Divisions later. The orders were placed without obtaining competition, that is without either advertising or soliciting bids from other qualified sources of supply.

As a result (1) Federal laws requiring competition have not always been complied with and the most favorable prices may not have been obtained and (2) the Smithsonian's records on available funds have not been current and have not provided the control to ensure that appropriated funds have not been overspent. (See p. 14.)

Although it was not possible to determine to what extent the lack of competition resulted in higher prices, GAO did note one instance in which competition resulted in a lower price. In purchasing carpeting for a Smithsonian exhibit hall, the Supply Division, by soliciting competitive price proposals, obtained the carpeting for $5,000, a savings of about $3,000. (See pp. 17 and 18.)

The Smithsonian receives money from various revenue-producing activities, including sale of books and other articles, concessions, and special events where admission fees are charged. These activities have been financed partly from private funds and partly from Federal appropriations, but all revenue has been treated as private funds of the Smithsonian. In fiscal year 1968, the Smithsonian received about $1.7 million from these sources.

GAO found that appropriated funds were being used to finance revenue-producing activities although all receipts from those activities were considered to be private funds. (See pp. 23 and 24.)

Internal auditing should be made a more effective and integral part of the Smithsonian's management control system. The Smithsonian has made only limited use of internal audit as a management tool, particularly in federally financed activities. (See p. 25.)

RECOMMENDATIONS OR SUGGESTIONS

GAO recommended to the Secretary that the Smithsonian:

--Reimburse the Natural History Building construction appropriation $43,930 from other funds for the cost of the alterations to the Arts and Industries Building and for the cost of supplies and equipment incorrectly charged to the appropriation. (See p. 12.)

--Continue to develop an internal audit staff of sufficient size and competence to perform effective audits of all the Smithsonian's activities, including those involving Federal as well as private funds. (See p. 26.)
GAO suggested that the Smithsonian enforce its instructions on practices to be followed in purchasing goods and services. (See p. 21.)

AGENCY ACTIONS AND UNRESOLVED ISSUES

The Secretary has expressed the view that the cost of the alterations to the Arts and Industries Building properly was chargeable to the Natural History Building construction appropriation as a contingency expense. (See pp. 9, 11 and 12.) In GAO's opinion, there is no reasonable basis for considering alterations to another building to be contingencies relating to the Natural History Building construction project.

The Secretary agreed that $3,835 for supplies and equipment was incorrectly charged to the appropriation for additions to the Natural History Building and stated that other funds were available to reimburse the appropriation for these charges. He believed that all remaining charges to the appropriation for furniture and equipment were authorized because the Smithsonian's budget estimate included an item of $685,000 for furniture and equipment.

GAO is unsure, however, whether the Congress expected the budget estimate for furniture and equipment in the construction appropriation to include items relating to the preservation, exhibition, and increase of the Smithsonian's collections, since funds for these purposes are included in the Smithsonian's annual appropriations. (See pp. 10 through 12.)

To strengthen administrative controls over purchasing practices, the Secretary issued additional instructions providing for high-level reviews of all purchases made without following prescribed procedures. GAO believes that, if properly administered, these additional instructions should improve the Smithsonian's purchasing practices. (See pp. 21 and 22.)

Further information is being developed by Smithsonian and GAO on the financing of revenue-producing activities from appropriated funds when all income from these activities is considered private funds. Whether an acceptable arrangement can be developed to report to the Congress the extent to which appropriated funds contribute to the Smithsonian's private fund activities will also be considered. (See p. 23.)

The Secretary has agreed to strengthen the internal audit function and stated that the Smithsonian will undertake to recruit a competent and adequate audit staff as soon as constraints are lifted on Federal employee ceilings. (See p. 26.)

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CONGRESS

The Smithsonian's use of the Natural History Building construction appropriation to pay for furniture and equipment is being reported to the Congress for such consideration as may be appropriate. GAO is unable to determine whether these expenditures fulfill the intent of the Congress. (See p. 12.)
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The General Accounting Office has made a review of selected financial management activities of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. The review was devoted primarily to those aspects of the Smithsonian's financial management activities which appeared to be in particular need of attention rather than to a general evaluation. The review covered selected financial transactions and procedures in fiscal years 1968 and 1969, with a limited examination of the records of prior years for specific types of transactions. The scope of the review is described on page 27 of this report.

The Smithsonian Institution, was created by an act of the Congress in 1846 (20 U.S.C. 41) in accordance with the terms of the will of James Smithson of England who in 1826 bequeathed his property to the United States to found at Washington an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men. In receiving the property and accepting the trust, the Congress determined that the Federal Government was without authority to administer the trust directly and, therefore, constituted an establishment whose statutory members are the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Chief Justice, and the heads of the executive departments.

The business of the Smithsonian is conducted by a Board of Regents composed of the Vice President, the Chief Justice, three members of the Senate, three members of the House of Representatives, and six persons other than members of the Congress. The Regents elect a suitable person as Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution who also serves as Secretary of the Board of Regents. The Secretary is the Smithsonian's executive officer and the director of its activities.

To fulfill James Smithson's bequest, the Smithsonian performs fundamental research; publishes the results of studies, explorations and investigations; preserves for study and reference items of scientific, cultural, and
historical interest; maintains exhibits representative of the arts, American history, aeronautics, space exploration, technology, and natural history; and engages in programs of education and national and international cooperative research and training.

The Smithsonian derives its financial support from both Federal and private sources. These include annual appropriations from the Congress for operating expenses of the various Smithsonian museums, its educational and research centers, and its separate program of academic grants for overseas research projects financed from excess foreign currencies. Federal appropriations are also received for construction programs and, through the Government of the District of Columbia, for support of the National Zoological Park. Additional funds are received from Federal agencies and private institutions in the form of research grants and contracts. Private endowments and gifts support numerous specifically identified exhibitions and educational and research areas.

For the year ended June 30, 1969, financial support for the Smithsonian's operations was provided as follows:

Federal appropriations:
- Salaries and expenses—normal activities $26,443,000
- Special foreign currency program 2,316,000
- Salaries and expenses—National Gallery of Art (a bureau of the Smithsonian with a separate board of trustees) 3,200,000

District of Columbia:
- Operation of National Zoological Park 2,528,000
- Research grants and contracts (Federal and private) 11,400,000

Private funds:
- Gifts (excluding gifts to endowment funds) 1,987,000
- Income from endowments and current fund investments (includes net income or loss from revenue-producing activities) 1,365,000

Total $49,239,000
The data on financial support from research activities and private funds was furnished to GAO by the Smithsonian. The Smithsonian also received $2,700,000 in Federal appropriations (plus contract authorization of $12,197,000) to finance construction projects.

Of the 3,434 employees on the staff of the Smithsonian Institution in the pay period ended June 28, 1969, 2,300 were paid from Federal appropriations and 1,134 were paid from private funds.

The principal officials of the Smithsonian Institution responsible for the administration of the activities discussed in this report are listed in appendix II.
CHAPTER 2

USE OF CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION FOR QUESTIONABLE PURPOSES

Our review of selected transactions relating to construction funds administered by the Smithsonian identified expenditures and obligations of Federal appropriations of about $380,000 which appeared to be questionable in view of the purposes for which the funds were appropriated.

PURPOSE FOR WHICH FUNDS WERE APPROPRIATED

By the act of June 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 785), the Congress authorized the Smithsonian to extend the Natural History Building of the National Museum by additions on the east and west ends of the building. Funds for the construction of these additions, in the total amount of $18,636,000, were appropriated by the acts of July 1, 1957 (71 Stat. 272), May 13, 1960 (74 Stat. 118), and August 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 262). Of the total amount appropriated, $17,417,844 was transferred by the Smithsonian to the General Services Administration for use in planning and constructing the additions. The remaining funds, in the amount of $1,218,156, were retained by the Smithsonian. By March 31, 1969, the Smithsonian had expended or obligated for expenditure $1,196,610 of these funds, leaving a balance of $21,546 unobligated.

The basic law governing the use of appropriated funds (31 U.S.C. 628) provides that, except as otherwise provided by law, sums appropriated shall be applied solely to the objects for which they are made.

We found one instance where $40,095 of funds appropriated for the Natural History Building additions were used to pay for alterations to another building. We found also that the appropriation for the additions was used to purchase (1) about $3,800 of equipment and supplies which were not authorized by the appropriation and (2) about $336,000 of furniture and equipment although it seemed
questionable whether the appropriation authorized such pur-
chases. These matters are discussed below.

USE OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED
FOR ONE BUILDING TO PAY FOR
ALTERATIONS TO ANOTHER BUILDING

Our review of selected transactions showed that
$40,095 of the construction appropriation for the Natural
History Building additions had been used by the Smithsonian
to finance the cost of alterations to another structure,
the Arts and Industries Building. A Smithsonian official
provided the following explanation for this use of the Nat-
ural History Building funds:

The Smithsonian's plans for the additions to the
Natural History Building had always contemplated that
the enlarged building would provide adequate space for
all departments of the Museum of Natural History. In
April 1962, while the extensive construction work on
the Natural History Building was in progress, it be-
came necessary to relocate the Museum's Department of
Entomology. The Smithsonian considered this to be a
temporary relocation and intended that the relocated
department would return to the Natural History Build-
ing when the construction work was completed. However,
upon completion of the construction some 3 years later,
the Smithsonian found that the planned return of the
Department of Entomology could not be effected because
of significant increases which had occurred in the
space requirements of other Museum activities.

As a result of intensive studies, the Smithsonian
concluded that, to accommodate the Department of Ento-
ology in the Natural History Building, it would be
necessary to relocate activities which occupied space
there but which were not directly essential to natural
history research. Accordingly, it was decided to re-
locate the Office of the Registrar of the National
Museum from the Natural History Building to the Arts
and Industries Building. To make this move possible,
it was necessary to make certain alterations to the
Arts and Industries Building to accommodate the Office
of the Registrar.
These alterations included the construction of a mezzanine floor and the installation of partitions, doors, plumbing, air-conditioning ducts and electrical systems. A contract for this work, in the amount of $40,095, was awarded to the lowest bidder by the Smithsonian on October 28, 1968, after advertising.

PURCHASES OF EQUIPMENT, SUPPLIES, AND FURNITURE

From our review of the record of the approval of the appropriation for the construction of the Natural History Building additions, we considered it questionable whether certain expenditures made from the appropriation were in accordance with the intent of the Congress.

In the budget estimate which the Smithsonian submitted to support its fiscal year 1961 request for Natural History Building construction funds, an amount of $685,000 was included for furniture and equipment. The record does not contain any further elaboration regarding this provision.

As indicated previously, the Smithsonian turned over $17,417,844 from construction appropriation to the General Services Administration to pay for construction costs and retained $1,218,156 for other expenditures. Our examination included a review of expenditures comprising about one third of the amount retained. We summarized the expenditures reviewed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storage cases, drawers, and trays</td>
<td>$195,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book stacks, shelving, and wall units</td>
<td>39,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microscopes, microtomes, and accessories</td>
<td>25,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other laboratory equipment and supplies</td>
<td>41,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typewriters, calculators, and other office equipment</td>
<td>15,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable partitions</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office furniture and supplies</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous equipment and supplies</td>
<td>18,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$340,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the record, we cannot determine whether the Congress intended that funds appropriated for the extension of
the Natural History Building would be used for acquiring some of these items which are used in preserving, exhibiting, and increasing the collections of the Smithsonian. Since the Smithsonian's annual appropriations for salaries and expenses are made for such purposes, we are unsure whether the Congress would have expected that the provision for furniture and equipment in the Smithsonian's budget estimate would have included provision for many of these items.

AGENCY COMMENTS AND GAO'S EVALUATION

In commenting on our draft report by letter dated March 12, 1970 (see app. I), the Secretary of the Smithsonian noted that the Smithsonian's fiscal year 1961 budget estimate for the construction of additions to the Natural History Building included a line item of $570,000 for contingencies. The Secretary expressed the view that, on this basis, the cost of the alterations to the Arts and Industries Building was properly chargeable to the Natural History Building additions appropriation as a contingency expense incident to the proper execution of the Natural History Building construction project. The rationale provided by the Secretary for this view was that the stated purpose of the alterations in question was to improve space utilization within the Natural History Building.

We believe that the provision for contingencies in the Natural History Building construction budget logically must be construed as covering only such unforeseen exigencies as might have been experienced in the construction of the Natural History Building additions. Although there might be advantages in having all departments of the Museum of Natural History located in the Natural History Building, we believe that the Smithsonian had no legal authority for charging the construction appropriation with the cost of alterations to another building to accommodate the dispossessed tenant because the funds involved were specifically appropriated for the Natural History Building.

The Assistant Secretary of the Smithsonian agreed, with regard to the $340,100 spent for the items listed above, that certain equipment and expendable supplies
should not have been charged to the construction appropriation. The Secretary subsequently advised us that a careful review of the expenditures showed that expendable supplies totaling $967, which the appropriation did not authorize, had been charged to this appropriation and that four purchases of surveying and underwater equipment totaling $2,868 had been incorrectly charged to the appropriation for the Natural History Building additions. The Secretary stated that other funds are available for reimbursing the appropriation for these charges.

It was the Secretary's view that the remaining charges to the construction appropriation, which we had questioned (a total of $336,300), were proper. The rationale for his position was that $685,000 had been included in the budget estimate for furniture and equipment and that congressional approval of the appropriation in the amount requested constituted authority for these purchases. We could not find any indication in the record of whether or not the term furniture and equipment was intended by the Congress to include many of the types of items which the Smithsonian indicated were authorized under the construction appropriation.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SECRETARY
OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

In the absence of specific authority for the use of $40,095 of funds appropriated for the Natural History Building for alterations to the Arts and Industries Building, we recommend that the Secretary of the Smithsonian seek another source of financing for these expenditures and reimburse the appropriation. We recommend also that the appropriation be reimbursed from other funds in the amount of $3,835 for the cost of the supplies and equipment identified by the Smithsonian as having been incorrectly charged to the appropriation.

MATTER FOR CONSIDERATION
BY THE CONGRESS

In view of the inclusion of $685,000 in the Natural History Building appropriation request for furniture and equipment and the approval of that request by the Congress
without comment, we are unable to determine whether many of such expenditures were in accordance with the intent of the Congress. Therefore, we are reporting this matter to the Congress for such consideration as may be deemed appropriate.
CHAPTER 3

NEED FOR MANAGEMENT TO STRENGTHEN CONTROLS OVER THE PROCUREMENT OF GOODS AND SERVICES

The objective of Government procurement is to obtain, at fair and reasonable prices and at the times required, needed quantities of materials and services of a satisfactory quality. This objective can be achieved through an effective procurement system. If such a system is to be effective, however, all organizational units must make maximum use of it.

Smithsonian instructions require that organizational units needing supplies, services, or equipment must submit purchase requisitions to the Supply Division, which has the responsibility for buying (after determination by the Fiscal Division that funds are available). We found, however, that many purchases were made directly by other Smithsonian divisions. Under such practices:

--statutory provisions requiring competition were not being complied with and, therefore, the Smithsonian might not have been obtaining the best prices for its purchases and

--records on the status of funds were not current and therefore could not provide control to ensure that appropriated funds were not over obligated.

The following sections discuss in detail the questionable procurement practices noted during our review.

PROCUREMENT BY THE SUPPLY DIVISION COULD RESULT IN OBTAINING MORE FAVORABLE PRICES

A Smithsonian study of procurement practices during the first quarter of fiscal year 1968 disclosed that staff elements were making commitments and placing orders with vendors for the purchase of services, supplies, and equipment instead of processing the required requisitions through the Fiscal Division and the Supply Division. This practice
resulted in contracts and purchase orders being issued subsequently by the Supply Division in confirmation of orders already placed by operating elements. The study showed that, during the period reviewed, 206 purchase orders totaling $57,902 were issued by the Supply Division in confirmation of informal orders placed by other Smithsonian elements.

As a result of this study, the Secretary issued Smithsonian Institution Office Memorandum 730, dated December 29, 1967, which directed that all procurements would be made, following verification by the Fiscal Division of the availability of funds, by the Supply Division or through arrangements made by a contracting officer of the Supply Division.

A Smithsonian study, covering the 2-month period October 3 through December 3, 1968, indicated that the situation had not improved. In this 2-month period, 111 confirming purchase orders totaling $42,429 were issued.

Our review of selected procurement transactions during fiscal years 1967-69 confirmed the findings of the Smithsonian studies and showed that the situation still existed. We found 71 instances in which orders for goods and services totaling $172,000 were placed directly with vendors by Smithsonian operating units for which contracts and purchase orders were later issued by the Supply Division. In practically all these instances, the unit which placed the order did not obtain competition but made purchases without obtaining price quotations from more than one source.

Example 1—On June 24, 1968, the Smithsonian awarded a contract in the amount of $5,200 for conducting orientation and technical familiarization courses for selected Smithsonian personnel in the field of documentary motion pictures. Invoices submitted by the contractor show that his services commenced on May 27, 1968, approximately 1 month before the contract was awarded. Smithsonian files indicated that the unit which made the arrangements for the contractor's services was the Office of Exhibits of the Museum of History and Technology. Smithsonian records indicate that the contractor was the only source solicited.
The Office of Exhibits did not prepare a purchase requisition for these services until June 5, 1968, 9 days after the services had commenced. After the availability of funds had been certified by the Fiscal Division on June 7, 1968, a contract was awarded by the Supply Division on June 24, 1968, effective May 27, 1968. The contractual documents show that the contract was negotiated on a sole-source basis. The contracting officer prepared a determination and findings which stated that the contractor was considered to be the sole source for the procurement because of his knowledge in the field and his knowledge of Smithsonian needs acquired as a result of his prior survey of the Smithsonian Institution Motion Picture Film Unit.

Example 2--The Smithsonian's Office of Education and Training engaged the services of a general consultant to assist the Director of Education and Training in the development of the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum. Although the consulting services began on August 1, 1967, a purchase requisition for these services was not prepared by the Office of Education and Training until September 29, 1967. The sole-source procurement was justified by the requisitioning office on the basis that the consultant, by virtue of education, training, experience, and background, appeared to be the only source for the required services.

After the availability of funds had been certified by the Fiscal Division on October 3, 1967, a purchase order was issued by the Supply Division. Because of the delay in the preparation and processing of the requisition, the purchase order was not issued until October 17, 1967, more than 2-1/2 months after the services began. The order provided for 166 hours of services at the rate of $15 an hour, for a total of $2,490.

Example 3--On July 18, 1968, the Division of Performing Arts prepared a requisition for the installation of electrical power and lights by a Maryland electric company for the Second Annual Festival of American Folklife which was held on the Mall during the period July 3-7, 1968. An invoice for these services in the amount of $3,652 was submitted by the vendor on July 12, 1968. The vendor indicated that the company's employees began this job on or before July 1, 1968.
The availability of funds was certified by the Fiscal Division on July 18, 1968, and a contract was awarded by the Supply Division for the invoiced amount. The statement and certificate of award was dated July 1, 1968, 17 days before the date of the requisition. The Supply Division official who signed the award document was unable to explain the discrepancy between the award and requisition dates. The Chief of the Supply Division, however, stated that this was another instance of a confirming contract for a procurement in which the Smithsonian requiring activity had bypassed the Supply Division in the ordering process and that the Supply Division had to prepare the papers necessary to pay the vendor for services rendered.

In a supporting determination and findings dated July 1, 1968, the Smithsonian contracting officer stated that negotiated procurement was justified because it was impracticable to secure competition by means of formal advertising. The stated basis for this determination was that the Smithsonian did not have adequate specifications and data with which to prepare an invitation for bids for formal advertising because of insufficient time and the varying and changing requirements of performers.

Supply Division officials agreed that, with better planning and more timely requisitioning action by the requiring activity, specifications probably could have been prepared which would have permitted the solicitation of competitive bids by formal advertising with the result that a more favorable price might have been obtained.

We believe that in the circumstances discussed above there was no assurance that other qualified sources of supply were not available because solicitation of these sources was not attempted. Therefore, there was no reasonable assurance that the most favorable prices for the required services had been obtained. We believe that the most desirable means of obtaining supplies and services at truly competitive prices is to make procurements on a competitive basis, preferably by formal advertising.
Generally, lower prices will be obtained by making procurements on a competitive basis. We believe also that the procurement of goods and services without effective competition may foster inefficient and uneconomical practices and tends to circumvent a basic policy of the Congress that all qualified suppliers shall have an equal opportunity to compete for the Government's business.

In the absence of price quotations from other potential sources of supply, it was not possible for us to determine whether savings might have been realized if competition had been obtained in the procurements we reviewed. However, we did note an instance which illustrates the potential savings obtainable. This procurement involved carpeting for the First Ladies Hall of the Museum of History and Technology. The Design Office of the Museum of History and Technology, which required the carpeting, obtained price quotations from two vendors and prepared a requisition requesting the Supply Division to purchase the carpeting at the lowest quoted price it had received, $8,099. A Smithsonian official stated that the Supply Division, by soliciting competitive price proposals, obtained carpeting of the same type and quality for $5,078, a saving of more than $3,000.

PROCUREMENT OF GOODS AND SERVICES PRIOR TO CERTIFICATION OF THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

The law provides that no officer or employee of the United States make or authorize an expenditure or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available therein (31 U.S.C. 665). To assure compliance with this provision, it is imperative that Government funds not be obligated or committed until the availability of such funds has been established. Such assurance does not exist in situations where liabilities are created by virtue of procurement commitments made prior to certification of the availability of funds. In numerous instances noted in our review, such situations occurred because Smithsonian organizational units placed orders with vendors before obtaining certification from the Fiscal Division that funds were available for such purposes.
In many instances, a certification of the availability of funds was not obtained until after the supplies had been received or the services performed. For example, in a 1967 procurement, the Design Office of the Museum of History and Technology arranged to have a New York firm prepare and furnish drawings and specifications for an air-conditioned and humidified storage area for musical instruments. An invoice submitted by the vendor on July 28, 1967, in the amount of $1,192, showed that the ordered services were performed during June and July 1967. A purchase requisition for this procurement was not prepared by the Design Office until August 17, 1967, and a certificate of the availability of funds was not obtained from the Fiscal Division until August 28, 1967, almost 2 months after the performance of the services had begun and 1 month after its completion.

In another instance, the Division of Performing Arts arranged with a Virginia supplier for the rental, installation, and operation of stages, scaffolds, screens, and lights for the Second Annual Festival of American Folklife held on the Mall during the period July 3-7, 1968. A purchase requisition for these services in the amount of $4,297 was prepared by the requiring Smithsonian activity on July 24, 1968. A certification of the availability of funds was not obtained from the Fiscal Division until July 25, 1968--17 days after the services had been completed.

As a result of the procurement of goods and services prior to the certification of the availability of funds, the Smithsonian's records on the status of procurement funds are not current and therefore have not provided the control over obligations of appropriated funds necessary to ensure compliance with the requirements of 31 U.S.C. 665.

SPLITTING OF PURCHASE ORDERS TO AVOID THE "OPEN MARKET LIMITATION"

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (41 U.S.C. 252), provides that, with certain exceptions, all purchases and contracts for property and services shall be made by advertising. One of the exceptions to this requirement is that purchases and contracts
may be negotiated without advertising when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $2,500. This exception is commonly referred to as the open market limitation.

Our review of 65 purchase orders negotiated in fiscal years 1968 and 1969, totaling about $120,000, revealed several instances where the open market limitation was exceeded. In some instances the limitation was exceeded because of successive purchases of like items by the same operating division. For example, in confirmation of orders placed by the Division of Performing Arts, the Supply Division issued four purchase orders, each under $2,500 but totaling more than $8,000, for the rental of tents for the Second Annual Festival of American Folklife held in July 1968. The Smithsonian might have been able to obtain a lower price if it had advertised for bids for the total requirement.

We also noted instances where the open market limitation was exceeded because operating divisions did not coordinate their procurement of common-use items. For example, two divisions, the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts, purchased certain items of furniture from the same vendor at approximately the same time. The furniture was acquired for joint use in an area used by both divisions. Although the amount of each purchase was less than the open market limitation, the combined purchases exceeded the limitation by about $1,500.

AGENCY COMMENTS AND GAO'S EVALUATION

We discussed the questionable procurement practices with Smithsonian officials who generally agreed with our findings. The Acting Secretary observed that unauthorized purchases had been a chronic problem with most scientific and research organizations. He stated that this problem had been recognized by the Smithsonian's management and that, in an effort to alleviate the problem, the Smithsonian planned to issue a new requisitioning handbook for use by its staff members.

In a report draft which we submitted to the Secretary of the Smithsonian for advance comments, GAO agreed that a proposed requisitioning handbook might be of some help in reducing problems in the Smithsonian's procurement practices
by providing a ready reference source for procurement rules. We expressed the opinion, however, that the issuance of the handbook would not correct procurement problems because the handbook would be essentially a reiteration of existing instructions—instructions which, as we have shown, Smithsonian personnel had not consistently observed. In this respect, as stated on page 15 of this report, the Secretary issued specific instructions to staff members in December 1967, directing that all procurements were to be made through the Supply Division following verification by the Fiscal Division of the availability of funds. As shown by our review, these specific instructions had not been followed in a number of instances. We concluded that appropriate administrative controls were needed to enforce compliance with such instructions.

Therefore, we proposed that the Secretary instruct the certifying officers not to approve for payment any voucher or invoice for goods or services without the Secretary's approval when the procurement transaction does not include an advance determination of the availability of funds from the Fiscal Division and when the purchase is not processed through the Supply Division.

In commenting on our draft report, the Secretary expressed the opinion that the proposed requisitioning handbook would be beneficial for improving control over procurement practices. Additionally, he indicated his intention to reissue positive instructions requiring that, except in cases of public exigency, all procurements be made through the Supply Division after verification by the Fiscal Division of the availability of funds.

AGENCY ACTION

The Secretary subsequently issued a memorandum on April 1, 1970, on the subject of procurement practices and policies, addressed to all principal professional and administrative members of the Smithsonian staff. In this memorandum the Secretary stressed the need for compliance with the established procedures to provide assurance that goods and services for Smithsonian activities were procured at reasonable prices and within the funds available. Additionally, he pointed out that staff members were subject to
statutory and administrative penalties for the violation of procurement regulations and for exceeding available funds.

The memorandum further provided that any procurements made without following the prescribed procedures would be referred to the Assistant Secretary of the Smithsonian or other appropriate authority; that these officials would investigate the matter and recommend to the Chief of the Supply Division whether the improper procurement should be ratified or canceled; and that the Secretary reserved the right to refuse payment for any such improper procurements.

CONCLUSION

We believe that the additional administrative controls established by the revised procedures should, if properly administered, be effective in improving the Smithsonian's procurement practices.
CHAPTER 4

REVENUE-PRODUCING ACTIVITIES

The Smithsonian Institution engages in several revenue-producing activities, including the sale of books and other articles, concessions, and special events for which fees are charged. According to Smithsonian officials, these activities are carried on by authority of the Smithsonian Board of Regents in furtherance of its educational mandate. Our review showed that the Smithsonian's revenue-producing activities had been supported partly from Federal appropriations and partly from Smithsonian private funds; however, all revenue had been considered as private funds by the Smithsonian. According to the privately audited financial statements included in the Smithsonian's annual report to the Congress, expenditures of private funds for these activities in 1968 totaled $1.9 million; revenues from these activities covered $1.7 million of these costs and the balance of approximately $200,000 was provided from the Smithsonian's unrestricted private funds.

In our audit, we did not develop information concerning the amounts of income derived from individual revenue-producing activities and the nature of such activities. The extent to which direct and indirect costs relating to the activities were paid from Federal funds could not be readily determined because the accounting records of the Smithsonian do not segregate the appropriated funds used for such activities. We did note, however, that appropriated funds were used to pay for certain direct expenses and certain indirect expenses, such as heat, light, maintenance, repairs, janitorial services and supplies, guard service, and other costs relating to the operation, maintenance, and administration of the Smithsonian Institution's buildings and grounds.

CONCLUSION

Further information is being developed by Smithsonian and GAO regarding the financing of revenue-producing activities, in whole or in part, from appropriated funds when all income from such activities is considered to be private funds. Consideration will be given to the question of
whether an acceptable arrangement could be developed to report to the Congress the nature of these revenue-producing activities, specific amounts of revenue accruing from each of them, the extent to which the costs thereof are paid from Federal funds, and the extent to which the Institution applies its own funds to these public service activities.
CHAPTER 5

NEED TO REAPPRAISE INTERNAL AUDIT ACTIVITIES

Section 113 of the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 66) requires that the head of each executive agency establish and maintain systems of accounting and internal control, including internal audit, designed to provide, among other things, effective control over and accountability for all funds, property, and other assets for which the agency is responsible. Our review revealed that the Smithsonian had made only limited use of internal auditing as an element of management control.

In an April 1965 letter report to the Secretary on the results of a GAO audit of Smithsonian payroll activities, we commented on the need for the Smithsonian to establish internal auditing procedures to test the adequacy of its internal controls. In its reply of May 20, 1965, the Smithsonian agreed that there was a need for an effective internal audit function and assured GAO that action would be taken to develop an independent internal audit staff which would report to the Secretary through the Assistant Secretary.

Our review showed that many activities and programs had not been subjected to any regular program of internal audit and that there was no internal audit manual or other written guidelines which stated the objectives of internal audit, the scope of the audit work to be performed, or standards of an internal auditor's performance. During the greater part of our review, the Smithsonian's internal audit staff consisted of one auditor who was employed in July 1968. Prior to that time, the Smithsonian had had no internal audit staff for several years. One additional auditor was employed shortly before our review was completed.

Most of the work of the internal audit staff had been on private fund activities which were also audited annually by a national firm of certified public accountants. We found that only a limited amount of the internal audit effort had been directed to the federally funded activities even though salaries and expenses paid from Federal
appropriations had increased from about $4.4 million in fiscal year 1957 to about $26 million in fiscal year 1969.

The Acting Secretary stated that the internal audit effort had been concentrated on private funds because the problems in that area had been more pressing than those involving Federal funds. He indicated, however, that the auditors were turning their attention to Federal operations and that the audit staff would be expanded as constraints were lifted on the Smithsonian's Federal employment ceilings.

**CONCLUSION**

We believe that expansion of internal audit effort by the Smithsonian on activities financed with Federal funds would result in more effective audit coverage of operations. We believe also that the various questionable policies and practices discussed in the previous chapters of this report demonstrate the need for increased internal audit attention to activities financed with Federal funds.

**RECOMMENDATION TO THE SECRETARY OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION**

We recommend that the Secretary continue efforts to develop an internal audit staff of sufficient size and competence to perform effective audits of all activities, including those involving Federal as well as private funds.

**AGENCY COMMENTS**

The Secretary concurred in our recommendation and stated that the Smithsonian would undertake to recruit a competent and adequate internal audit staff.
CHAPTER 6

SCOPE OF REVIEW

Our examination consisted of (1) an evaluation of admin- 
istrative procedures and internal controls on the receipt 
and disbursement of funds appropriated for selected activi-
ties, (2) a review of the policies and practices on the pro-
curement of goods and services, and (3) a detailed review 
of the administration of funds appropriated for certain con-
struction projects. Our examination also included such 
tests of financial transactions and records as we considered 
appropriate. We did not review the private funds adminis-
tered by the Smithsonian Institution.
Mr. Allen R. Voss  
Associate Director  
Civil Division  
General Accounting Office  
Washington, D. C. 20543

Dear Mr. Voss:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on your proposed report to the Congress on the improvement needed in the financial management activities of the Smithsonian Institution.

The following comments are submitted for your consideration.

Use of Construction Funds for Equipment and Furniture.

[See GAO note.]

It is submitted that the construction appropriation was approved by the Congress on the basis of a justification which specifically included a line item in the amount of $885,000 for furniture and equipment. The printed House Hearings on the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1961, on page 218, itemizes the purposes of the appropriation and clearly states the intent of the Congress in approving this appropriation in the full amount of $13,500,000, as requested and as justified.

There follows a quotation from page 218, in pertinent part.
Use of construction funds for equipment and furniture (continued)

Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New construction</td>
<td>$5,822,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Special foundations</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elevators</td>
<td>280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Air-condition extension</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Remodeling in existing building</td>
<td>1,739,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Air-condition existing building</td>
<td>1,860,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Furniture and equipment</td>
<td>685,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Divert large storm sewer</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ventilate basement area</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reservations</td>
<td>208,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>570,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General expenses:
- Drawings and specifications: $731,000
- Supervision: 180,000
- Office expense: 45,000
- Smithsonian Institution: 200,000

Total estimated limit of cost: 14,300,000

Appropriated under Public Law 85-77, approved Sept. 1, 1957: 800,000

Additional to be appropriated: 13,500,000

1 This climatic control is required in Washington to preserve the irreplaceable national collections.

[See GAO note.]
Inclusion of furniture and equipment in other construction appropriations

The inclusion of an amount in a construction appropriation to provide necessary furniture and equipment may be found in other appropriation acts, as outlined in the paragraphs below.

Example 1.

The Smithsonian appropriation for "Restoration and Renovation of Buildings" for fiscal year 1968 was based on a justification printed in the House Hearings on the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations, starting on page 1006. Included in the justification for completing renovation of the Smithsonian Institution Building is the following statement:

"It is now proposed that improvements be made at the western end of the first floor, comprising the old Chapel, west range, and the library. Improved lighting, flooring, partitioning, book stacks, display cases, and appropriate furnishings can convert this area into a study and discussion hall and library. This portion of the project is estimated to cost $200,000."

Example 2.

In the same Hearings, on page 1008, reference is made to the renovation and modification to the old Civil Service Building to accommodate the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery. The following statement is submitted:

"The building is being fitted with shelves, display cases, equipment and other items necessary to receive the collections."

In both of the preceding examples, the appropriations were approved by the Congress either in the full amount requested or with specific reductions not involving furnishings and equipment.

Example 3.

It has been learned from Mr. William A. Schmidt, former Commissioner of the Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, that in the years prior to the lease-purchase program
Example 3. (continued)

for the construction of public buildings throughout the country, items for furnishings and equipment were included in the building construction appropriations for that Service.

Example 4.

The "Memorandum of Understanding and Agreement for Design and Construction Services," No. PBS-67-5, transmitted to the Smithsonian Institution by letter dated March 20, 1967, by the Acting Commissioner of the Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, included in the total estimated cost of $15,000,000 an amount of $500,000 for furnishings for the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

Example 5.

We note in the House Hearings for the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1969, for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, starting on page 730, that construction and furniture and equipment funds are requested under the same heading, "Construction."

In consideration of the foregoing statements, it is submitted that the expenditure for furniture and equipment as a part of the project for the Natural History Building Additions was in accordance with the intent of Congress and was also consistent with the practice of the Institution and of other agencies.

Use of funds appropriated for one building to pay for alterations to another building

Your draft report states that the Smithsonian had no legal authority for charging the appropriation for the construction of the Natural History Building Additions with the cost of alterations to the Smithsonian's Arts and Industries Building in order to accommodate a dispossessed tenant of the former building.

It is submitted, to the contrary, that this appropriation was justified to the Congress specifically describing the necessity of including such alterations and improvements as may be necessary to integrate the Additions with the existing building. a/ The justifica-

Use of funds appropriated for one building to pay for alterations to another building (continued)

...tion specifically included the amount of $570,000 for contingencies, that is, those exigencies of construction which may be expected in order to carry out properly the purposes of the construction project.

The relocation of the Office of the Registrar from the Natural History Building to the Arts and Industries Building was judged to be essential as a part of the objective of the improvement of the Natural History Building. To make this relocation possible, it was necessary to make alterations to the Arts and Industries Building. Since the purpose of this expenditure was to improve space utilization within the Natural History Building, it is our judgment that the expenditure for the necessary alterations within an adjoining Smithsonian building was necessary and proper. This opinion is believed to be consistent with Section 4.5 of the General Accounting Office Policies and Procedures Manual, Title 7, where it states:

"Where an appropriation is made for a particular purpose, it confers, by implication, authority to incur expenses which are necessary or incident to the proper execution of the purpose, ...."

Controls over the procurement of goods and services

Your comments and recommendations in regard to controls over the procurement of goods and services have been reviewed carefully. It is noted that you recommend that the Secretary instruct the certifying officers not to approve payment for any voucher or invoice for goods or services without his specific approval if the transaction did not include an advance determination of the availability of funds from the Fiscal Division and if the purchase was not processed through the Supply Division.

As you recognized, the Supply Division with the support of the Secretary has endeavored to maintain control over procurement in the interest of improved administration. The Requisitioning Handbook for use by Smithsonian staff members should be helpful in providing a ready reference source of procurement rules. The Secretary has already issued and will now reissue positive instructions to all concerned members of the staff that all procurements are to be made through the Supply Division, following verification by the Fiscal Division of the availability of funds. This procedure will be subject to exception only in the case of public exigency.
Reappraisal of internal audit activities

Included in the comments on the need to reappraise the internal audit activities of the Institution, there is a recommendation that the Secretary continue his efforts to develop an internal audit staff of sufficient size and competence to perform effective audits of all functional areas, including those involving Federal as well as private funds.

The Smithsonian concurs in this recommendation and will undertake to recruit competent and adequate staff for this important function.

******************************

It is felt that the above given information satisfactorily clarifies and answers the points raised in your recent report. I would like, however, to add the further related statement. The Smithsonian welcomes constructive criticism of the type you have given us. At the same time, for a balanced picture of our situation, the record should carry a statement of the intense efforts which have been carried on for the past year or more, and are now continuing, to bring about improvements in our financial and accounting affairs. This includes such fundamental steps as the reorganization of the Fiscal Division, upgrading of personnel, complete and uniform coding of accounting transactions, changes to accrual accounting methods, automation and computerization of certain procedures including a new combined payroll-personnel program, and current efforts to prepare regularly more meaningful monthly reports to aid executives in the management and direction of their resources. These efforts have been supplemented by the issuance of a new procedural manual on the subject of property management. A new manual on procurement procedures will be issued in the near future and a new manual on auditing is in process also. Only the elements of time, manpower, and money are restricting these improvement efforts. They will be continued at maximum levels within the resources available to us.

Sincerely yours,

S. Dillon Ripley
Secretary

GAO note: Deleted comments pertain to material presented in the draft report which has been revised or which has not been included in the final report.
## APPENDIX II

**PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION**

**RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF**

**THE ACTIVITIES DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Regents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Warren</td>
<td>Chief Justice of the United States, Chancellor</td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren E. Burger</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubert H. Humphrey</td>
<td>Vice President of the United States</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiro T. Agnew</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton P. Anderson</td>
<td>Member of the Senate</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. William Fulbright</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Scott</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank T. Bow</td>
<td>Member of the House of Representatives</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael J. Kirwan</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George H. Mahon</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nicholas Brown</td>
<td>Citizen of Rhode Island</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford H. Greenewalt</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; Delaware</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryl P. Haskins</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome C. Hunsaker</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; Massachusetts</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Dillon Ripley</td>
<td></td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Secretary:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bradley</td>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Secretaries:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bradley (Administration)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Blitzer (History and Art)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney R. Galler (Science)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William W. Warner (Public Service)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Voss. Although copies of these two reports were made available to this subcommittee, I believe it would be useful to quickly summarize the more significant matters discussed in the reports.

**IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED IN FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES**

In our report to the Congress dated July 1, 1970, we questioned the Smithsonian's use of funds appropriated by the Congress for the construction of additions to the Natural History Building.

Our review of selected transactions showed that $40,000 had been used by the Smithsonian Institution to finance the cost of altering the Arts and Industries Building and that $340,000 had been used to purchase equipment, supplies, and furniture for the Natural History Building.

It was our opinion that the Smithsonian Institution had no legal authority for charging the Natural History Building construction appropriation with the cost to alter the Arts and Industries Building since under the law appropriations are available only for the purposes for which they are made.

We therefore recommended that the Smithsonian seek another source for financing the $40,000 expenditure and reimburse the appropriation.

Although the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution has expressed the view that the charges were proper, we remain of the opinion that the charges were not legal.

Therefore, unless the Smithsonian Institution can finance this cost from other legally available funds, the General Accounting Office will have to take formal exception against the accountable officer for the $40,000 expenditure.

The situation was not as clear-cut with respect to the $340,000 spent by the Smithsonian to purchase equipment, supplies, and furniture for the Natural History Building.

Our review of the record of congressional approval of the fiscal year 1961 appropriation request for the construction of the Natural History Building showed that an amount of $685,000 was included for furniture and equipment. The record does not contain any further elaboration regarding this provision.

Funds from the construction appropriation were spent for such items as microscopes, laboratory equipment and supplies, typewriters, calculators, office supplies, and so forth.

However, since the Smithsonian's annual appropriations for salaries and expenses are made for these types of items, we are unsure as to whether the Congress would have expected that the provision for furniture and equipment in the Smithsonian's budget estimate for construction would have included provision for many of these items.

The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution advised us that certain supplies costing about $4,000 were not authorized by the appropriation and that other funds were available for reimbursing the appropriation for these charges.

It was the Secretary's view, however, that the remaining charges of $336,000 were proper. Since we could not determine Congressional intent on this matter, we reported it to the Congress for its consideration.
Also included in our report to the Congress were findings concerning (1) the need for management to strengthen controls over the procurement of goods and services and (2) the need to reappraise the internal audit activities of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution concurred in our findings and recommendations and has taken, or has promised to take, certain actions which, if properly implemented, should improve the financial management activities of the Smithsonian Institution.

In addition, our report to the Congress stated that Federal funds are used to partially support revenue-producing activities of the Smithsonian Institution. However, revenues received from these activities are considered to be private funds by the Smithsonian.

According to the privately audited financial statements included in the Smithsonian's annual report to the Congress, expenditures for these activities in 1968 totaled $1.9 million while revenues totaled $1.7 million.

The remaining $200,000 to cover those costs not paid for from revenues was provided from the Smithsonian's unrestricted private funds.

The extent to which direct and indirect costs of these activities were paid for from Federal funds could not be readily determined by us because the Smithsonian's accounting records do not segregate the appropriated funds used for such activities.

However, we do know that appropriated funds were used to pay for certain direct expenses and certain indirect expenses, such as heat, light, supplies, and other costs relating to the operation, maintenance, and administration of the Smithsonian Institution's buildings and grounds.

In view of the unique status of the Smithsonian Institution and the legal provision that all revenues are to be credited to the Smithsonian bequest, we cannot conclude that moneys received from revenue-producing activities must be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

However, we believe that it is important that the Smithsonian Institution provide the Congress with information concerning the nature of these activities, specific amounts of revenue accruing from each of them, the extent to which the costs thereof are paid for from Federal funds, and the extent to which the Smithsonian applies its own funds to these public service activities.

The handling and reporting of revenue-producing activities is being given further consideration by Smithsonian and GAO officials.

NATIONAL COLLECTION OF FINE ARTS

Our review of the control over, and disposition of, art works at the National Collection of Fine Arts was made in response to a request by Congressman Hastings Keith.

At the completion of our review, we reported to Congressman Keith on July 16, 1970, that:

1. The national collection had, in the last 6 years, disposed of four paintings by European artists for the purpose of acquiring American art works.
2. The Smithsonian Board of Regents had not established a formal written policy on whether art works in the national collection should be sold or exchanged.

3. The practice followed by the national collection in valuing paintings being considered for disposition has been less stringent than appeared desirable.

4. The national collection's records of the location of its paintings in many instances were inaccurate, or did not adequately describe the location of the paintings.

5. The method of storing certain paintings subjected them to the risk of damage.

After we discussed these matters with Smithsonian officials, the following corrective measures were taken:

The Board of Regents went on record to permit the sale or exchange of art works but established a requirement that, depending upon the value of the art work, prior approval of the sale or exchange would be obtained from top management officials of the Smithsonian or from the Board of Regents itself.

The Secretary of the Smithsonian established a requirement for appraising the value of each art work to be sold or exchanged, with one professional, independent appraisal being required if the estimated value was likely to exceed $1,000, and two appraisals if the value was likely to exceed $50,000.

Also, the Secretary has suggested to the Director of the National Collection that he solicit the views of the National Collection of Fine Arts Commission on the method to be followed in establishing the market value of these art objects.

We believe that these actions of the Smithsonian will provide significant improvement in the controls over the sale or exchange of art works of the National Collection.

In our report, however, we expressed the belief that the National Collection should consider the views of more than one art expert in the value of an art work to be sold or exchanged. Such a procedure would be comparable to that followed by the Art Dealers Association of America. The Association requires that an appraisal be the combined judgment of more than one of its member dealers.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared statement. We shall try to answer any questions you have on these matters.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you very much, Mr. Voss.
I have several questions.
Does the GAO audit concern itself mainly with funds appropriated directly to the Smithsonian by Congress?
Mr. Voss. Our audit generally is just of those funds appropriated directly, yes, sir.
Mr. Thompson. In fiscal year 1970, my figures indicate that $29,965,000, not including the foreign currency program and operating expenses for the zoo, were appropriated. Is that accurate?
Mr. Voss. Yes, sir. About $30 million is correct. This would be the salaries and expenses, basically, of the Smithsonian Institution.
Mr. Thompson. Without regard to moneys from other Federal sources?
Mr. Voss. Yes, sir. The Smithsonian received about $11.5 million in fiscal year 1969 and about $10.6 million in fiscal year 1970 from grants and contracts, basically from NASA and the National Science Foundation.

Mr. Thompson. And do you audit those funds as well?

Mr. Voss. This was not a part of our audit of the Smithsonian. However, depending upon the individual grants and individual contracts that may be given by NASA and NSF, we may have access to those funds, the expenditure of those funds, through those contracts.

But that job would be done when we make reviews at NSF or at NASA.

Mr. Thompson. In other words, you go to the source of origin?

Mr. Voss. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. Then, if necessary, from the source of origin you go out to the various areas to which those original funds flowed.

Mr. Voss. We presently, for instance, have an audit going on at the National Science Foundation concerning certain grants that they make. It is a functional type audit. As part of that audit, one of the grants that has been selected for review was a grant made by NSF to Smithsonian. So that particular grant will be covered in that audit.

Mr. Thompson. In 1965, GAO made certain recommendations to the Smithsonian with respect to improving its auditing and accounting procedures.

What were those recommendations?

Mr. Voss. Basically, the 1965 report was an audit of the civilian payroll activities of Smithsonian. We found several errors in the calculations for salaries and sick and annual leave. These were minor, I would say.

However, the one recommendation which we felt was significant was the recommendation that dealt with internal audit. We felt at that time that there was very little, if any, internal audit being made of the appropriated funds, and we recommended that such be done.

Subsequent to the issuance of that report in 1965, we received a reply from the Secretary of the Smithsonian where he agreed that additional auditing of public funds was desirable and he was going to implement that recommendation.

However, during our audit in 1969, we found that basically there was still a need for increased emphasis on internal auditing and there was a need for additional staffing in internal audit activities.

Mr. Thompson. For additional staff?

Mr. Voss. For additional staff.

Mr. Thompson. Are you familiar with the statement made to the committee the other day by the Treasurer of the Institution, Mr. Wheeler, in which he reflected some changes that he had undertaken?

Mr. Voss. Not in any detail, Mr. Chairman. I do know that he did mention that there was a staff, I believe, of four internal auditors now, and that there was one internal auditor up to about 1969, and then a second was hired in 1969, and I understand two more have been hired in 1970.
Mr. Thompson. He described in some detail the changes underway now or that have been underway for a period of about 2 years involving the use of computers and a general speedup.

I would assume there would be a much faster retrieval system and so on.

Mr. Voss. Yes; the ADP equipment. We did not get into that in this recent audit because the increased use of ADP equipment has come into being just very recently. I believe within the last 6 months they have instituted some additional controls, internal controls, by use of the ADP equipment. But we did not get into that phase during our audit.

**Explanation of ADP**

SUBMITTED BY SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Automatic Data Processing is a generic term for the operations carried out on computing and auxiliary equipment. The Smithsonian Institution is equipped with a Honeywell 1250 computer on the Mall which is connected over telecommunications line with a CDC-6400 computer at the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The Information Systems Division provides support to the Smithsonian administrative, curatorial, and research activities. It supports needs in information storage and retrieval, scientific applications, library systems, and management systems.

The Management Systems section has implemented new accounting systems for the federal and private accounting offices to provide timely, accurate and controlled accounting data. The Buildings Management Department is being provided with methods of reporting and accumulating cost and work data for labor and materials at all management levels.

A combined payroll and personnel system is being completed. Reporting requirements are being revised while manual intervention is being simplified or eliminated. The new system will simplify payroll procedures. An up-to-date automated personnel system will replace the present manual procedures.

The Information Storage and Retrieval Section, in cooperation with members of the National Museum of Natural History, has developed the Natural History Information Retrieval System (NIHIS) that permits an investigator to direct questions to a data bank consisting of specimen records and related bibliography. The Scientific Applications Section has several programs to fulfill the needs of various departments. For example: tables on the velocities of free-falling particles in a viscous fluid; an analysis of faunal relationships without prior knowledge of ecological parameters, mathematical approaches to study the microstructure of bone by electron probe processing; and mathematical analysis of data on teeth from archeological finds.

The Information Systems Division established an inventory file for the Smithsonian libraries. The system supplies the staff with up-to-date information on published monographs.

The Smithsonian Subscription Fulfillment Program maintains control over mailings and Smithsonian Associates' accounts. The member file contains the addresses of over 37,000 people to whom more than 300,000 individual mailings are provided.

Another project—provides an automated information collection and dissemination system for botanical type specimens. The information is reported by cooperating herbaria who receive distribution records in return.

The UCLA Biomedical Computer Programs library of mathematical routines has been installed on the Astrophysical Observatory computer system. A telecommunications line to the CDC 6400 has provided the capability to perform various special projects for scientists that otherwise would have been too large to handle.

A postcard-size questionnaire has been prepared to collect information from museum visitors from which statistical analyses of the data will be made.

An automated bibliography prepared for the Flora North America Project will produce a concise diagnostic manual of all vascular plants north of Mexico.

The Smithsonian Libraries serial purchase file on the computer will automate renewals and orders and alert librarians to actions to be taken on them.
Activities of the Information Systems Division have been characterized by a continuous effort to coordinate new data-processing techniques with existing museum resources, to design additional systems capable of aiding scientists and researchers in their tasks, and to disseminate the products and techniques of these activities throughout the museum community.

Mr. Thompson. What comparison would you draw between the Smithsonian audit groups and the audit groups of the other Government bodies with which you are familiar?

Mr. Voss. We have issued, Mr. Chairman, about 20 or 25 reports on our reviews of internal audit activities in various departments and agencies in the Executive branch. Most of those reports were dealing with very large departments and it would be very difficult to draw a comparison there.

In addition, I might mention that in trying to determine an adequate size of an internal audit staff for an agency you would have to look at the agency’s activities.

Given an equal budget between two agencies, an agency with only one activity would be much easier to audit than another agency which may have a lot of activities.

I consider the Smithsonian to be very diversified in its activities. But I do know, for instance, that the Government Printing Office, with a budget of approximately $30 million, employs four internal auditors. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, with a budget of approximately $30 million, employs seven internal auditors.

The National Foundation on Arts and Humanities, which had a budget of approximately $15 million in 1969, employs one auditor.

The Smithsonian Institution, which had a $50 million budget in 1969, employed one auditor at that time. So it was obvious to us that the number of auditors, internal auditors, that they had, and the other types of internal controls that they were using, was not sufficient to handle the job that was needed by management.

Mr. Thompson. Of course, the Smithsonian is unique in that it has these private funds.

How does your audit of public funds differ from the audit of the private funds of the Smithsonian made by Peat, Marwick & Mitchell?

Mr. Voss. Peat, Marwick & Mitchell have been employed by the Smithsonian to attest to the financial statements, which means that they perform an audit of the expenditures for a given year and look at the balances or the financial condition of that institution at the end of the year.

Mr. Thompson. But they don’t look beyond that?

Mr. Voss. They do not. They could, of course, be employed for management consultant purposes, but with respect to the Smithsonian, they are only employed to attest to the accuracy and validity of the financial statements. They do not make, for instance, reviews of how efficient or economical the Smithsonian was in disbursing funds.

Mr. Thompson. Do you have any particular problems when you attempt to learn the complete financial structure of the Smithsonian?

Mr. Voss. Yes. If you are only allowed to look at a piece of an operation, it would be very difficult to appraise how efficient and how effective and how economical that operation was being handled.

Mr. Thompson. Your responsibility differs from that of the private firm in that part of your responsibility is, in a sense, to look beyond the mere statistical data, into the use of it.
Mr. Voss. Yes.

Mr. Thompson. When you review Peat, Marwick & Mitchell's audit, you simply look at it as a stockholder would the report of a corporation and analyze it on that basis, don't you?

Mr. Voss. Exactly. The financial statements that are published by Peat, Marwick & Mitchell covering their audit of the private fund transactions of Smithsonian would be similar to the financial statements which would be published by any CPA firm auditing a commercial operation, where the investor is merely looking at how the operation came out, profit and loss wise, and what the balances are with respect to such items as cash, accounts receivable, and inventories.

Mr. Thompson. With respect to your July 1 report, it is obvious that the Smithsonian disagrees over the legality of certain ways in which appropriated construction money is used.

Mr. Voss. Yes. I realize that we are talking about a $40,000 expenditure which may appear small when you consider the total cost of operating the Smithsonian Institution, or the total cost of constructing the building or addition to the building that we have been looking at, such as the east and west wing addition to the Natural History Building.

However, there is a principle involved here, and that principle is that the law says appropriations shall not be used for any other purpose except that which it is appropriated for, whether it be $40,000 or $40 million. We are talking about a principle.

The Smithsonian Institution in this case does not agree that what they used those funds for were illegal under the law. We do feel that they were illegal expenditures and we will be forced to take exceptions to those expenditures. But the main point is the principle.

Mr. Thompson. What is the result or would be the result of you taking an exception to a $40,000 item?

Mr. Voss. We would take the exception against the accountable officer, the certifying officer, in the Smithsonian Institution. He would be responsible for actually repaying that or finding ways to repay it. It could be repaid through the private funds of the Smithsonian, reimbursing the appropriation, or there could be a special bill introduced to alleviate the responsibility of the certifying officer repaying those funds.

Mr. Thompson. You are much more clear on this point than you are on the $300,000 item.

Mr. Voss. The $340,000——

Mr. Thompson. Is that because of the vagueness of the legislative history?

Mr. Voss. We could find nothing in the legislative history, the appropriation hearings, or the reports, which indicates just what the intent of the Congress was with respect to the $340,000.

Mr. Thompson. That is something of a difficult question because, as you know, under the Rules of the House the Appropriation Committee is forbidden to legislate in an appropriations bill. They often do it or try to do it, or do it and try to get rules waiving points of order.

But in that instance, my research shows that the committee did not ask for a rule waiving points of order, nor can I find in my research that they had any authority to or, indeed, that they did legislate in such a way that this would be clear.
Mr. Voss. I would agree with this, Mr. Chairman. We could not find any clear-cut authority here either. It is vague to us.

But I would bring in this matter: The construction of the east and west wings was essentially complete in April 1965. Construction moneys were appropriated in 1957, 1960 and 1961. However, since completion of the construction of the building in 1965, approximately a half million dollars was expended from an appropriation account called Construction; subsequent to completion we are still spending money. In fact, as of March 1969, there was still about $20,000 in that account unobligated.

It would appear that in constructing a building, shortly after the building is completed most of the money would have been expended for construction, including the furniture, fixtures and equipment. However, procurement of furniture and equipment has gone on for years after the building was complete and, in fact, in fiscal year 1968, about $100,000 was spent for furniture and equipment.

Mr. Thompson. Construction having been completed, wouldn't the normal procedure be for the unused funds to be returned to the Treasury?

Mr. Voss. Except for the one item and, as I say, this is a gray area, except for the one item that the Smithsonian brings up, and it is correct, that they had made available to them $685,000 for furniture and equipment for the Natural History Building extensions.

Mr. Thompson. And apparently that wasn't enough.

Mr. Voss. Yes. They have been using it for years. They are still using it.

Mr. Bingham. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. Thompson. Yes.

Mr. Bingham. Now that you get to that point, I don't understand the question that you raise, and I haven't since I saw the reference in your report.

Since that item was included, apparently, $685,000 for furniture and equipment, why is there a question about the $340,000? I don't understand it.

Mr. Voss. Congressman Bingham, generally speaking—this is not always the case, but generally speaking—funds made available for construction and for furniture and equipment are used to buy the type of furniture and equipment which is attached to the realty.

In many cases, funds for furniture and equipment are made available for those types of items which are not attached to the realty; but we usually find an expression of this during the appropriation hearings, where this is discussed. We could not find that expression in this particular appropriation.

Mr. Bingham. That being the case, and since the words in their normal meaning, furniture and equipment, would not mean necessarily fixtures—"fixtures" would be the word to be used in the sense that you are talking about, I don't see how you raise the question about it.

Mr. Voss. Furniture could also be permanently attached to the building.

Mr. Bingham. Yes, but the normal use of the words "furniture" and "equipment" suggests things that are not attached.

If you are talking about things that are attached, you would use the word "fixtures."
Mr. Voss. No. I find in some of the appropriations when they talk about furniture, fixtures, and equipment, and are making it clear to the committee what they intend to do with those funds, they bring out both types, that which is attached and that which is not attached.

As I say, we don't mean to take the position——

Mr. Bingham. I don't understand how, with that language in there and with nothing to suggest that the words "furniture" and "equipment" were intended to mean items to be attached to the building—I don't understand the basis for the question that furniture and equipment should not be included.

Mr. Voss. I think the real basis for the question is that when you look at an appropriation for construction and for furniture and equipment, you feel that the moneys that were made available for constructing and equipping the building should be expended shortly after the building has been constructed.

In this particular instance, funds have been spent for furniture and equipment for 4 and 5 years subsequent to the completion of the construction of the building, even though the annual appropriation that is made available to the Smithsonian, for salaries and expenses provides for the procurement of equipment and furnishings.

Mr. Bingham. They are raising a different question. It seems to me they are raising the question of whether they were going beyond the provision for the original furniture and equipment required to equip the building for its original purposes, but were carrying on some form of either replacement or something that you could not characterize a part of the original process.

But that is a different point. You didn't raise that in your report, as far as I know.

Mr. Voss. In the report itself the $340,000 that we have included there are expenditures made subsequent to June 1965, when the building essentially was completed.

If that was not made clear, that is what we intended to bring out. After the building was essentially completed funds were spent to provide furniture and equipment for the building.

Mr. Thompson. I understand that point. I think this colloquy and this lack of understanding, and I share Mr. Bingham's question about it, arises from a lack of clarity in the legislation. You say that you haven't been able to find any language under which this could be done, nor any prohibition, and neither can I.

Mr. Voss. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. So this just demonstrates to me, really, that this committee, the Committee on House Administration, and the Subcommittee on the Library and Memorials, must accept a degree of responsibility for not having done its legislative work. Rather, for too long we have been in a sense allowing the Committee on Appropriations to do it.

With all due respect to them, they just love to legislate whenever they can. There are all sorts of prohibitions in recent appropriation bills which really do amount to legislation.

Have you found any instances in which the Smithsonian receives income from private sources as a result of activity paid for by Federal funds?
Mr. Voss. The revenue-producing activities of the Smithsonian Institution, which would be, for instance, their museum shops, or their folk festivals, are financed partially from Federal funds and partially from private funds.

In the museum situation, where you have shops within the museum, the funds that are generated from the sales of the various articles that these shops are selling are deposited into the private fund account.

However, the indirect costs, such as the heat, light, the cost of construction of that portion of the building applicable to these shops, those costs come from appropriated funds. All revenues are deposited in the private account.

Mr. Thompson. So it would be very difficult to determine exactly the profit and loss situation, wouldn't it?

Mr. Voss. It could be determined on an allocation basis, but since, under the present accounting system at the Smithsonian, the costs are not allocated to these cost centers. If you would, it would be very difficult under the present system to determine those costs.

Mr. Thompson. On page 4 of your statement, you say that Federal funds are used to partially support revenue-producing activities, and that the revenues received from these activities are considered to be private funds by the Institution.

Then you indicate that the expenditures were $1.9 million and revenues $1.7 million, a loss of $200,000 which was made up from private funds.

Is that your understanding?

Mr. Voss. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. Thompson. And yet further, as I understand it, you don't have total access to the handling or to the manner in which the private funds are handled except to look at Peat, Marwick's audit, is that correct?

Mr. Voss. That is correct. By law, we do not have access to those accounts.

Mr. Thompson. When the Smithsonian receives income or is reimbursed as a result of any Federal expenditures, how should this income be handled?

Mr. Voss. Would you repeat that question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Thompson. I suppose what I am asking is wherever Federal funds are involved, do you agree that the Smithsonian should keep those in such a manner as to be able to account fully for them and their use to the GAO?

Mr. Voss. Yes. They do actually account for the Federal funds that they received through the appropriations in such a manner that we are able to audit the expenditures of Federal funds.

But if you get to the point of telling how much of those Federal funds specifically are allocated to various activities, they do not keep their records in such a manner that you can determine, for instance, how much of the overhead costs should be allocated to museum shops.

Mr. Thompson. Did you make any suggestions or were such suggestions included in your recommendations for improving the internal audit system?

Mr. Voss. Yes. We felt that greater emphasis was needed to provide better coverage of the auditing of the Federal funds. The one auditor that was there, and he was hired, I believe, in 1968, had spent most of his time, as of 1969, in auditing the private funds.
Mr. Thompson. Was he a publicly paid auditor?

Mr. Voss. He was paid from appropriated funds; yes, sir. We felt that more time should be devoted on the appropriated funds, and that there would be a need to increase the staff in order to do the job.

The Smithsonian felt that there were more problems, I must mention at that time, in the private side of their accounts. This is why the internal auditor was spending most of his time on the private side.

Mr. Thompson. The very nature of the Institution is such that it is natural, I suppose, that such practices would exist and it is probably proper. It is very difficult to separate within the Institution, itself, the private and public functions.

One could raise a question as to whether or not it is proper for a Federal employee to be working any time at all, any substantial time, on the private funds over which, in a very real sense, the Federal Government has no control, and, in a further sense, has no real right to look over in minute detail.

Mr. Voss. Of course, this works both ways, Mr. Chairman. There were about 3,500 employees on the Smithsonian payroll, both private and public, in 1969, of which about 1,200 were on the private payroll and about 2,300 on the public payroll.

And yet, those that are on the private payroll also spend time handling activities which are financed with appropriated funds.

The Secretary of the Smithsonian himself has to be involved in both sides, yet his total pay comes from the private funds.

Mr. Thompson. I don't really question these methods, because obviously, you can't run two separate institutions under one roof with both private and public funds.

To my mind, at least, the Secretary and his staff should have considerable latitude in the operation of the Institution, it being so totally unique.

Mr. Voss. I think what we were attempting to do in our report to the Congress was to disclose to the Congress that what is needed in this unique type operation, really, is better disclosure to the Congress by the Smithsonian of its total operations. This can be done annually, in their annual report both to legislative and appropriation committees.

It would show specifically the total cost of the operations and the total revenues of the operations, and possibly even including an allocation of costs to various operations.

Mr. Thompson. That would be very useful. At least it would eliminate a number of the type of questions that have come to my attention, and the attention of my colleagues.

I am reasonably sure that they don't have anything to hide. However, if they wanted to hide something in the private sector, they certainly could, beyond their audit.

In a sense, they are responsible for the administration of private moneys under a number of private trusts or other arrangements.

They have an obligation to do with the Smithsonian money what Mr. Smithsonian said; with the Freer money what Mr. Freer said; with the Roebling money what Mr. Roebling said, "Don't touch anything but my minerals," and on it goes.

So it is no doubt difficult for the Smithsonian and difficult for the Congress. But I do concur with you that it would be useful for a really full disclosure to the appropriations and the legislative committees.
I have one question with respect to the report which you sent our colleague, Mr. Keith on the sale of the paintings.

When the inventory was done on the art works by GAO, by whom was it done?

Mr. Voss. By professional staff members of our Washington regional office. We went out to locate the art works that we selected for review. We did, of course, have National Collection of Fine Arts people with us.

Mr. Thomson. In other words, you had someone there who was expert in the field?

Mr. Voss. Yes.

Mr. Thomson. I think for the moment that is all I want to ask you. Thank you very much for being here this morning, and for your very helpful report and testimony.

Although I don't expect any legislation to arise out of these hearings, our committee report will include some recommendations to the Committee on Appropriations. Maybe we will learn from the next witness who is going to come up with that $40,000, or, as they say up home, the 40-G's, being the track season.

Mr. Voss. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thomson. Our next witness is Mr. James Bradley, the Under Secretary of the Smithsonian, accompanied by Mr. John Jameson, director, Office of Programing and Budget; Mr. Fred Barwick, the chief of the supply division, and Peter G. Powers, general counsel.

STATEMENT OF JAMES BRADLEY, UNDER SECRETARY, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION—Resumed

Mr. Thomson. Mr. Bradley.

Mr. Bradley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The essence of our comments on the General Accounting Office report of July 1, 1970, has very conveniently been included as an appendix, in pertinent part, to the report itself, and I believe you have that report, Mr. Chairman. So we did not prepare another statement of comments.

If I may highlight our submission to the General Accounting Office and talk first about the furniture and the equipment items, since that has come up, we certainly share Mr. Bingham's reaction that it is difficult for us to understand why there is a question being raised for the expenditure of those funds, and funds, may I add, that there were appropriated by the Congress to remain available until expended.

In my years of construction experience, I have not heard of any practice or of any prohibition or any rule of thumb that says that funds that are available until expended are not available until expended.

It is perfectly true that in the case of the Museum of History and Technology, which adjoins the building——

Mr. Thomson. Are you alluding to the question I asked Mr. Voss to the effect that the construction having been completed, unexpended funds should be returned?

Mr. Bradley. I was alluding more particularly, Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Voss' statement, not to your question.

Mr. Thomson. I didn't understand that these funds were made available until expended. In that case, I agree with you.
Mr. Bradley. Thank you, sir. Now, referring to the furniture and equipment item, in our practice with the Appropriation Committee we spell it out, and as Government appropriations go, ours is rather a modest appropriation, in very great detail. In fact, sometimes the thought is that perhaps we go into too much detail.

Mr. Thompson. You are talking now about the Federal funds?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir. In the published hearings for the fiscal year 1961, there was included in full a statement of our justification for the construction funds, and it included not only Item 7 for furniture and equipment, but a number of other things that were equally important to the reconstruction of the central part of that building and the addition of these monumental wings on the west and east ends of the building, things that were equally as important. Included were air conditioning and diverting a large storm sewer. The storm sewer had to be moved. It was not part of the building, but it was made necessary by the reconstruction and the additions to the building.

We had other items such as reserves and contingencies that year, in a total appropriation of $13.5 million. The total improvement was pretty close to $19 million, funded in the 2 different years.

Mr. Thompson. If I may interrupt for a minute, would you comment on Mr. Voss' statement with respect to the $40,000? He very candidly stated that the furniture and equipment item, and the difference there, arises out of either a misunderstanding or a lack of specific and categorical legislative history.

We are really not bickering about that. It is a matter of practice. As I recall, you said the other day that you didn't consider it to be, on the larger amount, particularly significant since you felt you could have gone in and asked for that as a specific item for furniture anyway, paraphrasing you.

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. Your view is that it is a legitimate expenditure in the absence of any specific authorization or prohibition.

So we can't really bicker about that, except perhaps we will suggest to the Committee on Appropriations, if they will be kind enough to listen to us, that they might tighten up some of their practices. They are always making suggestions to us.

Mr. Bradley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Referring to the $40,000, the GAO report said that the Smithsonian had no legal authority to spend money appropriated for reconstruction and additions to the Natural History Building on the Arts and Industries Building.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that when this appropriation was justified to the Congress, we specifically described the necessity of including such alterations and improvements as may be necessary to integrate the additions with the existing building.

What those words mean to us—and I guess I wrote them myself—is that here we have an exploratory type of construction project, where we were putting seven-story additions onto a three-story existing central structure.

We couldn't be entirely sure of all contingencies. It was an exploratory operation. So we had to include in there some contingency funds.
Mr. Thompson. Do you mean in case the sixth additional story was all the first three could take, or something like that?

Mr. Bradley. Well, they had to match up, Mr. Chairman. We had to get massive air-conditioning ducts around in a building that was built in 1910, things of that kind.

It later became apparent to us that in order to bring back from the outlying location up on Lamont Street a certain department of scientists, known as entomology, it would be prudent and good planning to move the Registrar, who has to do not only with natural history, the building we are talking about, but also the adjoining building, history and technology accessions, to move her out and give the community of scientists a chance to work together.

We believed that there was just as much essentiality to that move as there was to move, let us say, the large combined system sewer down on a part of the lot where we were going to put the foundation in. That, too, had to be moved, as did the Registrar's office.

It is common practice to make way for construction by providing, when necessary, a relocation of items that are in the way of construction. We feel that this type of exigency is consistent with a manual put out by the GAO for the guidance of Government people, wherein it states:

Where an appropriation is made for a particular purpose, it confers, by implication, authority to incur expenses which are necessary or incident to the proper execution of the purpose.

Mr. Thompson. I would like to make it clear, Mr. Bradley, I don't question that you had good reason to do what you did. I am a little confused between the relationship of the storm sewer, the entomologists, the additional stories and so on, and the $40,000.

It is the method that I question. Obviously, you have reached an impasse. You take the position and are restating it now, that you used the $40,000 properly. The method is in question and that is all.

GAO takes the position that you did not and that somebody will have to come up with $40,000 from somewhere. How are you going to solve that problem?

Mr. Bradley. The first try that we are going to make is to talk after this hearing and in the light of whatever this committee has to tell us, with the Appropriation Committee.

It happens that we have an appropriation which was passed yesterday in the amount of a half million dollars for the very type of construction in the Arts and Industries building that we used the $40,000 for.

This consists essentially of flooring over certain two-story areas in order to develop necessary office space. This is precisely what we did with the $40,000. We now have $500,000 to do more of the same.

We would proceed back to the Appropriation Committee, if it is indicated that we are wrong in this particular case, and ask for their permission to reprogram, as we use the term, that is to say, to redirect funds that are legally available for this purpose. These funds are available for any building for the reconstruction, repair, and alteration.

Such funds would be available equally for the Arts and Industries Building, for which it was justified. the $500,000 that we now have, and it would be legally available also to do alterations or repairs in the Natural History Building, if the committees agree.
If this were considered to be a solution, we would get the $40,000 from the $500,000, if the committees approved.

Mr. Thompson. That is just a bookkeeping change.

Mr. Bradley. I know it is.

Mr. Thompson. Do you have anything left of that $570,000 contingency item?

Mr. Bradley. Sir, it has pretty well been worked down.

That is where the $40,000 came from.

Mr. Thompson. That is where it came from?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. I guess I am really not qualified to do this. On a much smaller scale, I go through this on a monthly basis with my wife, and invariably I attest to her good intentions, her honesty and so on. But I can never find the money.

She says, "Well, that is all right, I will get it from here and put it there. "It is like reading the late Senator Taft’s book on foreign policy. It reminded me when I read it, with all due respect to him, of the Australian bushman who bought himself a new boomerang and spent 2 years trying to throw the old one away."

But go on. Maybe you can straighten me out. I don’t mean to harass you. Really, I am admitting my ignorance.

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your good humor, indeed I do.

My last comment is that the particular pieces of paper that authorized this expenditure of $40,000, for the record, were proposed by the buildings management department, were approved by the Administrative Officer of the Natural History Museum, and were certified as to availability by an employee of the fiscal division, in the person of a Mr. Doar. Neither of the last two employees is with the Smithsonian right now.

If we have to get a relief bill through the Congress, we would have to find out where they are first, because I suppose they have some personal interest, if not liability.

I am hoping, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that we can secure the approval of the Appropriation Committees to reprogram the $40,000 from the current appropriation and repay Natural History out of money now available to Arts and Industries. But, as you say, it is a bookkeeping transaction.

Mr. Thompson. I think it is probably indicated, however, in order to clarify the situation. Then GAO would take another look at it and we would hope they would be satisfied, or else you will have to find those two fellows.

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Chairman, if you want to proceed to the next item in the GAO report, it has to do with the controls, and they feel we should improve the controls over the procurement of goods and services.

This is our buying operation. Mr. Fred Barwick is our experienced supply chief. With your permission, he would like to make a statement on that.

Mr. Thompson. I would like him to comment on Chapter 3 of the GAO report.

Mr. Barwick. Mr. Chairman, I have a prepared statement I would like to read or present for the record.
STATEMENT OF FRED BARWICK, CHIEF, SUPPLY DIVISION

The Smithsonian Institution conducts its procurement and purchasing function pursuant to the Code of Federal Regulations, title 41, Public Contracts and Property Management, chapter 1.

These regulations, sometime back, were implemented by the Smithsonian Manual which, through time, became obsolete and out of date.

They have recently, on April 8, updated and designated the Smithsonian Staff Handbook on Requisitioning, Purchase of Supplies and Services. I have appended to this statement a copy of the document.
SMITHSONIAN STAFF HANDBOOK

REQUISITIONING
—PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICES—

ISSUED BY
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
This Staff Handbook was prepared to provide adequate and up-to-date information covering the requisitioning for outside procurement of supplies, materials, equipment, and services. The policies and guidelines in the Handbook apply to all purchases, Federal and Private, and I must insist that they be followed by all Smithsonian employees and officers.

Basic principles of good requisitioning practices are given with sufficient detail for effectively preparing and processing purchase requisitions.

The Handbook does not attempt to cover unusual requirements. Such cases must continue to be settled on an individual basis with the Chief of the Smithsonian Supply Division.

The provisions of the Handbook are based on appropriate Federal laws and regulations and on Smithsonian policies and guidelines, but legal and regulatory citations generally are not included. Required interpretations will be provided by the Chief, SI Supply Division and/or the Smithsonian General Counsel.

S. Dillon Ripley
Secretary

NOTE: Internal requests for services such as photography, Buildings Management Department work, in-house reproduction (printing/multi-lithing, xeroxing), automatic data processing services and procurement of library materials are not included in this Handbook.
Chapter 1
GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. Introduction

This Handbook provides general policies and detailed procedures primarily for the guidance of staff members who initiate outside purchase requests. To the extent it will assist this process, subsequent actions by the SI Accounting Division and by the SI Supply Division also are outlined.

2. Coverage

The policies, forms, and guidelines in the Handbook cover all purchase requisitioning, Federal and Private, for all Smithsonian units and staff members. Where exceptions are in effect, they are covered in the text or in delegation of authority letters signed by the Secretary.

3. Definitions

ASPR: The regulations approved by the Department of Defense for Contracts and Grants awarded by organizations within that Department. The full title, "Armed Services Procurement Regulations," is referred to as ASPR in this and related SI Handbooks. Some NASA contracts also are covered by these regulations.

Contracts: All types of agreements and orders for the procurement of supplies or services.

Equipment: Personal property of a durable nature which retains its identity throughout its useful life and has a significant unit acquisition cost of $50.00 or more. (See Smithsonian Staff Handbook on Property Management--530, for special conditions covering DOD/NASA property costing less than $50.00.)

Excess Property: Any property under control of the SI which is not required for its needs, and any such property of Government agencies acquired by the SI at no cost other than transportation charges. (Federal side only; Private usually cannot acquire.)
Ex Post Facto Requisition: A requisition form prepared after goods or services have been ordered. Except where emergency purchasing procedures are available and have been followed, Ex Post Facto requisitions are illegal and payment by the Smithsonian Institution may be refused.

Federal Procurement Regulations: The regulations prescribed by the Administrator of General Services Administration to govern and guide Federal executive agencies in procuring goods and services.

Federal Specification: A description of a material or service promulgated by General Services Administration or other Federal agency.

Federal Supply Schedule: Vendors' catalogs showing the prices at which goods and services are available to Government agencies as a result of negotiations between GSA and vendors.


General Services Administration: The agency of the Federal Government chiefly responsible for procurement, property management and utilization, disposal, and records management. GSA promulgates regulations which govern and guide procurement, property management and other related activities of Government agencies.

Invoice: A "bill." An itemized list of goods and services provided by a vendor, showing quantities delivered and their prices.

Nonexpendable Equipment: An article of personal property which is complete in itself, is of durable nature with an expected service life of one year or more and does not lose its identity or become a component part of another article when put into use. For this classification, property which will be considered as nonexpendable also must be significant as a unit price, quantity, or nature. A unit acquisition cost of $50.00 shall be considered as a reasonable guideline as to unit price but some articles of lesser value may come within the nonexpendable property classification. Examples of articles which may be significant because of quantity or nature are: filing cabinets, radios, cameras, and firearms. All personal property subject to capitalization shall be considered nonexpendable.
Personal Property: SI- or Government-owned, borrowed, or rented property of any kind or any property in which the SI or the Government has an interest except real property and records. Property personally owned by an employee but used for official business is not "personal property."

Receiving Report: The Receiving Report copy of the SF-147, or of the SI-Supp-704; a pink copy of the SF-44; or an SI-Supp-700, describing what was received from a vendor, when it was received, condition on receipt, related accounting data, and the signature of the receiver.

Smithsonian Property: Property purchased on the Private side of the Smithsonian from Contract and Grant funds, title to which has been transferred to the Smithsonian; and property purchased from other Private funds of the Smithsonian.

Stores Stock: Stores of articles of personal property principally consisting of expendable items but sometimes including nonexpendable items stocked in the SI Supply Division for redistribution to ordering activities.

Supplies: Items of personal property of minor value of nondurable nature which ordinarily are consumed within one year after being placed in use, or which are used to form a minor part of equipment or fixed property and are, therefore, expendable.

Surplus Property: Any excess property not required for the needs and the discharge of the responsibilities of all Federal agencies, as determined by the Administrator, General Services Administration. (This does not include Smithsonian property, q.v.)
Chapter 2
GENERAL POLICIES

1. Federal Fund Purchasing

It is Smithsonian policy to obtain supplies, materials, equipment; building construction, alteration, or repairs; and services, purchased with Federal Funds, in full compliance with the Federal Procurement Regulations prescribed by the Administrator, General Services Administration. This requires that, unless otherwise provided by law, purchases and contracts using Federal Funds may be made or entered into only after advertising proposals sufficiently in advance. This requirement is excepted when justified within the guidelines of the Federal Procurement Regulations. The small purchasing methods described in Chapter 3 are among the authorized exceptions. It is inherent in this policy that no procurements shall be made prior to the Accounting Division certifying to the availability of funds. A further requirement is that only the SI Supply Division or properly appointed Contracting Officers may place orders which commit Smithsonian funds.

2. Private Fund Purchasing

With few exceptions, the policies and procedures which apply to Federal Fund purchases also apply to purchases from Private Funds. In addition, the provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Regulations (ASPR) and regulations of other Federal contracting/granting agencies will apply to procurements made under Federal Contracts and Grants awarded to the Smithsonian.

3. Cost-conscious Purchasing and Use of Supplies and Equipment

a. Increased Smithsonian activities in research, education, exhibits, and public service require adequate resource support. Nevertheless, the Institution must obtain only what is essential to effective program accomplishment. Once obtained, these resources whether Federal or Private must be used wisely and efficiently. Responsibility for effective purchasing must rest with bureau and other personnel who identify needs and initiate and approve purchase requisitions.

b. To assist requisitioning units in meeting this responsibility, Contracting Officers are required to review all purchase requisitions
with particular care and, where opportunities may exist for cost reduction with no diminishment of quality or other criteria, to suggest these to the units concerned.

c. In addition, the following conditions are in effect:

(1) Class A executive-type furniture and filing cabinets will not be purchased or leased with Federal Funds whether for additional or replacement purposes. Similarly rugs, carpets, and draperies will not be obtained except where essential for exhibit or other public areas. Unless provided for in the terms of Federal Contracts or Grants, this restriction also applies to purchases from such funds.

(2) Units shall share equipment which is used occasionally or less than full-time, where sharing will avoid the procurement of duplicate equipment and will not interfere severely with work performance. Prior to submitting a requisition, units should call the SI Supply Division to determine whether the requested equipment is available within the Smithsonian. (Property acquired under Federal Contracts and Grants must remain with and be used only on the funded project until termination of the Contract or Grant.)

(3) Equipment will not be replaced if it can be repaired or rehabilitated economically and used without safety hazard, excessive additional maintenance costs, or substantial reduction in trade-in value. The SI Supply Division will advise on Government and commercial repair and rehabilitation services and will work with the Buildings Management Department in meeting certain needs by in-house services.

(4) When possible, requirements for equipment not available within the Smithsonian will be met from GSA's excess property program. Units should make their needs known to the SI Supply Division so that GSA excess property lists may be checked for desired items. These lists will be circulated regularly to interested units. Property should not be claimed unless it can be put to prompt and productive use.

(5) Furniture, office equipment, and other materials excess to the needs of organization units will be returned to the SI Supply Division for reassignment. Use Form SI-707, "Nonexpendable Property Transaction," for this purpose. See Appendix 1, and Smithsonian Staff Handbook on Property Management--530. (For property acquired under DOD/NASA Contracts, the Accountable Officer has the sole discretion in determining when property purchased with such funds is excess in his present and future requirements. When he makes this
determination, the Contracts Office and the Property Management Officer will be notified so that disposition instructions from the Defense Property Administrator may be requested.)

(6) Employees must make every effort to assure that office and other supplies, such as pens, pencils, paper clips, tape, envelopes, and stationery are used only for official purposes.

(7) Office copying machines must be used wisely and efficiently and not as a substitute for typewriter carbons. Units which are not obtaining the quality or quantity of carbon copies they believe their typewriters can make should call the SI Supply Division to have the machines checked and adjusted. Requests for additional or replacement copying machines must be referred to the Administrative Systems Division prior to processing by the SI Supply Division.

(8) Cost-type contracts should require the contractors to use Government supply sources and should include other appropriate requirements to assure cost-conscious purchasing and sound property management.

4. Contacting Vendors

a. Contact with vendors will be made only by the SI Supply Division or with the prior knowledge and approval of that Division. Such contact would be appropriate, for instance, in cases when desired items of unusual technical, scientific, or mechanical equipment are not available and the requester must agree on satisfactory substitutes with the vendor. Quotations, catalogs, or other information or descriptive material resulting from authorized vendor contacts must accompany requisitions submitted to the SI Supply Division.

b. Contracting Officers, other than the Chief, SI Supply Division, also may contact vendors to the extent allowed in their written delegations of authority.

c. These requirements are not intended to prevent employees from obtaining information about new and improved supplies and equipment. They are intended to prevent commitments which the Smithsonian cannot honor and to prevent employees from incurring a liability for which they personally may be held responsible.

5. Ex Post Facto Requisitions for Purchases

a. Federal and Smithsonian regulations and policies provide several methods for emergency purchasing or contracting. In addition, the Chief, SI Supply Division is available to assist in obtaining unique items or services which may not be available readily from usual sources of supply. These elements of the Smithsonian
Institution Supply Management Program, preclude the need for Smithsonian staff members to make unauthorized commitments with vendors for the purchase of services, supplies, materials, and equipment without first processing the required documents through the Accounting Division and the SI Supply Division.

b. Ex Post Facto requisitions to cover unauthorized commitments and/or procurements are illegal when obligating Federal Funds and contrary to Smithsonian Institution policy when obligating Private Funds. The Secretary reserves the right to refuse payment if such requisitions are presented for approval. In addition, two statutes exist which provide severe penalties for violations of procurement regulations as well as for exceeding available funds--31 U.S.C. Section 665(a) et seq and 41 U.S.C. Section 11(a). The administrative penalties include suspension from duty without pay or removal from office. Persons convicted of willful violations are subject to a fine of not more than $5,000.00 or imprisonment for not more than two years, or both. See Appendixes 2 and 3.

c. Further, the austerity program in effect at the Smithsonian and throughout the Government can be supported best if every possible means is used to obtain the most for funds available whether Federal or Private. Competitive bidding by established vendors is one method designed to do just that.

d. The policy continues in effect the requirement that all procurement must be made by the SI Supply Division or its designated representative or by other Smithsonian officials who are designated in writing by the Secretary as Contracting Officers.

6. Justifications Required for Certain Types of Purchases

When Federal Funds are used, the SI-4s requesting purchases in the categories listed below shall be accompanied by written justifications prepared by the requesting unit. In addition, the terms of some Federal Contracts and Grants require such justifications and, when other Private Funds are used, this requirement also should be followed in every possible case. When purchases are requested in these categories, the SI Supply Division must be given sufficient time to prepare determinations (written conclusions based on the justifications) to show that the proposed purchases are proper and essential to Smithsonian operations.

a. Brand Name or Equal When a brand name is used only to describe the product, the requisition must show "Brand Name or Equal." If possible, more than one acceptable brand name product should be referenced. The accompanying justification must state:
the physical, functional, salient features or characteristics of the requested product which are essential to the needs of the requesting unit; and, to the extent available, the common name of the product, applicable model, make, catalog number, and name of the manufacturer, producer, or distributor. Prospective vendors or contractors will be given an opportunity to offer products other than those specifically referenced by brand name if such other products will meet Smithsonian needs in essentially the same manner as the described item.

b. **Brand Name—No Substitute** When a brand name product is the only item acceptable, the requisition must show "Brand Name—No Substitute." The accompanying justification must give in detail the features of the item which are not available in other brands and any other information which will support sole source procurement.

c. **Foreign Products** The Buy American Act requires that only domestic source articles, materials, and supplies shall be acquired for public use. The restrictions of the Act do not apply: to articles, materials, or supplies for use outside the United States; to articles, materials, or supplies of a class or kind which the Smithsonian has determined are not mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available commercial quantities and of a sufficient quality; or when it is determined by the Smithsonian that the cost of domestic source articles, materials, and supplies would be unreasonable or that their acquisition would be inconsistent with the public interest. The justification accompanying the request for purchase of a foreign product must contain a full description of the product and, as appropriate, the following elements: the impact on unit operations if the foreign product is not obtained; unavailability from domestic sources; unacceptable quality or other reasons why the domestic product will not satisfy precise needs.

d. **Furniture and Furnishings, Office Machines, and Equipment** The written justification covering requests for items in this category must explain fully the need for the purchase or rental. A copy of SI-31, the justification form required when electric typewriters are requested, is given in Appendix 4.

e. **Motor Vehicles** The Buildings Management Department is responsible for control and use of Smithsonian vehicles. Requisitioning units must consult that Department prior to processing requests for acquisition of such equipment.
f. Products Similar to Those Covered by GSA Federal Supply Schedules
When products in this category are requested, the justification must describe the pertinent differences between the requested and the scheduled item and explain why the requesting unit concluded that the scheduled products will not meet its special requirements.

g. Products at Prices Other Than the Lowest Delivered Price Available
The justification accompanying requests in this category must be based on specific needs which clearly are associated with achievement of program objectives. Personal preference for a more costly product is not an appropriate basis for a justification. Factors which may be used as a basis of justification are:

(1) Special features of requested item, not provided by similar but less costly items, are required (not merely desired or preferred) for effective program performance.

(2) The requested item, as opposed to lower-priced items, must be and is compatible with items or systems already in use in the requesting unit.

(3) Trade-in considerations favor the higher-priced item and will result in the lowest net cost.

(4) Time of delivery in terms of actual need cannot be met by the manufacturer or dealer of a lower-priced item.

(5) Probable life of item requested, as compared with that of a lower-priced item, is sufficiently longer to warrant the additional cost.

(6) Warranty conditions of the higher-priced item are sufficiently better to justify the added cost.

(7) Greater maintenance availability, lower overall maintenance costs, or anticipated trouble-free operation will produce long-range savings greater than the difference in purchase price.

h. Service Contracts (for personal and nonpersonal services)
Special considerations and justifications for service-type contracts are required—especially when it may appear to be "personal" services as opposed to "technical professional nonpersonal services." The Chief, SI Supply Division must be brought into all preliminary discussions which may lead to a service contract. As necessary, he will refer the proposal to the SI General Counsel before awarding a service contract.
Chapter 3
AUTHORITIES AND DELEGATIONS

1. Authorizing Officers

a. The administrative official or other employee to whom the Secretary has delegated authority in writing to approve requisitions and similar authorizations drawn against Federal or Private Funds. For each of the various categories of these funds, the Authorizing Officer is as follows:

(1) Federal Appropriations and Accounts

(a) Salaries and Expenses

The head of the organization unit receiving an allotment from The Secretary through the Office of Programming and Budget, Office of the Treasurer.

(b) Special Foreign Currency Program

(1) The Secretary for award letters.

(2) Director, Special Foreign Currency Program, to recommend contracts resulting from approval awards.

(3) Director, Office of International Activities, for travel authorizations for research program development.

(c) Construction

The Assistant Secretary

(d) Trust Accounts

(1) National Zoological Park--Director, National Zoological Park.
(2) Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute--Director, Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute.

(3) National Collection of Fine Arts--Director, National Collection of Fine Arts.

(2) Grants and Contracts (Including Smithsonian Research Awards and Special Foreign Currency Awards to Smithsonian Offices)

The principal investigator or comparable person for the grant, contract, or award.

(3) Gifts

The head of the organization unit or other employee identified in the exchange of correspondence between the Smithsonian Institution and the donor as the person responsible for performing the work for which the gift is made.

(4) Restricted or Unrestricted Private Funds

The head of the organization unit or other employee receiving a budget or allowance approved by The Secretary. In all other cases, authorization is by The Secretary.

b. The authority to approve requisitions against Federal appropriations and accounts may be redelegated. In all such cases, redelegations must be in writing with copies sent to the Office of Programming and Budget, Accounting Division, SI Supply Division, and the Administrative Systems Division.

c. The authority to approve requisitions against grants, contracts, and gifts also may be redelegated with copies sent to the units mentioned in b. above.
d. Permission to redelegate authority to approve requisitions drawn against restricted or unrestricted Private Funds must be obtained by submitting a request to The Secretary through the Accounting Division and The Treasurer.

2. **Contracting Officers**

Only Contracting Officers, authorized in writing by The Secretary or the Chief, SI Supply Division, may commit or obligate the Government or the Smithsonian Institution. The specific responsibilities of Contracting Officers are: conducting contract negotiations; determining the type of contract to be used; establishing the contract terms, conditions, and general provisions, including methods of pricing, payment, and financing; final execution of the contract on behalf of the Government or the Smithsonian, general contract administration, and termination of the contract.
Chapter 4
NORMAL PURCHASING METHOD

1. Requisition Form Required

The SI-4 "Requisition for Supplies and Equipment" is used to initiate the majority of purchase requests whether Federal or Private Funds are used:

2. Using SI-4

a. The SI-4 is used to request outside purchase of:
   (1) Rents, communications, and utilities (Object Class 230)
   (2) Printing and reproduction (Object Class 240)
   (3) Other Services (Object Class 250)
   (4) Supplies and materials (Object Class 260)
   (5) Equipment (Object Class 310)

b. Specific items included in the various Object Classes are in Appendix 5.

3. Preparing SI-4

a. The SI-4 must not cover items or services in more than one Object Class, i.e. cameras and films are in different Object Classes--310 and 260 respectively. Federal and Private Fund requests must not be included in the same SI-4. Requirements within the same Object Class should be consolidated on one requisition to the fullest possible extent. Requisitions must be prepared accurately and carefully. Attention to these guidelines will speed up accounting and purchasing actions.
b. Requirements covering a long list of specialized items may be submitted first in memorandum form to the SI Supply Division, which will furnish the unit with the necessary information to complete a requisition.

c. Any questions or doubts about potential hazards in equipment or materials to be procured, may be discussed with the Safety Management Office.

d. A sample of a completed SI-4 is in Appendix 6.

4. Approving SI-4

a. Chapter 3 identifies officers authorized to approve requisitions. The approving responsibility covers certification of the need for the items or services and their cost. It does not include authority to commit Smithsonian funds; such authority rests only with Contracting Officers. The general guidelines covering the approval are:

   (1) Federal Funds. Approval of requisitions to be paid from Federal appropriations usually is the responsibility of the head of the organization unit to which an annual allotment of Federal Funds is made.

   (2) Contracts and Grants. Only the principal investigator or his delegate personally authorized by him in writing approves requisitions drawn against Contracts or Grants awarded from external sources.

   (3) Budgeted Private Funds. Approval of requisitions to be paid from budgeted Private Funds will be made by the head of the unit or by the staff member to whom The Secretary authorized an allotment of such funds.
(4) **Unbudgeted Private Funds.** The approval of requisitions to be paid from unbudgeted Private Funds of the Smithsonian will be made in the Office of The Secretary. Each such requisition submitted for approval must show the actual cost, if known, or a reasonable estimate. The Secretary or his designated representative will review the requisition, ascertain fund availability, and, if approved, forward it to the Accounting Division.

5. **Routing SI-4**

Copies 1 through 6 of approved requisitions are routed to the Accounting Division via the requisitioning unit's fund control point. Copy 7 is retained in the unit pending receipt of Copy 4 certified as to fund availability by the SI Accounting Division.

6. **SI Accounting Division Actions**

On receipt of an approved requisition, the Accounting Division will:

a. Verify the approval; the accounting classification code; and, for Private Funds, conformance with provisions of applicable Federal Contracts or Grants and with the conditions of gifts, bequests, or endowments.

b. Enter the Requisition Control Number on all copies of the requisition (this number also is used as the last four digits of the Purchase Order No.).

c. Certify the requisition as to availability and propriety of use of funds.

d. Distribute copies of the requisition as indicated on the SI-4.

e. Return immediately to requisitioning unit all copies of requisitions which it cannot process and explain reason for this action.
7. **SI Supply Division Actions**

On receipt of an approved and certified requisition, the SI Supply Division will:

a. Ascertain whether requirements can be met from SI stores stock, other available SI sources; excess property; or the Federal Supply Service.

b. Determine whether to procure standard items rather than requested nonstandard items when the former would appear to meet the needs; coordinate this action with requisitioning unit.

c. Obtain requesting unit's concurrence on any other variances from the requirements of the requisition, taking into account any special needs of the requestor; delivery dates; availability of service, parts, and repairs; and related factors having a direct effect upon the end use of the product.

d. Obtain required justifications from requisitioning unit if these are not already attached to the SI-4.

e. Assure, when nonexpendable equipment is to be purchased, that the procedures required for appropriate control are followed.

f. Secure The Secretary's approval when required for certain foreign procurements.

g. Make determinations and findings when required by law or regulation.

h. Issue solicitations for bids or proposals as appropriate.

i. Coordinate with requisitioning unit and the Accounting Division when the cost of the item exceeds the amount approved on the requisition. (The SI Supply Division is authorized to exceed, without additional certification of funds from the Accounting Division, variances of 10 percent or $100.00, whichever is the lesser amount.)
j. Use the requisition as a Purchase Order if determined appropriate and the procurement will cost less than $250.00.

k. Prepare an SF-147 "Order for Supplies and Materials" when Federal Funds are used and the procurement does not exceed $2,500.00 (except when procurement is pursuant to Federal Supply Service contracts or from Government agencies); otherwise a contract is issued. A copy of the SF-147 is at Appendix 8.

l. Prepare an SI-Supp-704 "Purchase Order" or a "contract" when appropriate, for Private Fund procurements. A copy of this form is at Appendix 9.

m. Use other purchasing methods as dictated by the procurement involved and coordinate with the requisitioning unit so the unit will have timely information about the status of their requisition(s).

n. Distribute copies of the Purchase Order or Contract as indicated assuring, when the requisitioning unit is the delivery point for the order, that tagging instructions for controllable, nonexpendable equipment accompany the Receiving Report copy sent to the unit.

o. Apply required (rubber stamp) certification to Receiving Report copy of the requisition covering materials for immediate consumption acquired under DOD or NASA Contracts or Grants to show that the materials have been issued for use.

8. Requisitioning Unit Actions (After Order is Issued)

On receipt of their "record" copy of the Purchase Order, the requisitioning unit will:

a. Compare it with the requisition to assure the order was completed in strict conformance with their request.

b. Determine, in coordination with the Accounting Division, the reason for any change, particularly in the accounting code and, if required, adjust records maintained in the unit.
c. Retain the Receiving Report copy and tagging instructions furnished by the SI Supply Division when the unit is the delivery point.

d. Upon complete and satisfactory delivery of materials, equipment, devices, etc., appropriately endorse the Receiving Report copy and return it to the SI Supply Division immediately.
Chapter 5
SMALL PURCHASING METHODS (Open Market)

1. **Imprest Fund (Federal)**

   a. This fund is used for:

      (1) Emergency, fill-in, occasional, or special purchase of supplies or nonpersonal services; and for emergency repairs of equipment.

      (2) Postage stamps, parcel post, C.O.D., postal charges, international mail coupons, local drayage.

      (3) Public transportation tokens (including reimbursement for cash fares), taxi fares.

      (4) Reimbursement on a mileage basis for local use of personal cars on official business. The employee will submit an approved SF-1164, "Claim for Reimbursement for Expenditures on Official Business." A copy of the SF-1164 is at Appendix 10.

      (5) Emergency travel advances not to exceed $50.00. These may be obtained from the subcashier in the Accounting Division. The traveler will furnish an approved SF-1038 to obtain the advance. (For such advances made by the Travel Services Office, see section 2, page 5-3.) A copy of the SF-1038 is at Appendix 11.

   b. There is a maximum limitation of $100.00 on each item purchased. Under emergency conditions, the limitation may be increased up to $250.00 with the prior approval of the Authorizing Officer and the Chief, SI Supply Division.

   c. The Imprest Fund Cashier and his alternate are located in the SI Supply Division. A subcashier is located in the Accounting Division. Cashier hours are: 8:45 a.m. until 1:00 p.m., 2:00 p.m. until 3:00 p.m.

   d. Authorizing Officers who wish to make regular use of the Imprest Fund should establish a prior commitment of funds by submitting an SI-4 to the Accounting Division. The requisition will be for a stated period, usually ending on June 30; and for a "not-to-exceed" amount.

   e. The Cashier may either reimburse employees for amounts paid by them for authorized purchases or advance the cash necessary to make such purchases.
f. When cash is advanced to the employee, he will be asked to sign an "Interim Receipt for Cash." The Cashier retains this and gives the employee a blank SF-1165, "Receipt for Cash--Subvoucher," to be signed by the vendor. The employee-buyer returns any unused cash, the signed SF-1165, and the vendor's sales slip or cash register tape to the Cashier who voids the interim receipt and returns it to the employee. A copy of the SF-1165 is at Appendix 12.

g. Purchases for which cash has been advanced must be confirmed within five workdays from the date of the advance.

h. All purchases must be supported by an original bill, sales slip, cash register ticket, invoice, SF-1165, or equivalent receipt form itemizing the supplies or services purchased and the amount thereof. When purchases are in excess of $15.00, each receipt should be signed by the dealer as evidence of payment. When purchases are for $15.00 or less, a receipt showing the articles or services purchased should be secured, but the signature of the dealer will not be necessary. Receipts should be hand-carried to the SI Supply Division or sent by Registered Mail if the purchases were made by a unit outside of the Washington Metropolitan Area.

i. At least monthly, the Cashier sends an SF-1129, "Reimbursement Voucher," to the Accounting Division, listing the transactions for the period, the name, and cost of the item or service purchased, and the appropriate accounting classification code. The SI Supply Division will send a copy of the voucher to units which request it for verification of the unit's records. A copy of the SF-1129 is at Appendix 14.

j. Transactions made under this plan are identified in the monthly financial reports by the words "Imprest Fund."

2. Petty Cash Fund (Private)

a. This fund established and maintained in the Accounting Division may be used for:

(1) Emergency, fill-in, occasional, or special purchase of supplies or nonpersonal services.

(2) Postage stamps, parcel post, C.O.D., postal charges, local drayage.

(3) Reimbursement for bus and taxi fares.
(4) Emergency travel advances not to exceed $50.00 may be obtained from the Private Revolving Fund in the Travel Services Office. The traveler will furnish an approved SI-Fis-345, "Application and Account for Advance of Funds." A copy of SI-Fis-345 is at Appendix 13.

b. The fund will not be used for:

(1) Equipment purchases.

(2) Paying transportation charges on bills of common carriers.

(3) Meeting payrolls or paying for personal services.

c. Petty Cash Purchases, not to exceed $50.00 from any one vendor at any one time, may be approved when, in the opinion of the Cashier, the best interests of the Smithsonian will be served. Individual procurement transactions of $15.00 or more must be approved by the Assistant Treasurer.

d. The Petty Fund Cashier and alternate are located in the Accounting Division (Private). Cashier hours are: 8:45 a.m. until 1:00 p.m., 2:00 p.m. until 3:00 p.m.

e. The Cashier may either reimburse employees for amounts paid by them for authorized purchases or advance the cash to make such purchases.

f. When cash is advanced to the employee, he will be asked to submit an approved SI-4 1/2 or an approved SI-Fis-653, "Cash Reimbursement Voucher," which the Cashier will retain. The employee-buyer returns any unused cash and the vendor's receipted sales slip or cash register tape. Any adjustment of the original cash advanced will be signed by the employee-buyer and certified by the Cashier.

g. Purchases for which cash has been advanced must be confirmed within five workdays from the date of the advance.

h. When the Cashier reimburses an employee for authorized purchases paid from personal funds, an approved form SI-Fis-653 must be furnished to the Cashier, together with vendor's receipted sales slip or cash register tape. A copy of SI-Fis-653 is at Appendix 15.

1/ Until the present stock of SI-8, "Private Funds Requisition for Services and Supplies or Equipment," is exhausted, it will be used in lieu of the SI-4 for Petty Cash Fund (Private) transactions ONLY.
i. Transactions made under this plan are reflected in the monthly financial reports.

3. Standard Form 44, "Purchase Order, Invoice, Voucher"

a. This method of purchasing allows organization units to purchase small or emergency quantities of supplies, materials, or non-personal services over-the-counter (or otherwise immediately available) primarily from local vendors. The SF-44 is not used for travel, transportation, personal services, contractual services (except for minor equipment repairs not to exceed $100.00 with prior approval of the Property and Stores Management Section, SI Supply Division), or to purchase items which meet the criteria for controllable equipment described in Smithsonian Staff Handbook--530. It is not used to purchase items unless delivery will be immediate or within a few days. There is a maximum limitation of $50.00 on each item purchased unless the appropriate Authorizing Officer and the Chief, SI Supply Division, have agreed previously on a higher limitation of not to exceed $250.00. A transaction must not be divided into smaller units to avoid either this $250.00 limitation or the overall limitation of $2,500.00. The SF-44 must be used exclusively for the commitment for which it was issued.

b. Authorizing Officers who wish to use SF-44s in their units must establish a prior commitment of funds by submitting an SI-4 to the Accounting Division. The requisition will be for a stated period, usually ending on June 30 on Federal; and for an "not-to-exceed" amount. It need not show a vendor or vendors or a particular category or categories of items. The Accounting Division will earmark the stated amount of funds; show a control number on each copy of the SI-4; return one copy to the requisitioning unit; and send a copy to the SI Supply Division.

c. The preprinted number on the SF-44 is the purchase order number and appears on the unit's monthly financial reports.

d. In June, the Accounting Division in coordination with the unit, determines whether part of the commitment of Federal funds should be retained to cover outstanding invoices or whether to terminate the commitment.
e. At the end of each fiscal year, unused SF-44s drawn against Federal funds and the buyer's i.d. cards must be returned to the SI Supply Division for cancellation.

f. The SF-44s and the buyer's i.d. cards must be safeguarded. Losses of either must be reported immediately to the SI Supply Division. When no longer needed, the books (including those partially used) and the i.d. cards must be returned to the SI Supply Division.

g. Detailed instructions covering the use of the form are attached to each book of SF-44s and are not repeated here (the instructions printed on each book do not apply to SI); a copy is given in Appendix 17, a sample completed form is given in Appendix 16.

4. Charge Accounts

a. Authorizing Officers, by prior arrangement with the Chief, SI Supply Division, may make certain purchases by a "Charge Account" method. Such accounts provide an additional purchasing convenience for the requisitioning units and avoid the writing and processing of numerous requisitions and purchase orders. Successful use of Charge Accounts, as in other purchasing methods, depends upon the requisitioning unit's full compliance with the covering policies and guidelines. If experience shows that the accounts are not being used properly and effectively, they will be terminated without notice by the Chief, SI Supply Division, in coordination with the SI Accounting Division.

b. Charge Accounts are:

(1) Used for day-to-day requirements for supplies and nonpersonal services.
(2) Limited to $250.00 for each individual purchase transaction unless prior arrangements have been made with the appropriate Authorizing Officer and the Chief, SI Supply Division, for higher amounts.
(3) For a specific time period, usually the current Fiscal Year.
(4) Limited, for internal fiscal control purposes, to a total annual amount. (The total dollar amount normally is not disclosed to the vendor.)
(5) Made with vendors who do not require a Purchase Order.
c. Charge Accounts are arranged with local vendors from whom:

(1) Numerous individual purchases likely will be made each Fiscal Year.

(2) A variety of items in a broad class of goods, like hardware or laboratory supplies, generally are purchased but the exact items, quantities, and delivery requirements are not known in advance and may vary considerably.

(3) Dependable service and consistently lower prices than other suppliers are obtained.

(4) Maximum discounts are offered.

(5) Receipts are given for each purchase.

(6) Monthly invoices are received listing items, quantities, prices, buyer's name, and date items sold.

d. Charge Accounts must not be used:

(1) To make purchases from out-of-town vendors.

(2) To purchase equipment which, regardless of cost, normally would be controllable.

(3) To avoid the $2,500.00 limitation.

(4) To avoid the requirement to submit justifications for certain types of purchases.

(5) To make purchases not authorized by law, regulation, or Smithsonian policy.

(6) To engage the personal services of any individual in an employee/employer relationship.

e. Authorizing Officers who wish to use Charge Accounts will discuss their needs in advance with the Chief, SI Supply Division, to assure this is the best method of purchasing the goods required. If the Charge Account method is approved, the Authorizing Officer will submit a completed SI-4 to the Accounting Division to establish the required allotment order. The SI-4 must include the time period covered;
the total dollar limitation; the class or classes of goods to be purchased; and the names of the employees in the requisitioning unit who will be authorized to make charges.

f. The Supply Division, on receipt of a certified copy of the SI-4 from the Accounting Division, will make the necessary arrangements with the vendor and furnish the unit with charge cards for each of the employees listed on the requisition. The SI Supply Division also is responsible for spot-checking periodically to assure that the selected vendors remain competitive in all respects.

g. The requisitioning unit is responsible for:

1. Sending vendor's sales slips or cash register tapes, marked with the Requisition Control Number (RCN-), to the SI Supply Division immediately following each purchase.

2. Inspecting deliveries to verify quantity and quality of goods.

3. Notifying the SI Supply Division immediately of shortages, overages, and damaged or unacceptable materials.

4. Sending, within 24 hours, an SI-Supp-700 "Receiving Report" to the SI Supply Division certifying the receipt of complete and satisfactory deliveries. A copy of the SI-Supp-700 is at Appendix 18A.
Chapter 6

[RESERVED]
Chapter 7
AMENDMENTS AND CANCELLATIONS

1. To amend a requisition, purchase order, or contract, the requisitioning unit must submit a new SI-4, approved and routed as the original one. The amending SI-4 shall show under the "Description of Supplies and Services" the following statement in capital letters:

"REQUEST REQUISITION [PURCHASE ORDER, CONTRACT] NUMBER__________BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:"

2. To cancel a requisition, purchase order, or contract, the requisitioning unit must call the SI Supply Division immediately and, in the next mail, forward, via the original routing, a memorandum confirming the cancellation.
Chapter 8
RECEIVING REPORTS

1. Basic Action
   
a. Whether delivery is made to the SI Supply Division or to the requisitioning unit, the following basic actions must be taken by the person authorized to accept delivery:

   (1) Verify completeness of shipment by comparing with the receiving report and packing lists.

   (2) Inspect for condition.

   (3) Test where appropriate.

   b. If all these actions cannot be performed at time of delivery, mark the carrier's delivery document "Received subject to later inspection and count" when signing that delivery has been accepted.

   (1) Complete the special certification rubber-stamped by the SI Supply Division on the Receiving Report when "materials for immediate consumption" are acquired under DOD or NASA Contracts or Grants.

   (2) Follow ASPR receiving procedures when required for controllable property obtained under DOD or NASA Contracts or Grants (see Appendix 7 of SSH Property Management-530).

2. Receipt By Requisitioning Unit
   
a. If complete inspection was not made at time of delivery, this should be done as early as possible and the following steps taken:

   (1) When all goods are received and are satisfactory, certify the Receiving Report copy of the Purchase Order (copy #10 on the SF147 and any copy of the SI-Supp-704) to show "All items received" and forward it IMMEDIATELY to the SI Supply Division. When goods were purchased through use of an SF-44, a pink copy is the Receiving Report and it must be sent immediately to the Accounting Division, NOT to the SI Supply Division. (When the purchasing method used did not require a Purchase Order, an SI-Supp-700 "Receiving Report" must be used.) See sample SI-Supp-700 at Appendix 18A.

   (2) When the shipment is over or under quantity ordered, is damaged, does not meet other specifications covered in the Purchase Order, notify the SI Supply Division immediately and obtain instructions on how to proceed.
(3) When partial shipments are made, send an SI-Supp-700 to the SI Supply Division. At the same time note on the unit's Receiving Report copy of the Order, the quantity of each item received and the date received; retain this copy until delivery is completed and is satisfactory, then sign and note that "all items have been received" and forward the Report to the SI Supply Division.

(4) Tag controllable, nonexpendable equipment as previously instructed by the SI Supply Division; complete any required record cards and return them to the SI Supply Division.

3. Receipt by SI Supply Division

a. If complete inspection was not made at delivery time, this should be done as early as possible and then the following steps taken:

(1) Tag and record controllable, nonexpendable equipment.

(2) Deliver the shipment to the requisitioning unit with the Receiving Report copy of the Purchase Order to be signed as a receipt by the unit and returned immediately to the SI Supply Division.

(3) Send immediately ONE of the following to the SI Accounting Division--either a form SI-Supp-700 when partial shipment is made or the Receiving Report copy of the Purchase Order when all goods are delivered and are satisfactory. The report must be certified to show "all items received" and the date of receipt. The employee who checked the shipment, also must sign the report and show date of inspection.

.............

NOTE: Receiving Reports must be given priority attention and, when possible, processed within 24-hours after delivery of goods.
Chapter 9
INVOICES

1. Vendors and contractors supplying goods or services to the Smithsonian Institution expect and are entitled to prompt reimbursement. Responsibility for payment rests with the Accounting Division, but that Division first must receive the Invoice and a Receiving Report or an SI-Supp-700, certified to show that the goods or services were delivered and are fully satisfactory. IMMEDIATE submission of Invoices also enables the Smithsonian to take advantage of all available time discounts and helps to conserve the requesting unit's funds.

2. All Invoices received by any employee must be noted to show the Purchase Order number and MUST BE SENT IMMEDIATELY to the Accounting Division. DO NOT SEND ANY INVOICES to the SI Supply Division.

3. If the Accounting Division has any questions about an Invoice which would delay its payment, the requisitioning unit must be advised immediately so payment can be made as promptly as possible.
Excerpts from 31 U.S.C. Section 665(a) et seq

"31 U.S.C. 665(a) - Expenditures or contract obligations in excess of funds prohibited.

No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available therein; nor shall any such officer or employee involve the Government in any contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law.

After June 5, 1957, any appropriation required to be apportioned pursuant to section 665 of this title, may be apportioned on a basis indicating the need for a supplemental or deficiency estimate of appropriation to the extent necessary to permit payment of such pay increases as may be granted those employees (commonly known as wage-board employees) whose compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates."

"31 U.S.C. 665(b) - Voluntary service forbidden.

No officer or employee of the United States shall accept voluntary service for the United States or employ personal services in excess of that authorized by law,* except in cases of emergency involving the safety of human life or the protection of property." [*This applies to experts and consultants, including honorary appointees.]

"31 U.S.C. 665(a) - Administrative division of apportionment; simplification of system for subdividing funds.

Any appropriation which is apportioned or reapportioned pursuant to this section may be divided and subdivided administratively within the limits of such apportionments or reapportionments. The officer having administrative control of any such appropriation available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, and the head of each agency, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall prescribe, by regulation, a system of administrative control (not inconsistent with any accounting procedures prescribed by or pursuant to law) which shall be designed to (A) restrict obligations or expenditures against each appropriation to the amount of apportionments or reapportionments made for each such appropriation and (B) enable such officer or agency head to fix responsibility for the creation of any obligation or the making of any expenditure in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment. In order to have a simplified system for the administrative subdivision of appropriations or funds, each agency shall work toward the objective of financing each operating unit, at the highest practical level, from not more than one administrative subdivision for each appropriation or fund affecting such unit."
"31 U.S.C. 665(h) - Expenditures in excess of apportionment prohibited; penalties.

No officer or employee of the United States shall authorize or create any obligation or make any expenditure (A) in excess of an apportionment, or (B) in excess of the amount permitted by regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (g) of this section."

"31 U.S.C. 665(i) - Administrative discipline; reports on violations.

(1) In addition to any penalty or liability under other law, any officer or employee of the United States who shall violate subsections (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall be subjected to appropriate administrative discipline, including, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without pay or removal from office; and any officer or employee of the United States who shall knowingly and willfully violate subsections (a), (b) or (h) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

(2) In the case of violation of subsections (a), (b) or (h) of this section by an officer or employee of an agency, or of the District of Columbia, the head of the agency concerned or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall immediately report to the President, through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and to Congress all pertinent facts together with a statement of the action taken thereon."
§ 11. No contracts or purchases unless authorized or under adequate appropriation; report to the Congress

(a) No contract or purchase on behalf of the United States shall be made, unless the same is authorized by law or is under an appropriation adequate to its fulfillment, except in the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for clothing, subsistence, forage, fuel, quarters, transportation or medical and hospital supplies, which, however, shall not exceed the necessities of the current year.
OBJECT CLASSIFICATIONS

220 - TRANSPORTATION OF THINGS (Restricted to those units which have received allotments in this object class)

Comprises charges for the preparation for shipment, shipment handling, unloading, and storage of property (including animals). It includes postage used in parcel post, rental of trucks, and reimbursement to personnel for the authorized movement of their personal and household effects.

230 - RENT, COMMUNICATIONS AND UTILITIES

231 - Real Property Rental - Rental or lease of real property including land, structures, and improvements as well as fixed equipment.

232 - Equipment Rental - Rental of office machines, furniture, furnishings and other equipment, computers and related automatic data processing equipment.

233 - Communications - Telephone and telegraph equipment, installation, and service charges.

234 - Postage - Postage stamps, fees, metered mails, mail box rentals (see 4220 for parcel post).

235 - Utilities - Purchased water, gas, electricity, and steam.

240 - PRINTING AND REPRODUCTION (Restricted to those units which have received allotments in this object class)

Comprises composition costs, printing, binding, and rebinding; duplicating; forms, when printed or assembled to order, including letterheads and envelopes; and photography and related operations when required in connection with printing and duplicating.

241 - Printing Within the Smithsonian

242 - Outside Printing

250 - OTHER SERVICES

Includes all contractual services not otherwise classified.

251 - Lectures

252 - Training

253 - Office Machines Maintenance

254 - Scientific & Photographic Equipment Maintenance

255 - Mechanical Equipment Maintenance
256 - Personal Service Contracts
257 - Computer Time
259 - All Others

260 - SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS

Includes all commodities which are ordinarily consumed or expended within one year after being put into use or which are converted in the process of construction, or which are used to form a minor part of equipment or fixed property.

261 - Stationery and Office Supplies
262 - Scientific and Photographic Supplies
263 - Clothing Supplies
264 - Periodicals and Newspapers
265 - Museum Shops Supplies (Use 710 for purchases of resale items).
266 - Building Maintenance and Mechanical Supplies
267 - Forage and Animal Supplies
268 - Printing and Duplicating Supplies
269 - All Others

310 - EQUIPMENT

Comprises property or a more or less durable nature which may be expected to have a period of service of a year or more after being put into use without material impairment of its physical condition and has a significant unit-acquisition cost of $50.00 or more. (See Smithsonian Staff Handbook-530.)

311 - Furniture and Furnishings
312 - Exhibit and Storage Cases
313 - Office Machines
314 - Scientific and Photographic Equipment
315 - Mechanical Equipment
316 - Smithsonian-Built Equipment
317 - Specimens, Objects, and Animals for the Collections
318 - Books
319 - All Others
320 - LAND AND STRUCTURES

Comprises the purchase of land, buildings and other structures including existing improvements and rights therein as well as non-structural improvements such as landscaping and drainage; additions to buildings, and fixed equipment permanently installed in and made part of real property.

321 - Land and Structures

322 - Courts and Grounds Maintenance (Freer Only)

330 - PURCHASES OF SECURITIES - PRINCIPAL (Accounting Division Use Only)

331 - Current Funds

332 - Freer

333 - Consolidated

334 - Other

340 - PURCHASES OF SECURITIES - INTEREST (Accounting Division Use Only)

341 - Current Funds

342 - Freer

343 - Consolidated

344 - Other

350 - SUBCONTRACTS

351 - Celescope

360 - TRANSFERS (Accounting Division Use Only)

361 - Transfers In

362 - Transfers Out

400 - OVERHEAD

410 - GRANTS, SUBSIDIES, AND CONTRIBUTIONS

420 - INSURANCE CLAIMS AND INDEMNITIES

500 - SALES RETURN

600 - PRORATION ACCOUNT (USED ON NASA CONTRACTS ONLY)

710 - MUSEUM SHOPS PURCHASES FOR RESALE
Mr. Barwick. The volume of procurement is up to some 12,000 transactions a year, aggregating about $12 million. The variety of items and services procured covers a broad range. Although the requesting individuals include a variety of personalities, they exhibit one common trait and that is the determination to do a good job.

In their efforts to get their projects underway, these dedicated people frustrate the normal procurement processes and sometimes lead prospective contractors into premature performance.

These actions generate *ex post facto* procurements which are the most perplexing.

Mr. Thompson. What do you mean by *ex post facto* procurement?

Mr. Barwick. The obligation is made before going through the normal processing of procurement; that is, by first certifying that funds are available.

Mr. Thompson. Do you think that is good practice?

Mr. Barwick. It is horrible.

Mr. Thompson. Sir?

Mr. Barwick. Horrible.

Mr. Thompson. The GAO found 71 instances where there were orders for goods and services totaling $172,000, which were placed in this method, without obtaining competition or without securing the necessary authority first.

Mr. Barwick. Right.

Mr. Thompson. Is that practice continuing?

Mr. Barwick. In the rest of my statement I cover what steps we are taking to curb that. The answer is it is not prevalent.

Mr. Thompson. It is not prevalent?

Mr. Barwick. It is greatly reduced.

Mr. Thompson. It still exists?

Mr. Barwick. It is greatly reduced.

Mr. Thompson. Greatly reduced?

Mr. Barwick. Right.

Several of the most important steps usually taken by procurement officials are completely negated by that practice. That is, we are prevented from providing the property from property we already have, in some cases.

We are prevented from acquiring it from Federal stocks that are available. We are prevented from advertising. We are prevented from negotiating competitively.

All this is wiped out by these actions.

In addition, an unfunded obligation is generated by these actions since funds have not at that time been specifically reserved and certified by the fiscal office for the project involved.

Notwithstanding this situation, in the 4 years I have been Chief of the Supply Division, I don't have any information that would indicate any person has unlawfully or wrongly gained personally.

Mr. Thompson. I don't have any information that would lead me to disagree with you, but I might suggest that under these practices you are very fortunate that you have such honest people, because under such circumstances it is entirely possible; is it not?

Mr. Barwick. Absolutely.
In an attempt to control this situation, in December of 1967, Mr. Ripley, the Secretary, issued an office memo, insisting that this practice cease.

[Memorandum described follows.]

**Smithsonian Institution**

**Office Memorandum 730, December 29, 1967**

To: Heads of bureaus, offices and divisions and the professional research staff.

Subject: Ex Post Facto Purchase Requisitions.

The contents of this memorandum are not to be construed as discouraging or curtailing the use of any purchasing arrangement previously established with the Supply Division (i.e. Standard Form 44 purchases, allotment orders, charge accounts or Sundry Purchases). The following paragraphs concern procurement which would normally be made through the issuance of a contract or purchase order for specific articles and/or services.

It has been brought to my attention that members of the staff have been making commitments with vendors for the purchase of services, supplies, and equipment without first processing the required paperwork through the Fiscal Division and Supply Division. Not only is this the most costly way of purchasing supplies and services but, of equal importance, it is completely illegal when spending Federal funds.

The austerity program in effect at the Institution and throughout the Government can be served best if we use every means at our disposal to get the most for our money. Competitive bidding by established vendors is one method designed to do just that. Therefore, I must insist that, following verification by the Fiscal Division of the availability of funds, all procurement be conducted by the Supply Division or through arrangements made by a Contracting Officer of the Supply Division. In the event a special or unique procurement problem arises which cannot be satisfied through ordinary contracting practices, the Chief of the Supply Division must be notified so a suitable solution can be arranged.

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary.

Mr. Thompson. What was the date of that memo?
Mr. Barwick. It was December 29, 1967.
Mr. Thompson. The cases that GAO refers to are from 1967 to 1969.
Mr. Barwick. That is right.

The next sentence in my statement is: Satisfactory compliance did not result. Further efforts to require compliance in all areas of procurement practices with those applicable sections of the old Smithsonian Manual were canceled.

The provisions, policies, procedures, and so forth, were updated to correspond with the Code of Federal Regulations and issued as a Smithsonian Staff Handbook, which has been offered for the record.

In addition to the Handbook, the Secretary presented a separate memorandum to all personnel having management control appropriated funds directing that ex post facto practices cease, advised the penalties of law which may be imposed, and prescribed investigative procedures to be followed when these actions are discovered.

[Memorandum described follows.]

**Memorandum, April 1, 1970**

To: Mr. James Bradley.
From: S. Dillon Ripley.
Subject: Procurement practices and policies.

Recently my attention has been brought forcefully to the fact that in a number of instances foods and services have been procured without following established procedures. Such procedures require proper documentation to verify availability
of funds (Federal or Private) and to commit the Smithsonian Institution Supply Division to carry out the procurement for the user. Guidelines covering procurements are stated in Office Memorandum 731, dated March 26, 1968, concerning processing of purchase requisitions.

I must insist that these practices be followed as obviously we must know that funds are available and that the price is right. In meeting the latter objective, the Smithsonian Institution Supply Division's actions may involve; using the General Supply Schedule of the General Services Administration, obtaining informal quotations for small purchases, securing competitive proposals by soliciting bids for large procurements, making findings occasionally to justify sole source of supply, making determinations and findings occasionally to justify deviations from the requirement to advertise, and applying other procurement regulations which will assure that goods and services are acquired as promptly as possible, at a fair price, and within available funds.

You are reminded that two statutes exist which provide penalties for violation of procurement regulations and for exceeding available funds—31 U.S.C. section 655(a) et seq. (see SI Manual Section 310), and 41 U.S.C. section 11(a). Administrative penalties include suspension from duty without pay or removal from office. Persons convicted of willful violations are subject to a fine of not more than $5,000.00 or imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

You and all members of your staff concerned with requisitioning goods and services are strongly advised that the correct procurement practices must be followed and that only properly appointed contracting officers may issue purchase orders.

Office Memorandum 698, dated June 12, 1967, allows for the immediate purchase of small or emergency quantities of materials. In the event of an exigency which cannot be met by this method of purchase, the approval of the Assistant Secretary concerned or other appropriate authority will be required to authorize the emergency purchases.

Any procurements made without following established and prescribed procedures will be referred to the Assistant Secretary or other appropriate authority. These officials will investigate the matter and recommend to the Chief, Smithsonian Institution Supply Division, whether the improper procurements should be ratified or cancelled. The Secretary reserves the right to refuse payment if such procurements are presented for approval.

As stated in Office Memorandum 730, dated December 29, 1967, the austerity program in effect at the Institution and throughout the Government can be served best if we use every means at our disposal to get the most for our money. Competitive bidding by established vendors is one method designed to do just that. Therefore, I must repeat that, following verification of the availability of funds, by the Accounting Division, all procurement must be conducted by the Smithsonian Institution Supply Division or through arrangements made by a Contracting Officer of that Division. In the event a special or unique procurement problem arises which cannot be satisfied through ordinary contracting practices, the Chief of the Smithsonian Institution Supply Division must be notified so a suitable solution can be arranged.

Mr. Thompson. What was the date of that action?
Mr. Barwick. That was April 1, this year.
Mr. Thompson. What have you done about it since then?
Mr. Barwick. When ex post facto procurements come across, they are stopped at my desk. and I refer the matter to the appropriate Assistant Secretary of the Smithsonian, asking three questions: One, why ordinary procurement practices could not have been followed? What steps he is going to take to prevent this from happening in the future? And his recommended disposition of this case?
We hold up action on those cases until we get the information.
Mr. Thompson. Have you made any exceptions?
Mr. Barwick. Do you mean penalized anyone?
Mr. Thompson. No. Have you been persuaded from the responses to the three questions that you should, under the circumstances, proceed with an ex post facto purchase?
Mr. Barwick. We have, yes, sir, after a satisfactory explanation has been brought forward.

Mr. Thompson. In other words, you make a value judgment in each of these instances?

Mr. Barwick. Right.

Mr. Thompson. Notwithstanding the prohibition of the practice?

Mr. Barwick. Part of the Code of Federal Regulations have procedures for ratifying these actions, and this procedure is followed.

Mr. Thompson. Then you are operating within that structure?

Mr. Barwick. Right.

Substantial results have come about from these last actions. The requiring officials or the requisitioning officials more often consult with the procurement officials, and usually, almost always, procurement can be conducted within the framework of the regulations to everyone's satisfaction.

Mr. Thompson. How long would it take normally to process completely a procurement order?

Mr. Barwick. It would depend on the nature of the article and the method of procurement. If it is an off-the-shelf item, usually you can process the entire thing within a week.

If it is something that must be advertised, you have to give prospective vendors time to bid, and it might take 6 weeks.

Mr. Thompson. Would a very strict adherence to this policy of not making *ex post facto* orders inhibit you too much?

Mr. Barwick. Could I hear that again, please?

Mr. Thompson. Would a strict adherence to the normal policy restrict or impede your operation?

Mr. Barwick. It would make my job much easier.

Mr. Thompson. I think that is a good idea, then. You ought to do that.

Mr. Barwick. That is what we are striving for now.

There is one thing I would like to explain that may have brought this practice about.

In earlier years in the Smithsonian, a greater proportion of the funds were private and those funds were unrestricted to a great extent.

Mr. Thompson. Are they still?

Mr. Barwick. No. We are following essentially the same procedure for private funds as Federal now.

Mr. Thompson. But you are not compelled to do so with your private funds.

Mr. Barwick. We are not compelled to, but as a general practice we do.

That is the end of my statement.

Mr. Thompson. Do you approve all procurement orders yourself, or does your staff?

Mr. Barwick. Through authority delegated by me, my staff and I approve all outgoing procurements.

Mr. Thompson. But the ultimate responsibility is yours?

Mr. Barwick. It is mine.

Mr. Thompson. I think it is clear that you are on the right road. You may be a little slow, but you are on the right road.

Mr. Barwick. Thank you.
Mr. Bradley. Mr. Chairman, shall we proceed?
Mr. Thompson. Please do.

Mr. Bradley. The GAO report demanded that the Smithsonian improve and strengthen, and that means more people, our internal audit. This is simply the business of having rather broadgauge auditors look over, frequently on a spot basis or sampling basis because the volume is pretty large, and see that the transactions, whatever they might be, from payroll on through to procurement, large contracts or small, are done not only with regard to legality but also with regard to propriety and efficiency.

Since I have been around the Smithsonian it has been a struggle to achieve this. We have had difficulty in finding good auditors who can do internal auditing.

It takes a special kind of a broadgauge fellow in order to do this effectively and to be in position to interpret to the professional staff members what he is getting at. We have now had the very good fortune of acquiring, I believe, four such auditors, as GAO testified. In earlier days we had none.

Sometime in the middle of my career at the Smithsonian we had an eminently capable fellow by the name of Douglas Martin. He was just fine but then the State of New York called him back. Now he is in charge of audit systems for the State of New York.

This has been a series of attempts to build up a staff but only now do we have the staff. We thoroughly agree with GAO that this is the thing to do.

Mr. Thompson. These gentlemen work under Mr. Wheeler?
Mr. Bradley. They work under me directly, rather than Mr. Wheeler. The idea is that on occasions they will have to go into Mr. Wheeler’s outfit and do some auditing.

Mr. Thompson. I was impressed by Mr. Wheeler’s presentation the other day. He is to be commended for it. I am glad you have the people on board now that you feel are so able.

Mr. Bradley. Thank you, sir.
Mr. Chairman, you had a question earlier, I believe, about the matter of activities from which some revenues resulted.

Mr. Powers, if I may call upon him, would like to make a short statement on that.

Mr. Thompson. Yes.

Mr. Powers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a few comments to add to what the GAO people have said this morning.

As stated in Chapter 4, the Smithsonian and the GAO are presently engaged in a joint study of those public-service activities of the Institution which generate revenues of various kinds to help pay the costs of these activities.

Parenthetically, it might be more accurate to refer to these as “revenue-supported” activities rather than “revenue-producing,” because they do not as a group “make money,” in the business sense, and possibly never will, although it is the fervent hope of our Treasurer, Mr. Wheeler, that the revenues will soon begin to cover at least the direct expenses of these activities, which are now borne in part by unrestricted private funds. This study began during the recent GAO audit and is making useful progress. When it is completed a further report will be issued.
I don't want to say anything that would in any way compromise these discussions or try to anticipate the report, but I think that a few general remarks (based on my own work, to date, in this study) might clarify for the committee certain basic facts about the administration and support of the activities with which the study is concerned.

There are three kinds of costs involved in any Smithsonian activity:

First, the Institution-wide costs of central management; for example, the Secretary, the Under Secretary, Assistant Secretaries, Treasurer, and General Counsel;

Second, the indirect overhead costs such as utilities, maintenance and guards;

And third, the direct expenses of the specific unit: salaries, inventory costs, and so forth.

From the beginning, the Secretary and a number of other officers have been paid from private endowment funds, but more recently, the Assistant Secretaries and the General Counsel have been placed on the public payroll.

Thus, in this category of cost, every activity of the Institution, including those under study, is supported by both private and public funds.

In the second category, although the Smithsonian castle was originally built and maintained by using the interest income from the Smithsonian bequest, for many years now most of the costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining Smithsonian buildings have been paid from appropriated funds. These expenditures benefit most of the revenue-supported activities as well as others, although I believe the study will probably show the Cambridge Computer Center does not receive any such support and the Belmont Conference Center very little.

In the third category, direct expense, the contribution from appropriated funds is minimal. It is my understanding that, of the eight activities under study, only two—the Folk Life Festival and the Smithsonian Press—have any employees paid from appropriated funds. In the case of the Folk Festival, the activity itself is free, and the incidental sales of programs and food, which have so far failed to reduce the deficit materially, are handled by volunteers and concessionaires.

At the Press, which has been heavily subsidized by the private trust funds for over a century, it would appear from a recent analysis made by the Director that about one-fifth of its publications are produced for sale while one-fourth of the Press salaries are paid from private funds, as are all manufacturing costs for such sale publications.

Thus, in general, the direct costs of the activities under study are met from the revenues from these activities and from other unrestricted private funds. As stated in Chapter 4, this contribution of private funds to direct costs in 1968 was about $200,000. My guess is that our further analysis will show that the total contribution of Federal support in all three categories of cost, direct and indirect, was substantially less than this figure.
All of the aforesaid expenditures, both public and private, for these activities are independently audited and reported annually to the Congress. The joint study now in progress is intended to analyze the relationship of public and private support in these areas, and I am confident that the results of the study will provide invaluable guidelines for the future development of these activities.

Mr. Chairman, I have copies of the analysis that the director of the press made of the 1970 expenditures, and a statement in support thereof.

I was going to either submit it now or as part of the response to the numerous questions raised by Senator Goldwater.

Mr. Thompson. It might be more appropriate to accompany the response to Senator Goldwater.

Mr. Powers. All right.

Mr. Thompson. When do you expect this study to be ready?

Mr. Powers. I think in the autumn. I am centrally involved in this, and perhaps as soon as the hearings are over I can get back.

Mr. Thompson. In other words, we are delaying you. I apologize, sir.

Mr. Powers. On the other hand, the GAO people are cooperating very well, the General Counsel and so forth. But they do have a few other matters of high priority.

I think it will be in the early autumn that we will have a report.

Mr. Thompson. The committee would appreciate having that when it is finished. I think it will be a valuable document.

I am sorry we have to conclude now because the quorum bell has rung.

The subcommittee will recess, to meet in this room on Wednesday next.

Mr. Bradley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Whereupon, at 11:25 a.m. the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Tuesday, July 28, 1970, in room 2261.)
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

General Background—Policies, Purposes, and Goals From 1846 to Present

TUESDAY, JULY 28, 1970

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND MEMORIALS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Frank Thompson, Jr., (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Thompson, Brademas, Bingham, and Schwengel.

Staff member present: John d'Amecourt, staff director.

Mr. Thompson. The subcommittee will be in order.

Our first witness this morning is Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, who is going to discuss with us the sale and disposal of art works. He is accompanied by Mr. Charles Blitzer, Assistant Secretary for History and Art of the Smithsonian.

STATEMENT OF S. DILLON RIPLEY, SECRETARY; ACCOMPANIED BY CHARLES BLITZER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ART AND HISTORY, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Dr. Ripley. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce, as I did before, "Professor" Blitzer, who will in effect speak to the issue this morning. But before we commence, if I may, I should like to mention the fact that yesterday a regent of the Smithsonian died, who was a Member of this Congress, Congressman Kirwan, and the Smithsonian is deeply gripped by his loss. He has been of inestimable value in the years of his service as a regent of the Institution. And I might remind the members of this committee, I am sorry Mr. Gray isn't here to agree with this, that it was Mr. Kirwan who led the discussions on the floor of the House in 1966 which resulted in the passage of the authorizing bill for the National Air and Space Museum and who, in effect, ran that bill and its progress through the House where it was adopted by I think virtually unanimous vote authorizing the site on Fourth and Seventh Streets along Independence Avenue and the eventual, as we hope, construction of that great museum.

Mr. Thompson. I think it is entirely appropriate that you mention our late colleague. Michael Kirwan was a great personal friend of mine and was easily one of the most popular and certainly one of the most powerful Members of the House; witness his great success with his aquarium project and a number of other things. We will all miss him.
He had been ill for a long, long time, as you know.

So, thank you for reminding us.

Dr. Ripley. I would like, if I might, to ask Mr. Blitzer to proceed.

Mr. Blitzer. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am happy to have an opportunity to comment on the General Accounting Office report on the Sale and Exchange of Paintings by the National Collection of Fine Arts (NCFA). This is obviously a very careful and thorough report. It was made, and I have personal knowledge of this, on the basis of very extensive research by the GAO and with our full cooperation.

If you will permit, I should like to highlight a few of the GAO findings and comment on some of its conclusions in this report.

In doing so, I hope I will be able to reassure some people who have been understandably concerned about a number of innuendoes and misstatements which have appeared in the press and elsewhere about these transactions.

First, the GAO report establishes that the number of paintings disposed by the NCFA is in total 4, all of them European paintings. Second, the report states that these transactions were carried out by the staff of the National Collection of Fine Arts, and if I may, I would say that, they were all initiated by the staff of the National Collection of Fine Arts. The purpose was to improve that museum's collection of American art.

Third, the report establishes that the entire proceeds of all these transactions were in fact devoted to the acquisition of American art for the NCFA. The works acquired solely or largely as a result of these transactions were:

(a) The contents of the studio of the 19th century sculptor Hiram Powers, including two life-size marble busts, six life-size plaster statues, 19 life-size plaster busts, 44 identified plaster portrait busts, as well as a trunk full of correspondence to and from Powers, a manuscript biography of Powers, a checklist of Powers' works, and Powers' sculpture tools and studio props.

I might add that these very materials are now being used by Richard Wunder of the NCFA staff who is preparing what he told me as recently as 2 months ago, will be a definitive study of Hiram Powers as a leading American sculptor.

[Document supplied by Mr. Blitzer]

VALUE OF THE HIRAM POWERS COLLECTION

The historic, artistic and scholarly value of the Powers collection is enormous, particularly for a museum specializing in the history of American art.

The monetary value of the collection can only be estimated, unless it is thought necessary to pay for one or more formal appraisals. The following estimates of present value were given us by a leading authority on 19th Century American sculpture, who is familiar with both the Powers collection and the current art market:

1. Two life-size marble statues (Eve—$20,000) (American Indian—$12,000) ......................................................... $32,000
2. Seven life-size marble busts .............................................. 28,000
3. Six life-size plaster statues (America, $12,000; two Greek Slaves, $24,000; three others, $15,000) .......................... 51,000
4. Nineteen life-size plaster busts .......................................... 22,800
5. Forty-four plaster portrait busts ....................................... 22,000
6. Memorabilia ........................................................................ 10,000

Total .................................................................................. 165,800

The collection was purchased by the Smithsonian in 1967 for $99,408.05.
(b) *Helen Brought to Paris*, a large painting (57x75 in.) by Benjamin West (1738–1820), who has been described by Edgar Richardson as "the first American-born painter to win an international reputation and play a part in the artistic life of Europe"; (c) a pair of portraits by Gustavus Hesselius (1682–1755) and a pair of portraits probably by his son, John Hesselius (d.1788); according to Richardson, "The two Hesseliusues were the principal painters in the area of Philadelphia, the colonial metropolis, for half a century."

(d) *Cabin Door Still Life*, a large painting (56x34 in.) by Richard Labarre Goodwin (1840–1910).

I might add that in spite of rumors that I have heard and things that I have read in the newspapers, I know of no person who can speak with authority in the field of American art, who knows about these transactions, who has suggested the National Collection of Fine Arts lost by any or all of these transactions.

Every opinion I have been able to gain is that the National Collection of Fine Arts as a collection is stronger as a result of these transactions.

Fourth, the report concludes that the procedures followed by the NCFA and the Smithsonian in these transactions were imperfect. We accept this conclusion and, as the report also recognizes, we have taken appropriate steps to correct these procedural deficiencies.

If I may, I would quote briefly two documents, one a memorandum from the Secretary of the Smithsonian to the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery; dated December 15, 1969:

The following procedures shall be followed in the disposition of any object valued at more than $100 in the collections of the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts.

The bureau director, after consultation with the appropriate curator, shall submit to his commission his recommendation for the disposal of any object in the collection valued at more than $100. He shall at the same time present to the commission a statement of clearance from the Smithsonian Office of General Counsel. In addition to approving the disposition of the work of art, the Commission shall agree to the method of disposal of the object whether by auction, by exchange, by direct sale or any other method. The recommendation of the director and his commission and evidence of legal clearance shall be submitted to the Secretary for his approval.

Mr. Thompson. The GAO report says that in May of 1970 the regents adopted a procedure and goes on to describe it. In that procedure, it says the prior approval of the Director of the National Collection, its Art Commission, and the Smithsonian General Counsel and the Secretary, is required for the sale or exchange of an art work valued at over $1,000.

So the figure is now $1,000 as distinguished from the preliminary

$100?

Mr. Blitzer. This was a decision by the Board of Regents which was discussed at some length, I may say, as to the appropriate dollar level. The regents decided that this much machinery for the sale of a duplicate print that was worth $111—

Mr. Thompson. Yes; I had in mind that there are reproductions available which cost over $100.

Mr. Blitzer. My interpretation would be that the December 15 memorandum of the Secretary still stands. But it is not superseded, but simply supplemented by the Regents March declaration.
Fifth, the report is critical of storage and record keeping at the NCFA. Although the conditions described are to a substantial degree the result of the history of the NCFA, which existed in one form or another for more than a century with no proper home, and which during that time accumulated extremely varied collections of some 13,000 art objects, this is not to say that the deficiencies should be uncorrected.

Before the GAO had begun its investigation, and long before we had received its report, Dr. Joshua Taylor, the new director of the NCFA, had begun to take decisive steps to improve both storage and record management, giving these objectives the highest priority among all the activities of his museum. In that, I think he differed from some of his predecessors.

As the GAO report recognizes, steps are being taken to correct this and indeed have been taken to correct these deficiencies.

To turn now to the more general policy question of whether museums should sell or exchange objects in their collections, with the purpose of improving these collections, opinions vary widely. I should first say that I believe there is no question of the Smithsonian’s legal authority to do so.

In addition to the general power of the Institution to dispose of its property, each act of Congress concerned directly with Smithsonian art museums explicitly contemplates the possibility of such exchanges and sales. But to say that a museum may do this is not to say that it should.

Although I believe that most museums have engaged in this practice and that a large number of them have also been willing to defend it publicly, it is certainly true that a number of museum directors and trustees are opposed to the alienation of any object in a museum collection.

On the one hand, I am aware of an important court decision holding that museums have an obligation to improve their collections in this way, but I am sure that someone else could point to an equally impressive source arguing the reverse:

A recent decision upholding the power of the Philadelphia Museum of Art to sell works of art from its collections contains a pertinent statement concerning a museum’s affirmative duty to improve its collections:

“An art museum, if it is to serve the cultural and educational needs of the community, cannot remain static. It must keep abreast of the advances of the times, like every other institution whose purpose is to educate and enlighten the community.

“In the early days, directors of art museums found themselves in charge of big, but empty buildings. Virtually every painting owned by every museum was constantly on exhibit. It required a myriad of pictures to cover the available wall space. They therefore bought in large quantities and exhibited practically everything they could acquire.

“Today the fashion has changed completely. Each picture is hung in a manner to achieve maximum effectiveness. The number of paintings shown in a single room has been drastically reduced: Considering the great number of masterpieces now forming part of the great collections, it is mandatory that all collections be constantly screened and weeded out, so that only the best, not only educationally and historically, but also artistically, are kept for exhibition.”


Mr. Blitzer. The problem is well illustrated in the case of the National Collection of Fine Arts itself. The former Director adopted a policy of engaging in occasional sales and exchanges.

[Document supplied by Mr. Blitzer.]
MEMORANDUM MAY 8, 1969

To: Mr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary.
From: David W. Scott.
Subject: Proposed sale of an NCFA painting.

You will recall that last year we sold a painting by Francesco Guardi from our collection in order to cover the purchase of the Hiram Powers collection.

I would like to propose selling another smaller Guardi from our collection at the July auction at Sotheby's to raise cash for possible American painting purchases that we may be making within the next year. Unless we have sufficient cash resources to move quickly in the market, we find that it is difficult to acquire the caliber of painting needed to round out our historical collections. The Guardi I propose selling has been appraised by Sotheby's at $15,000-$20,000. It is a small painting, unrestricted in terms of gift, and not of museum quality. Its condition would preclude trading or lending it advantageously.

I do not believe that putting one such painting on sale at auction each year anonymously would reflect adversely on the National Collection of Fine Arts.

Mr. Blitzer. The present Director has reversed this policy. (I might add that three of the four transactions discussed occurred precisely during the transition between these two administrations there.)

In January of 1969, the Secretary asked the Chairman of the NCFA Commission for the Commission's advice on this policy question. A few months later, three members of the Commission stated that in their view, "the disposal by a museum of surplus or unrelated objects on the art market has almost invariably, in the perspective of time, proven to be a mistake."

Yet a year later, at its May 1970 meeting, the Commission had a lively discussion of this question with strong expressions of opinion on both sides. The Chairman summarized the discussion as follows:

This is a very important and very fundamental question and I am glad to see there are differences of opinion on this issue. This Commission needs continuing thought and perspective on the problem.

One thing that complicates the question, and that perhaps makes it incapable of any general solution valid for all times and places, is that museums vary so much in their circumstances. This is very clear just within the context of the Smithsonian. The Freer Gallery is forbidden by terms of its trust to dispose of any object in its collections. The National Portrait Gallery was created only 8 years ago, with virtually no collection, and so the question has not arisen.

The Cooper Union (now Cooper Hewitt) Museum has from its origin emphasized the usefulness of its collections to students and professionals, rather than the accumulation of fine works of art, and consequently it has consistently followed a policy of culling and improving its collections. One regular feature of its financial statement has been an item headed "Objects Sold Fund."

It is Joseph Hirshhorn's explicit hope that the Director and Board will always continue to improve the collections of the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden through judicious sales and exchanges.

Thus we find five Smithsonian museums, each with a different approach to this question, depending upon its history and its circumstances.

Faced with this diversity, which seems to me in itself a healthy thing, I believe that the policy we have adopted is a sensible one. We have placed primary responsibility in the hands of the professional staff, the director, and the advisory board or commission of each museum, subject to review by our General Counsel's office and by the Secretary.
All transactions will be regularly reported to the Board of Regents, and major transactions will also require the Regents' prior approval.

In summary, then, we accept this General Accounting Office report. We welcome its careful explanation of the NCFA's plan to improve its collection through these four transactions, and we have willingly followed its recommendations.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you very much.

At this point in the record, we shall include the report of the Comptroller General, and the accompanying letter to our colleague, Mr. Keith of Massachusetts.

(Statements referred to follow:)


B-168120
Hon. Hastings Keith, House of Representatives,

Dear Mr. Keith: This letter is in further response to your letter of October 8, 1969, in which you requested our Office to review the disposition of certain art works from the National Collection of Fine Arts of the Smithsonian Institution.

The National Collection has disposed of four paintings in the last 6 years. Two of the paintings were sold at auction, one was sold through an art dealer, and one was given to an art dealer in exchange for an American painting. The paintings, which were by European artists, were sold or exchanged for the purpose of improving the collection of American art works. By this means, the National Collection has acquired a number of American art works and is planning to acquire others.

The Smithsonian Board of Regents had not established a formal written policy on whether art works in the National Collection should be sold or exchanged, but it was subsequently advised of the disposition of these four paintings. Since there were differing views on whether the Smithsonian and similar institutions should sell or exchange paintings, we advised Smithsonian officials that it seemed desirable for the Smithsonian to establish a formal written policy on this matter.

We believe that the practice followed by the National Collection in valuing paintings has been less stringent than appears desirable because it has obtained only one independent estimate of value of the paintings considered for sale or exchange. We were concerned that one estimate might not be an adequate basis for establishing a painting's market value. We therefore suggested that, if a decision was made to continue to permit sales or exchanges of paintings, procedures be established requiring more than one independent appraisal of the value of paintings that were being considered for sale or exchange.

We tested the accuracy of records maintained by the National Collection of the location of paintings. Our tests showed that in many instances the records were inaccurate or did not adequately describe the location of the paintings. During our tests we noted that some of the paintings were leaning in rows along walls and partitions in the main storage area. This method of storage subjects the paintings to the risk of damage.

We discussed these matters with Smithsonian officials with a view toward obtaining appropriate corrective measures. We were advised by Smithsonian officials that the following steps were being taken in response to our proposals and discussions:

The Board of Regents, in May 1970, adopted a procedure for sales and exchanges of art works which, in effect, established a written policy permitting such sales and exchanges. The procedure requires prior approval of the Director of the National Collection, its Art Commission, the Smithsonian's General Counsel, and the Smithsonian's Secretary for sale or exchange of any art work valued at over $1,000. The prior approval of the Board of Regents is also required if the art work is valued at over $50,000.

The Secretary of the Smithsonian advised the Director of the National Collection that at least one professional appraisal of the value of each art work to be sold or exchanged should be obtained if the estimated value of the art work was between $1,000 and $50,000 and that two such appraisals
should be obtained if the estimated value was more than $50,000. In addition, he suggested that the Director solicit the views of the National Collection of Fine Arts Commission on the method to be followed in establishing market value of art objects.

The Director of the National Collection advised us that (1) problems in storage facilities were being corrected, (2) a complete physical inventory of art works would be taken, and (3) adequate inventory records would be established.

With regard to valuing art objects, the Art Dealers Association of America requires that appraisals made by its members be the combined judgment of more than one of its members. We believe that, in establishing the market value of art objects that are to be sold or exchanged, the National Collection should consider the opinions of more than one art expert.

Our detailed comments on these and other matters are set forth in the enclosure to this letter.

As a result of agreements reached with Mr. Lloyd Salvetti of your staff, we (1) obtained, and incorporated in the enclosure, the comments of Smithsonian officials on the matters discussed therein and (2) are making copies of this letter and the enclosure available to the Smithsonian, the Board of Regents, the National Collection of Fine Arts Commission, and interested members and committees of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE, OBSERVATIONS ON THE SALE AND EXCHANGE OF PAINTINGS BY THE NATIONAL COLLECTION OF FINE ARTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

INTRODUCTION

The General Accounting Office (GAO) has examined into the sale and exchange of paintings by the National Collection of Fine Arts of the Smithsonian Institution. This review was undertaken pursuant to a congressional request that GAO look into dispositions of art works belonging to the Smithsonian Institution. As part of our examination, we interviewed officials of the Smithsonian Institution and its National Collection of Fine Arts. We also reviewed appropriate registrar, curatorial, and administrative records of the National Collection and, with the assistance of its personnel, we ascertained that certain works of art were in its possession or were otherwise properly accounted for. In addition, we interviewed officials of the following art firms and museums:


The Smithsonian Institution was created by an act of the Congress in 1846 (20 U.S.C. 41), as an establishment for the "increase and diffusion of knowledge among men." Its business is conducted by a Board of Regents composed of the Vice President of the United States, the Chief Justice, three members of the Senate, three members of the House of Representatives, and six other persons who are not members of the Congress. The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution is its executive officer and the director of its activities. He is appointed by the Board of Regents and also serves as secretary to the Board.

The National Collection traces its legislative authority to the act of 1846 which established the Smithsonian Institution. In 1938, by Public Resolution 95, the Congress instructed the National Collection to foster in the United States an appreciation of past and contemporary art, to encourage the development of contemporary art, and to effect the widest distribution and cultivation in matters of such art. In carrying out these instructions, the National Collection stresses American art and considers itself a museum for such art.

The National Collection is headed by a director who is appointed by the Board of Regents and is under the general direction of the Smithsonian's Assistant Secretary for History and Arts. The National Collection of Fine Arts Commission (formerly the Smithsonian Art Commission), created by the Board of Re-
gents, is responsible for considering and reporting to the Board all fine art matters under the National Collection's jurisdiction. The Commission is authorized 24 members, including artists, experts in the fine arts, and business or professional men interested in the fine arts. The members are appointed by the Board of Regents for 4-year terms and serve without compensation. The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution is an ex officio member of the Commission.

The collection of art works at the National Collection originated in a museum established by John Varden in Washington, D.C., in 1829. It is one of the nation's oldest continuous collections of art works. Over the years, the National Collection has acquired many valuable donations and deposits of art works. As of December 5, 1969, it had over 13,000 pieces of art of various media. The National Collection did not have a permanent home in which to exhibit and store its art works until 1967 when it moved to the old Patent Office Building in Washington, D.C.

NEED FOR IMPROVED CONTROLS OVER ART WORKS IN THE NATIONAL COLLECTION

The National Collection disposed of four paintings in the last 6 years. These paintings were by European artists, and the disposals were made to provide the means to obtain art works by American artists that would improve the National Collection. We found that the Board of Regents had not established a formal written policy on whether art works should be sold or exchanged and, if such sales and exchanges are to be made, how the market value of such paintings should be established. Also, there was a need to improve the accountability over art works in the National Collection.

Details of our findings and the actions taken by the Smithsonian are presented below.

PAINTINGS DISPOSED OF BY THE NATIONAL COLLECTION OF FINE ARTS

Two of the four paintings which the National Collection disposed of during the last 6 years were sold at auction, another was sold through an art dealer, and the fourth was given to an art dealer in exchange for an American painting.

The paintings were disposed of as the result of plans by the National Collection's former director to provide a means of improving its collection of American art works by selling and trading the European and American paintings—whose dispositions were not restricted by the terms of the gifts and bequests—which it did not intend to exhibit and which it did not need as evidence of the National Collection's history. From the sales and the exchange, the National Collection has acquired a number of American art works and is planning to acquire others.

Information relating to the four paintings sold and exchanged by the National Collection is discussed below.

"Ruins and Figures" by Francesco Guardi

"Ruins and Figures" by Francesco Guardi, an 18th century Venetian artist, was one of 24 paintings donated by Ralph Cross Johnson in 1919. The former director of the National Collection describing it as a very important and fully signed and documented painting.

We found that the National Collection had unsuccessfully attempted to sell the painting to several American museums, including the National Gallery of Art, for $120,000. The painting was then sold to a European art dealer at a London auction in July 1968, for approximately $120,000. After commission and other expenses, the net proceeds amounted to about $107,100. The sale proceeds were used to reimburse the Smithsonian's private funds for a loan to the National Collection to purchase the studio collection of a major 19th-century American sculptor, Hiram Powers.

"Virgin and Child" by Jan Massys

"Virgin and Child" is another of the 24 paintings donated by Ralph Cross Johnson in 1919. It was described by a member of the National Collection's curatorial staff as an unsigned and undocumented painting attributed to Jan Massys, a 16th-century Flemish artist. The painting was traded in June 1969 to an art dealer in New York for a painting, "Helen Brought to Paris," by Benjamin West. The National Collection's staff wanted a painting by West, a prominent 18th-century American-born artist, to fill a gap in its collection of American paintings.

The trade was publicly criticized because the National Collection received a painting which the dealer had priced at $10,000 for a painting which the dealer had placed on sale at $35,000. The information that we obtained from the art dealer concerning the paintings is summarized in the following paragraph.
He had mistakenly quoted the West painting's 1961 price of $10,000 to the National Collection. Although the painting was worth much more than $10,000 at the time of the trade, he decided to stand by the quoted price. The Massys painting, on the other hand, had increased in value since the trade because through research he had established Jan Massys as the artist; while, at the time of the trade, the painting had only been attributed to that artist. Further, in pricing the painting at $35,000, the dealer was also anticipating an increase in its market value. The painting has not been sold and, because the trade was publicly criticized, it has been withdrawn from sale.

The National Collection's staff informed us that the trade was negotiated on the basis of an estimate of the price—$6,000 to $8,000—the Massys painting would bring at auction against the asking price of $10,000 for the West painting. The estimate of the price that the Massys and other European paintings would bring at auction was made by a representative of a well-known art auctioneer. In his opinion, the Massys would bring a low price at auction because there would not be much competition for it—its only interest is for study purposes to illustrate the Italian influence on Flemish painting and it is not the type wanted by collectors. He considered the Massys overpriced at $35,000. He stated, however, that he would not be surprised if it brought the dealer $15,000 to $20,000. He said that a dealer could get a higher price than the auction price for the Massys because he could wait for an interested buyer or could interest someone in buying it, whereas, at auction there would be only a few days in which to arouse a buyer's interest in the painting.

Another opinion on the matter was given by the former chairman of the National Collection of Fine Arts Commission who wrote the Assistant Director of the National Collection that, in his opinion, the exchange was advantageous to the Smithsonian.

We are not in a position to reach a conclusion as to whether the trade was prudent.

"Water Scene With Old Mill" by Francesco Guardi

"Water Scene With Old Mill," another painting by Francesco Guardi, was one of 59 paintings acquired in 1956 by request of Ralph Cross Johnson's daughter, Mabel Johnson Langhorne. Curatorial records indicate that the painting was in poor condition and according to the former director of the National Collection, was not of a quality suitable for an art museum. The painting was sold for approximately $15,600 at a London auction in December 1969. After commission and other expenses, the net proceeds amounted to about $13,900.

The painting was sold to provide funds to purchase desirable American paintings. Present intentions are to use the proceeds as partial payment for four portraits by 18th-century American artists, Gustavus and John Hesselius, purchased for $24,000.

We found that the painting had been sold without obtaining the advance opinion of the Smithsonian's General Counsel as to whether the terms of the bequest permitted its sale. the Smithsonian's General Counsel subsequently studied the terms of the bequest and expressed the opinion that the sale of the painting was not prohibited. The Secretary of the Smithsonian has since issued instructions requiring disposals to be cleared through the General Counsel.

"Rome and the Campagna," by Richard Wilson

"Rome and the Campagna" by Richard Wilson, an 18th-century English artist, was acquired in 1943 by bequest of the Reverend F. Ward Denys. The National Collection's staff sent the painting to a New York art dealer in June 1969 with the intent that he arrange a trade, subject to their approval, for an American painting equal in value to an estimated auction price for the Wilson of $12,000 to $16,000.

We were advised that the dealer apparently misunderstood and, instead of arranging a trade, sold the painting for $17,000. After deducting $3,000 for expenses and other charges, the dealer remitted $14,000 to the National Collection. Because the National Collection received payment approximately equal to what it believed it would have received at an auction, it decided that the results of the transaction should be accepted. We were further advised that the proceeds would be applied to the purchase of a painting by the 19th-century American artist, Richard LaBarre Goodwin, and several sculptures by the 19th-century American sculptor, William Rinehart.
FORMAL POLICY ADOPTED ON SALES AND EXCHANGES OF PAINTINGS

The Board of Regents had not established a formal written policy concerning the sale or exchange of art works in the National Collection. Although the Board was subsequently advised of the disposal of the four paintings discussed above, it had not provided staff members responsible for the National Collection with formal guidance on whether it favored such sales and exchanges and, if it favored such sales and exchanges, under what conditions they should be made.

There are differing opinions as to whether institutions such as the National Collection should sell or exchange art works. At the request of the Secretary, a panel composed of the chairman and two members of the National Collection of Fine Arts Commission, studied the matter. In an April 1969 report, the panel expressed the opinion that the paintings in the National Collection should not be traded or sold. They stated the belief that American art works could be borrowed from other museums for exhibit in return for the loan of unrelated or surplus art works in the National Collection and that such works should not be sold or exchanged for the purpose of acquiring additional American art works. The panel stated also that disposal or paintings should be avoided because the museum's ability to acquire further gifts might be adversely affected if prospective donors knew that the art works they donated might subsequently be sold.

In contrast, officials of a number of museums that we visited told us that museums did make sales or exchanges of art works but that high management levels carefully controlled such sales or exchanges. Also, some of these people stated that a museum should constantly try to improve its collection through judicious sales and trades so that only the best art works educationally, historically, and artistically are kept for exhibition.

Because of differing opinions on the matter, we suggested that the Board of Regents establish a formal written policy as to whether art works should be sold or exchanged and, if such sales or exchanges were favored, the conditions under which they should be made.

At a meeting on May 21, 1970, the Board of Regents adopted a procedure which, in effect, established a written policy of permitting sales and exchanges. The text of the Board's resolution follows:

"Resolved, That no object of art in the permanent collection of the National Portrait Gallery or the National Collection of Fine Arts valued at more than $1,000 shall be exchanged or sold without prior approval of the museum Director, the museum's Commission, the Smithsonian's Office of General Counsel, and of the Secretary;

"That no object of art in the permanent collection of the National Portrait Gallery or the National Collection of Fine Arts valued at more than $50,000 shall be exchanged or sold without prior approval of the museum Director, the museum's Commission, the Smithsonian's Office of General Counsel, the Secretary, and the Board of Regents;

"That the exchange or sale of any object of art in the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts shall be reported to the Board of Regents by the Secretary; and

"That the proceeds from any such sale shall be used solely for the acquisition of works of art for the museum from which it came."

NEED FOR IMPROVED VALUATION PROCEDURES FOR SALES AND EXCHANGES

The Smithsonian did not have an established procedure requiring the valuation of paintings that were to be sold or exchanged. We believe that such a procedure is needed to provide greater assurance that the proceeds from the sales and exchanges of art works are commensurate with their market value.

For three of the four paintings that were sold or exchanged, we found that one independent estimate of the value of each painting was obtained before the sale or exchange was made. The valuation on the fourth painting, Guardi's "Ruins and Figures," the most valuable of the paintings, apparently was based on a study of the market value of the painting. The study was made by a former National Collection employee who specialized in 18th-century Italian painters.

Two of the four paintings, the Guardi's, were sold at auction. To the extent that competitive bidding was obtained at the auction, there would be greater assurance that market prices were obtained for the paintings. The other two were disposed of by other means and therefore an evaluation of their worth prior to disposition would have been of greater importance.
Inasmuch as the valuation of paintings is a matter over which sizable differences are possible, we believe that more than one valuation should be obtained before a selling price is established to provide greater certainty that the valuation is representative of a painting's market value. This seems particularly appropriate where the disposition of a European painting in the National Collection is concerned because, as we were advised, the staff is oriented toward American art and has less knowledge of the value of paintings by European artists and might have to place more reliance on the value of judgments.

After we pointed out the need for establishing a procedure for valuing art works to be sold or exchanged, the Secretary of the Smithsonian advised the Director of the National Collection that at least one professional, independent appraisal of any work of art which the Director proposed to sell or exchange should be obtained if the work was likely to be worth more than $1,000; and, if the work was likely to be worth more than $50,000, two such appraisals should be obtained. The Secretary also suggested that the Director might solicit the views of the National Collection of Fine Arts Commission on the method to be followed in valuing art works.

We believe that, because of the difficulties and the many judgmental factors involved in establishing the market value of art work, the Director should follow the suggestion of the Secretary and consult the National Collection of Fine Arts Commission on this question. Of particular concern, in our opinion, is the number of appraisers whose views should be obtained in valuing an art work. In this respect, the Art Dealers Association of America, which makes appraisals of art works but limits its appraisals to situations involving donations to museums, provides for one appraisal but requires that the appraisal be the combined judgment of more than one of its member dealers. We believe that the National Collection should consider the opinion of more than one art expert in appraising the value of art works to be sold or exchanged.

ACCOUNTABILITY OVER ART WORKS TO BE IMPROVED

During our inquiry into the extent to which art works belonging to the National Collection had been sold, we examined into the system used to maintain accountability over the art works in the National Collection. We believe that better recordkeeping techniques are needed to enable the Smithsonian to maintain adequate accountability for the art works in the National Collection.

The National Collection is the custodian of over 13,000 American and foreign paintings, prints, drawings, watercolors, sculptures, miniatures, and decorative art objects. The National Collection maintains records of the location of each work of art. To test the accuracy of these records, we selected 113 of the 213 foreign paintings in the National Collection including paintings which the National Collection's staff had considered for disposal and the remaining paintings from the Johnson gift and Langhorne bequest.

For the following reasons, we had difficulty finding 51 of the 113 paintings from the information contained in the National Collection's records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem:</th>
<th>Number of paintings involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Painting was not in the location shown on the records</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location was not adequately described in the records</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of the painting was not recorded</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We subsequently located 46 of the 51 paintings. After completion of our audit work at the site, the staff of the National Collection located the other five paintings. The staff told us that the difficulty in locating the paintings resulted from a combination of the National Collection's past history when it did not have the means to cope with its growing collection and the problems involved in moving into its permanent quarters in the old Patent Office Building.

During our test, we observed that the National Collection's facilities and methods for storing works of art not on display did not appear to afford adequate protection against damage. In the main storage area, for example, stacks of paintings were leaning in rows along the walls and partitions. We were advised by the National Collection's conservator that this was not an approved procedure for storing paintings because stacking the paintings increases the chance of their being damaged.
At the completion of our review, the Director, who assumed office in January 1970, informed us that the storage deficiencies were being corrected. Furthermore, he advised us that he planned to take a complete physical inventory and establish adequate inventory records.

Mr. Thompson. I think it is evident that from the action of Dr. Ripley and subsequently the guidelines or requirements set down by the Board of Regents that you have satisfied at least one complaint of the GAO or their complaints.

The question of the disposition of some of the paintings mentioned in the GAO report hasn't been categorically answered. I see no need to do it now.

This collection really had no home until very recent years. It was stored in the Smithsonian, was it not?

Mr. Blitzer. That is correct.

Mr. Thompson. I had the pleasure of being the sponsor of the legislation which saved the Patent Office building from becoming a parking lot and converted it to what it is now, the home of the National Collection of Fine Art.

Mr. Blitzer. That is what did it for us, really.

Mr. Thompson. Later, that was amended to create the National Portrait Gallery.

Mr. Blitzer. If I might add, Mr. Chairman, in addition to that, during that same period of roughly 120 years, the Collection of Fine Arts under various names really did not have a very strong sense of mission and purpose and program and I think was tempted for whatever reasons to accept things that were offered to it of a very miscellaneous character.

Mr. Thompson. They have a tremendous number of items, very few actually of which are on exhibit at any one time.

Are there storage facilities in the Patent Office building?

Mr. Blitzer. There are.

Mr. Thompson. Has that collection been culled out?

Mr. Blitzer. The only culling is the four transactions that you have heard about.

Mr. Thompson. I would suppose they have a lot of items which really are of relatively little value. Isn't that so?

Mr. Blitzer. Very little monetary value, certainly.

Mr. Thompson. Mr. Brademas?

Mr. Schwengel?

Mr. Schwengel. I am sorry I am a little bit late. I have another committee that necessitated my being there, the Subcommittee on Flood Control. And at certain times of the year that is kind of important in the Mississippi Valley area. So, I had to be there to be sure our interests there were protected.

I have some general questions, recognizing what you know about the Library of Congress being a service to all the libraries in many ways and the people nationwide.

How close is the Smithsonian—I know you relate some to other museums—with you in their program? Do you have programs that cooperate and counsel, evaluate museums and activities of this type over the country?

Dr. Ripley. We have consistently taken that position, Mr. Schwengel. You will recall in the history of the Library of Congress there was
considerable debate. There has been over the years, about whether indeed it was a library for the Congress or a library which could be of service to the Nation. And there has been active debate within the Congress on this issue.

It is only in recent years that the Library has in effect been allowed by the Congress to express this role and this sense of mission. I can say only in contrast to that that the Smithsonian since its inception has assumed that this was its mission, both with scholars individually and with the related similar institutions, both here and abroad.

Mr. Thompson. With respect to the Library, I might say to my colleague that we might at some later time want to learn about the Library as we do the Smithsonian Institution and at that time, the Librarian and his staff can come before us and give us their views of their function which has broadened, as Dr. Ripley indicates, in recent years.

Mr. Schwengel. Do you have anything written on this subject of cooperation and policy?

Dr. Ripley. Yes, sir; we do and before this committee at this time there has been a reauthorization of the National Museum Act which specifically enjoins the Institution to undertake these activities.

Mr. Schwengel. I have some special interests in this and I would like to have what you have in my files. It may be well, Mr. Chairman, for all members of the committee to have it, because I think it is quite important as we seek to serve the long range interests of the Institution.

Mr. Thompson. The Chair might say that we hope to move the National Museum Act extension bill some time in the immediate future. There are some difficulties surrounding it.

Mr. Brademas. I would express the hope, Mr. Chairman, that at some point in time we would have an opportunity to talk to Dr. Ripley and his associates about the relationships between the Smithsonian and other museums in the United States. This is not, I take it, the appropriate point for that discussion.

Mr. Thompson. I think that that would be a very welcome discussion, especially in light of the fact that we will have that legislation on the floor sometime relatively soon or in September, I would hope.

Dr. Ripley. We would be very glad to participate, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Brademas, and we believe that we have worked out an acceptable pattern for the future should this act be appropriately reauthorized.

Mr. Thompson. I just have one or two questions, Mr. Blitzer.

Under the terms of gifts, which the Institution receives, are you restricted by any of the trusts or endowments with respect to the disposition of works, except in the instance of the Freer?

Mr. Blitzer. Yes; I believe in several instances we are in various ways. I might point out, for example, the magnificent gift to the National Collection of Fine Arts a couple of years ago of a collection worth some $1 million of contemporary American painting, which came with a clear understanding, I believe a condition, that the National Collection was free in that case to dispose of any work in that collection for the purpose of acquiring another work by the same artist.

In other words, there the donors' intention was to maintain the general shape of collection while allowing leeway to improve its individ-
ual pieces. I believe the Gellatly collection we are not free to dispose of at all.

List of Major Art Acquisitions and Donors’ Restrictions

Apart from the Freer, Mellon, and Hirshhorn gifts (and subsequent acquisitions by the National Gallery of Art), the major gifts and bequests of art to the Smithsonian have been made to the museum now called the National Collection of Fine Arts. A brief description of these gifts and bequests follows:

The first major gift or bequest was that of Harriet Lane Johnston in 1903. As a result of the bequest, a question was raised concerning the status of the Smithsonian as a national gallery of art in the sense set forth in the will. The Supreme Court of the District of Columbia ruled 11 July 1906 that the art gallery of the Smithsonian, theoretically in existence from the original organization, was indeed to be construed as the National Art Gallery. In later documents, this decision was cited as the legal basis for the existence of such an institution, although the title quickly became the National Gallery of Art. Mr. Rathbun’s book of 1909 emphasized the growing awareness of a National Gallery of Art, even though it had only modest physical being. In the bequest of Harriet Lane Johnston there were no specific restrictions made concerning the works given.

The next major gift, obviously stimulated by the court action of 1906, was that of William T. Evans. In March of 1907 Mr. Evans presented some 43 works to the Smithsonian and augmented the group to 50 by July of that year. The works were to be shown in the atrium of the Corcoran Gallery until a national gallery would be readied in the Smithsonian. Through the following years, until his death in November 1918, Mr. Evans added substantially to the gift of the paintings. Mr. Evans reserved for himself the right to add to the collection and to substitute better works when they were available.

The next in order of time was the collection presented by Walter Cross Johnson, who gave a substantial group of American paintings in 1919. He included in his statement of gift the sentence, “It is my express desire and wish that said collection be hung in a room by itself without addition or diminution.” Legally, this language is precatory, rather than mandatory, and does not constitute a restriction. Those paintings remaining in the hands of his daughter, Mabel J. Langhorne, were bequeathed by her in 1956, in fulfillment of her father’s wishes, to the National Collection of Fine Arts. Her will stated “... on the following express conditions, namely: all of said pictures shall be placed together in one or more rooms in said National Collection of Fine Arts, and preferably adjoining the pictures already given to said National Collection of Fine Arts... by my father, Walter Cross Johnson, such collection to be kept intact, without addition or diminution, as a memorial to my father, and to be known as the Walter Cross Johnson Collection.”

Mrs. Catherine Walden Myer, who died in 1922, left a fund for purchase, from income or principal, “first class works of art, preferably paintings, for the use and benefit of the National Gallery of Art, to be selected when and as designated by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.” In 1933 Mr. Tolman decided and received the permission of the Secretary to use the interest of this fund for the purchase of miniatures. This policy was followed also by Mr. Beggs.

On 13 June 1929, John Gellatly made a gift to the National Gallery (referring to the 1906 court decision) of his collection of paintings and art objects. His gift was made and accepted on the terms and conditions set forth in two letters of March 1929. The stipulation in the letter of 27 March 1929 to Gari Melchers, then chairman of the National Gallery of Art’s Commission, was that the trustees of the Smithsonian “consider my collection worthy to be placed in its present complete form as shown in the galleries at the Heckscher Building, in a section of the National Gallery and accept the gift under that condition, the collection to always remain in the National Gallery complete as collected by me, without alteration or addition.”

In May of 1950, Mary Louisa Adams Clement gave her collection of material related to the Adams family “to the Smithsonian Institution permanently for the use of and deposit in the National Collection of Fine Arts and the U. S. National Museum...” In her letter of presentation written to Dr. Wetmore, Miss Clement stated: “In accordance with my conversation with Mr. Thomas

1 Fragments of collections of art that came into the possession of the Smithsonian Institution before 1903 are well described in Mr. Rathbun’s book The National Gallery of Art 1908.
Beggs, it is my understanding (A) that the articles on the attached list be kept together in one exhibit, (B) that they be exhibited first in the existing National Museum building and (C) after the new building has been completed that they will be moved to and displayed together in one exhibit in the new building’s historical collection in an appropriate period room or rooms.”

In 1951 a fund was established in the Smithsonian by Natalie C. and Laura D. Barney in memory of their mother to further the appreciation of American art and encourage American artists. This was to be accomplished by lending paintings for display in Federal offices and public institutions from the Alice Pike Barney Memorial Lending Collection. Most of the 333 paintings in the collection are by Mrs. Barney.

There were few major gifts or bequests between this period and the present. One fund of some interest, however, that continues to function, is the Ranger Fund, which actually was set up at the death of Henry Ward Ranger in 1916. This fund is administered by the National Academy of Design. It provides for the purchase of works by American artists by the committee of the National Academy of Design, which are then provisionally given to institutions around the country. Ten years after the death of the artist of any work, that work may be recalled to become a permanent part of the National Collection of Fine Arts. If the decision is not made within five years, the work remains permanently in the possession of the institution holding it.

In accordance with an agreement signed in 1967 with S. C. Johnson & Sons, Inc., provision was made for that company's collection of American paintings to be given to the National Collection of Fine Arts. It was stipulated that the entire collection would be shown together at the opening of the newly installed NCFA in 1968, and that thereafter a major gallery in the NCFA building would be labeled The Irene and Herbert F. Johnson Gallery. This gallery was to be approximately 4,000 square feet, would be adjacent to the Lincoln Gallery and would be appropriately designated at its entrance doorways and in the literature and programs of the Smithsonian. A major portion of the Johnson Collection would be displayed in this area. Other stipulations relate to making available the Collection and information about the Collection to the public. Provisions for modifying the stipulations were made.

Gifts of art to the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum are listed elsewhere in this record.

Mr. Thompson. So, I gather that except where you are specifically restricted by the terms of the gift, you would feel free to improve the collections, by sale, trade, or otherwise?

Mr. Blitzer. My view of this, since I am not an expert in the field of American art, is that the Director and the Commission should feel free to propose that kind of transaction and, if it is large enough, for the regents to see whether they approve of it also.

I certainly may say I think it would be inappropriate, and I believe the Smithsonian Art Commission and the regents believe it would be inappropriate, simply to pass a blanket prohibition against disposing of anything. As someone said, if you want a prescription for becoming the Nation’s attic, it is to keep taking things and never use them to get better things.

Mr. Thompson. Mr. Bingham, do you have a question?

Mr. Bingham. No, thank you.

Mr. Thompson. Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Schwengel. Not with any indication of criticism, you spoke of the reversion of the policy of the previous administration. Can you give us a thumbnail sketch of that policy and what your evaluation of the change is?

Mr. Blitzer. The new and the old?

Mr. Schwengel. Yes.

Mr. Blitzer. The former director believed it was proper and prudent occasionally and quietly to dispose one way or another on the market of unwanted objects in the collection with the explicit and
sole purpose of improving the collection. It was under that policy that these four transactions were carried out.

The present director, who took office January 1 of this year, believes, I think less as a matter of principle than as a matter of practice, that this is not a very useful, sensible thing for that museum to do.

I may say that the number of non-American works of art of substantial value in the NCFA is rather small. He feels that in some cases it is better and indeed, I agree, to try to arrange a long-term exchange with another museum. If they would like a European painting that we have and they have an American painting that we would like, we could exchange these for some indefinite period.

In terms of discretion and avoiding this kind of conversation, it would perhaps be better not to deal on the market.

And it is my view that the initiative in these matters should come from the Director with the consent of his Commission. I may say, it would never cross my mind or the Secretary's to believe that anything in that collection could be sold at the initiative of the central administration against the will of the staff of the museum. This is simply inconceivable to me and has never happened.

Mr. Thompson. In these instances cited in the GAO report, I haven't gone into them in any great detail, because the transactions are complete now, the procedure has been changed, I think it is obvious that if a serious mistake wasn't made at least there was questionable judgment involved in one or two of the instances.

Mr. Blitzer. It is my impression, sir, that there was questionable judgment about procedure. I am not persuaded, and this on the basis of really a considerable attempt to get informed opinions about this, that in any one of those transactions the Smithsonian lost.

Indeed, I think the GAO report itself—

Mr. Thompson. I am not indicating that.

Mr. Blitzer. The procedure was imperfect, I readily admit.

Mr. Thompson. The proceeds in one instance were used to go to the Smithsonian's private funds for a loan to the National Collection to purchase the Powers Collection.

Mr. Blitzer. Yes; to repay the loan.

Mr. Thompson. That is all I have. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Mr. Robert H. Simmons, a private citizen, of Washington, D.C., and of Massachusetts.

Mr. Simmons, before you proceed. I have a comment or two which may be of value.

First, to remind you that the purpose of these hearings is to give to the subcommittee and the House of Representatives knowledge as to the operation, purposes, future, and so on of the Smithsonian Institution and matters relating to it.

Second, to say I have just gotten your statement which, of course, we are going to allow you to read or summarize, as you wish.

Witnesses before Congressional committees have at least limited immunity from suit. There is absolute immunity with respect to Members of Congress under the Constitution.

There haven't been many court cases deciding definitively the exact extent of witness immunity, but it is clear from the law, and my interpretation of it, at least, that you do have a limited immunity, especially when you are speaking to questions which arise out of the hearings.
So, in the case of your statement, I would just caution you that if there is any question in your mind as to any allegations made in it, you might be wise to consult counsel with respect to whether or not you should read them at this time.

As far as the Chair is concerned, of course, you are perfectly able to proceed as you wish. I felt it incumbent on me to caution you as to what my interpretation of the law is.

**STATEMENT OF ROBERT H. SIMMONS**

Mr. Simmons. Thank you, sir. I have consulted counsel, Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin, and Kahn who have gone over my statement and found nothing is libelous or slanderous in it.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I would like to insert in the record at this time a few documents concerning the disposition of works of art. As you may or may not know, I was the constituent of Congressman Hastings Keith who wrote to him considerably worried about what was going on in the National Collection of Fine Arts after the resignation of Dr. David W. Scott.

I was at that time, as you may or may not know, a year ago, in June, organizing the exhibition of Henry Tanner, a very distinguished Negro American painter. At that time, I discovered much to my deep concern, that works of art were being disposed of in what I thought were to be irregular procedures.

It has not been quite so easy over this last year, as may be indicated by this statement that you have just heard, to bring about a change in procedures. I have been stalking through the Halls of Congress to get Congressmen to take some action as long as a year ago and typical of the reaction of the Board of Regents, I may say at this time, was that of Senator Fulbright, whose aide in November told me in answer to a question that the Smithsonian Institution is such an insignificant event in his life that he just couldn't answer my question.

That was almost typical of the reaction, I may say, of the Board of Regents except for the Chairman of the Executive Committee, Dr. Haskins, who was considerably concerned when I went to him with this problem and Senator Hugh Scott, whom I didn't see in person, but who wrote to me this letter of September 22, 1969, well before the General Accounting Office began its investigation:

Thank you very much for expressing your view that the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution ought to exercise tighter supervision to works of art which are not displayed but are under the control of the National Collection of Fine Arts.

It was good of you to be in touch. I have been directly in touch with Mr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian, in regard to this matter. You will be hearing from me further as soon as I have anything additional to report.

Later in September, because nothing was being done at all, I organized what I called the “Citizens Committee on National Treasures,” a small group of people very much concerned about this kind of thing. Our statement of purpose I would also like to enter in the record:

---

**Citizens' Committee on National Treasures,**

**Washington, D.C.**

**STATEMENT OF PURPOSE**

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States of America, do hereby form the CITIZENS' COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL TREASURES to help preserve and protect the paintings, sculptures, and other works of art, decorative arts,
and crafts, and the gems, coins, and other treasures belonging to the American people and entrusted to the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., and in other cities, and to foster the proper use of said treasures in the public interest.

Furthermore, among our special concerns are the following:
1. That no work of art or other treasure belonging to the American people and included in the Smithsonian collections shall be in any way disposed of except after thorough scholarly and scientific research and evaluation, and only after the unanimous approval of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and only after due and proper public notice of proposed sale, barter, exchange or other mode of disposal.
2. That not only shall the terms of bequests to the Nation of said National Treasures be honored by the Smithsonian Institution but that the interests of the present owners, the people of the United States of America, shall be protected by the Board of Regents.
3. That, specifically, the Gellatly, Langhorne, Johnson, Johnston, Barney, and other collections of art of American, European, or other origin in the custody of the National Collection of Fine Arts, the collections in the custody of the National Portrait Gallery, Renwick Gallery, Cooper-Hewitt Museum of Decorative Arts and Design, and Barney House, the gem collections, painting collections, and other collections of treasures in the custody of the Museum of Natural History, and the coin, glass, print, ceramics, and other collections of treasures in the custody of the Museum of History and Technology shall be protected, preserved, and properly displayed under controlled conditions in a manner consistent with the public interest, the conservation of the treasures, and the function of the museums concerned.
4. That, specifically, all said works of art and other treasures recently disposed of improperly shall be returned to public ownership.
5. That, specifically, no said work of art or other treasure shall be permitted to be loaned or removed to areas outside controlled museum conditions except after proper evaluation of the circumstances and with the unanimous approval of the Board of Regents, and after due and proper public notice.
6. That thorough inventories of the National Treasures shall be periodically undertaken by an independent agency appointed by and reporting to the Board of Regents and that the results of such inventories shall be published and offered to the public.
7. That continuing research and evaluation shall be given to the National Treasures and that this information shall be published and offered to the public.
8. That these special concerns shall not preclude others.

**BYLAWS**

1. The Chairman of the Citizens' Committee on National Treasures is given the authority to speak for the committee in matters relevant to its stated purposes.
2. Neither the chairman nor any member of the committee shall engender financial debts for which the committee may be liable.
3. General expenses of the committee's activities will be met by volunteer donations by the committee members.
4. The chairman will make periodic progress reports to the membership of the committee, which reports will be made public.
5. The committee will remain active until such time that its membership unanimously agrees that its purposes and objectives have been realized.
6. Any member of the committee may resign without special notice.
7. Meetings of the committee will be held at least once a year at a time and place agreed upon by the membership.

**OFFICERS**

The term of office of the chairman of the committee will be 1 year, the first year terminating on October 1, 1970.

The first chairman of the committee will be the undersigned Robert Hilton Simmons, unanimously approved by the committee membership.

Subsequent chairmen of the committee will be elected by a majority vote of the committee.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Plymouth, September 29, 1969. Then personally appeared Robert H. Simmons and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be his full act and deed, before me.

Robert H. Simmons.


Furthermore, among our special concerns are the following:

1. That no work of art or other treasure belonging to the American people and included in the Smithsonian collections shall be in any way disposed of, except after thorough scholarly and scientific research and evaluation and only after the unanimous approval of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and only after due and proper public notice of proposed sale, barter, exchange or other mode of disposal.

2. That, not only shall the terms of bequests to the nation of said National Treasuries be honored by the Smithsonian Institution, but that the interests of the present owners, the people of the United States of America, shall be protected by the Board of Regents.

I would like this entire statement to go into the record, and I would also like to enter into the record an article that appeared in the Washington Post, December 18, 1969, entitled "Smithsonian Swaps $30,000 Painting."

I would like to enter into the record an article appearing in the Times of London on January 12, 1970, "Museum in Cut-Price Art Deals."

I would also like to enter into the record an article that appeared later, I guess it was April, in 1970, called "Smithsonian's Art Goof." That was later, June.

I would also like to enter into the record this letter dated November 29, 1968, from the then Director of the National Collection of Fine Arts, David W. Scott, to Charles Blitzer and S. Dillon Ripley.

[Mr. Simmons read the following into the record:]

The accompanying notes on the basic nature of our collection touch on matters of the display, transfer and sale of objects entrusted to us. They might be termed a director's view of his responsibilities toward the collections of his museum. I believe they reflect a philosophy shared by other art museum directors of the country and conform, where parallels may be drawn, to accepted practice.

This is for the record.

The Nature and Utilization of the Collection of the National Collection of Fine Arts.

The Act of Establishment of 1846 called upon the Smithsonian to establish a gallery of art and act as a repository for works belonging to the government. The resulting collections and the function of serving as a government repository were incorporated in the original National Gallery and were assigned to its successor, the National Collection of Fine Arts, in the Act of May 17, 1938. (This Act, in effect, establishes three functions for the NCFA: serving as a repository, promoting the appreciation of art, and encouraging art.

The NCFA is at the same time both the original national gallery and the national gallery of American art. It traces the history of American collecting from the time John Yarden established his museum in 1829. It is an historical deposit and archive of considerable significance.

A fair number of works deposited here before 1930 were of foreign origin. As soon as the budget permits us to open additional galleries, we should set up a display that traces our history as a collection and recognizes the wishes of the donors of important foreign works.

Some of our foreign works were given with specific requirements that they be displayed. As long as our galleries are not completed because of lack of funds, we can justify our failure to exhibit the works. I feel, however, that we must plan to make in the future at least token recognition of the donations
of foreign works by such benefactors as John Gellatly and Ralph Cross Johnson. The display would have intrinsic artistic merit and would place American collecting in an historic context.

There is good reason to continue to hold some of our foreign art with the American. We would only limit ourselves unnecessarily if we were to relinquish this policy now. We should keep a reflection of our historic beginnings. We should not restrict ourselves or get rid of our holding en masse till we know exactly what the future holds for us. (The Whitney got rid of its 19th century art and now wishes it had not.) We are not confined by tradition, legislation or even interests to American art, and we are almost inevitably involved in some reciprocity with foreign museums through our International Art Program.

It is particularly because of the importance of projecting the image of honorable tradition and reliability that I feel that any liquidation or transfer of works entrusted to the NCF A must be done with the greatest of caution. Donors give their treasures to a museum as to a bank. They and their heirs and friends follow the fortunes of the works for years. If their wishes are not respected, the word gets out and it becomes very difficult to acquire further gifts. Rumors spread through the art world quickly, and if the rumor starts that we are indiscriminately transferring and liquidating parts of our collections, we will be seriously hurt.

We must remember that the very fact that Mr. Freer's wishes have been followed for nearly 50 years has greatly influenced both Mr. Hirshhorn and Mrs. Post in their decisions to give their collections to the Smithsonian.

The collectors who have given their most valued belongings to the old National Gallery and present National Collection have in doing so placed faith in both the Smithsonian and its art museum that their wishes would be respected. As the museum's present director I have inherited an obligation to treat these wishes with respect. I shall have a hard time establishing confidence in prospective donors if we break faith with past donors.

In view of this, I feel the following principles are fundamental:

1. Works of art are to be disposed of or transferred only on the initiative of the Director, and with the full consent of the curator concerned. (The use to which a work is put, its condition and value, are to be determined by the Director and curator.)

2. Works should be available for display in the context in which they are most useful. This context may be provided by another bureau than that of the original gift. Since the display may prove to be temporary, it may be better for the works to be sent on loan, subject to periodic review, with title remaining with the original bureau, so that it will return to its original collection when no longer needed.

3. Our collections are in serious need of reinforcement in the American field, and our only resource that can be used to promote this end are the valuable works which are not of high priority in our exhibition plans. It follows that it is important that we study ways of converting some of these art works into pieces that we need urgently for our survey. This must be done most discreetly by the NCF A staff. For example, exchange can be effected with other museums which will amount to long-term loans, without transfers of title, so that no one will be offended by our actually disposing of a gift entrusted to our care. Again, each instance involving trade, transfer, deposit or sale must be carefully studied and approved by the Director and curator concerned.

4. If the Director and curator decide that a work of art which is an unrestricted gift may be sold, the proceeds will be used for the purchase of art and works acquired will be credited to the generosity of the donor of the original work. Similarly, a work acquired through exchange with another institution will be credited to the generosity to the original donor to the National Collection.

Mr. Thomson. That is a statement by Mr. Scott, is it not?

Mr. Simmons. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thomson. In effect, as I understand it, it suggests to the Secretary that these procedures be adopted.

Mr. Simmons. I think so. I don't think, however, that the entire procedures were covered even then. I think all of these things should be, and as they are now, cleared through the Board of Regents. This is the system.

Mr. Thomson. Have you seen the GAO report?

Mr. Simmons. Yes, sir; I have.
Mr. Thompson. And the procedures which have been established since May of 1970.

Mr. Simmons. These are safeguards which I had suggested to them last year, but it took an awful lot of doing.

Mr. Thompson. Without objection, the letter which you have read extensively from will be made a part of the record as will the other documents.

(The information referred to follows:)

U.S. Senate,

Mr. Robert H. Simmons,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Simmons: Thank you very much for expressing your view that the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution ought to exercise tighter supervision to works of art which are not displayed but are under the control of the National Collection of Fine Art.

It was good of you to be in touch. I have been directly in touch with Mr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian, in regard to this matter. You will be hearing from me further as soon as I have anything additional to report.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

Hugh Scott.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 18, 1969]

SMITHSONIAN SWAPS $30,000 PAINTING

(By Jack Anderson)

The venerable Smithsonian Institution has swapped off one of the nation's art treasures without getting a formal appraisal of how much it was worth. Result: the taxpayers were badly skinned.

The Smithsonian's curators gave up a superb Flemish painting, valued at $30,000 to $35,000, in exchange for an American original with a price tag of only $10,000.

The unorthodox deal was made by Robert Tyler Davis, acting director of the Smithsonian's new National Collection of Fine Arts, who has virtually no funds for art purchases.

Over the past two years, Congress has allocated only $47,000 for new paintings—not enough money to buy much fine art. There were paintings on hand, however, that Davis felt could be sold or swapped for something better.

To enhance the national collection, therefore, Davis had to reach into the public art treasury stealthily as a wristwatch hustler on a Naples street corner.

Last February, the national collection learned of an impressive painting, "Helen Brought to Paris," by the American artist Benjamin West, at the James Graham & Sons Gallery in New York City. The collection decided to swap a Jan Massys painting, "Mother and Child," for it.

Prudence demanded the more careful appraisal before this public treasure was given up to a private gallery. Yet no formal appraisal was ever made.

FAST SHUFFLE

The collection did obtain a written estimate from Parke-Bernet Galleries, whose expert on old masters looked at the "Mother and Child" for a few minutes. Reached in New York City, the expert, Hugh Hildesley, said his estimate was strictly "informal." A formal appraisal, he explained, is notarized and requires hours of research and examination.

Without waiting for this, the Smithsonian approved the trade on the recommendation of its own experts. Davis was so delighted with the deal that he wrote happily to Robert Graham, a partner in the Graham Gallery: "I am pleased that you have agreed to (the) exchange."

The Graham Gallery immediately put a price of $35,000 on the "Mother and Child"—more than triple the worth of the West painting that had been given to the Smithsonian in the exchange.

It is an interesting coincidence that the Smithsonian's secretary, S. Dillon Ripley, was a Yale classmate of Robert Graham Ripley, however, denies having any advance knowledge of the swap.
Next time, promised a spokesman, the Smithsonian will get two formal appraisals.

Note: Vice President Spiro Agnew, in a speech denouncing critics for wanting to transfer space funds to poverty programs, demanded rhetorically: "Would they ask Congress to stop building a fine arts center, to sell the treasures of the national galleries?" This is exactly what is happening, in part because Agnew and the administration have been unwilling to budget the money needed for new paintings.

[From Times of London, Jan. 12, 1970]

MUSEUM IN CUT-PRICE ART DEALS

WASHINGTON, JANUARY 11.

The Smithsonian Institution, starved by Congress of public funds for art purchases, has quietly disposed of a number of paintings in the United States and London for sums which critics say was less than their true value.

One such case occurred last June when the National Collection of Fine Arts which was established primarily for the promotion of American art, exchanged a painting by Jan Masys for a work by the American artist Benjamin West. The West painting, Helen brought to Paris, was priced at $10,000 (about £4,160) by the James Graham Gallery in New York, the same value as was put on the Masys work in an informal estimate. However, as soon as the Graham Gallery received the Masys, it put it on sale at $55,000.

Mr. Robert Simmons, the founder of a group called the Citizens Committee on Public Treasures has alleged that Mr. Robert Tyler Davis, the director of the National Collection of Fine Arts sold another painting from the gallery's basement in London last month without first seeking the three public bids normally required for the sale of public property. The painting was described in Sotheby's catalog as A View of a Venetian Lagoon, by Guardi, the eighteenth century Italian painter.

Officials at the Smithsonian confirmed that the Guardi came from the Langhorne bequest at the Smithsonian, but said that because of its small size it was unsuitable for museum exhibition. It is approximately eight by 12½ in.

They added that the institution considered American citizens would be free to bid in London if they desired to do so. However, a spokesman for the institution added that in future two formal appraisals of any works being sold would be received.

Criticism has also been voiced at the decision to establish a museum on the Mall beneath the Capitol to contain the Joseph H. Hirshhorn art collection.

Although the museum will carry the name of Mr. Hirshhorn, a wealthy uranium magnate, its construction will be financed by $14m. in public funds. The critics allege that Mr. Hirshhorn only paid an estimated $5m. for his collection, although he later had it revalued at $25m.

It is also unusual to have an institution named after a private businessman on the Mall, which most Americans look upon as being among the more sacred spots in the nation.

When the project came before Congress, Mr. Hirshhorn testified that a number of other countries were offering facilities for his collection. At one point it was claimed that Queen Elizabeth II had offered 10 acres of Regent's Park.

[From Washington Post, July 12, 1970]

SMITHSONIAN’S ART GOOF—PRESSED FOR CASH, INSTITUTION SELLS PAINTING, THEN BELATEDLY TRIES TO GET IT BACK

(By Jack Anderson)

The venerable Smithsonian Institution, whose art and historical treasures are viewed by 10 million people each year, was so hard up for cash last year that the curators sold two valuable paintings and traded off another.

This column found out about the swap and reported that the taxpayers had been skinned. The curators gave up a superb Flemish painting, valued at $30,000 to $35,000, in exchange for an American original worth only $10,000.

But the curators managed to cover up one of the sales. We have now learned belatedly that they also sold a fine landscape by the 18th century artist Richard Wilson for $14,000. After we began making inquiries last December, the curators tried frantically to get the painting back.
The sale was made without the written approval of the Smithsonian's regents, art advisers or chief executive. Indeed, at least three distinguished advisers to the National Collection of Fine Arts strongly opposed selling off the nation's art treasures.

They made their views known in a private letter to the Smithsonian's secretary, S. Dillon Ripley. The disposal of valuable paintings, they declared, "has almost invariably, in the perspective of time, proven to be a mistake."

For cash on the barrel head, however, the curators were willing to part with the Wilson painting. The New York dealer who handled the sale, Robert Osborne, scrupulously gave the curators an opportunity to back out of the deal. By the time we began checking into the story in December, however, it was too late.

Associate Curator William Truettner tried belatedly to get the painting back. Records show he called Osborne on Dec. 12, 14 and 15 in an effort to retrieve it. But he was obliged to notify the Smithsonian's Assistant Secretary Charles Blitzer that the painting had been sold.

This was awkward for the unhappy Blitzer who had just put out a statement denying that any more paintings had been sold. He also placed some anguished calls to the New York dealer, who tried but failed to talk the buyer into returning the painting.

Questioned by this column, Blitzer didn't attempt to deny the sale. "It was a goof," he said.

This column also reached Ripley at his summer home in Litchfield, Conn., to ask how a national art treasure could be sold out from under his nose. "I can't check every day," he replied waspishly, "to see if the janitor's buttons are polished."

Footnote: On at least two occasions, Ripley has borrowed Smithsonian paintings to decorate his own walls—a practice that is considered improper. He made personal use of the nation's art treasures, he said, because he was having parties attended by Smithsonian regents.

To: Mr. S. Dillon Ripley, Mr. Charles Blitzer.
From: David W. Scott.
Subject: Nature of NCFA Collection.

The accompanying notes on the basic nature of our collection touch on matters of the display, transfer and sale of objects entrusted to us. They might be termed a director's view of his responsibilities toward the collections of his museum. I believe they reflect a philosophy shared by other art museum directors of the country and conform, where parallels may be drawn, to accepted practice.

**THE NATURE AND UTILIZATION OF THE COLLECTION OF THE NATIONAL COLLECTION OF FINE ART**

The Act of Establishment of 1846 called upon the Smithsonian to establish a gallery of art and act as a repository for works belonging to the government. The resulting collections and the function of serving as a government repository were incorporated in the original National Gallery and were assigned to its successor, the National Collection of Fine Arts, in the Act of May 17, 1938. (This Act, in effect, establishes three functions for the NCFA: serving as a repository, promoting the appreciation of art, and encouraging art.)

The NCFA is at the same time both the original national gallery and the national gallery of American art. It traces the history of American collecting from the time John Vander established his museum in 1829. It is an historical deposit and archive of considerable significance.

A fair number of works deposited here before 1930 were of foreign origin. As soon as the budget permits us to open additional galleries, we should set up a display that traces our history as a collection and recognizes the wishes of the donors of important foreign works.

Some of our foreign works were given with specific requirements that they be displayed. As long as our galleries are not completed because of lack of funds, we can justify our failure to exhibit the works. I feel, however, that we must plan to make in the future at least token recognition of the donations of foreign works by such benefactors as John Gellatly and Ralph Cross Johnson. The display would have intrinsic artistic merit and would place American collecting in an historic context.

There is good reason to continue to hold some of our foreign art with the American. We would only limit ourselves unnecessarily if we were to relinquish
this policy now. We should keep a reflection of our historic beginnings. We should not restrict ourselves or get rid of our holding en masse till we know exactly what the future holds for us. (The Whitney got rid of its 19th century art and now wishes it had not.) We are not confined by tradition, legislation or even interests to American art, and we are almost inevitably involved in some reciprocity with foreign museums through our International Art Program.

It is particularly because of the importance of projecting the image of honorable tradition and reliability that I feel that any liquidation or transfer or works entrusted to the NCFA must be done with the greatest of caution. Donors give their treasures to a museum as to a bank. They and their heirs and friends follow the fortunes of the works for years. If their wishes are not respected, the word gets out and it becomes very difficult to acquire further gifts. Rumors spread through the art world quickly, and if the rumor starts that we are indiscriminately transferring and liquidating parts of our collections, we will be seriously hurt.

We must remember that the very fact that Mr. Freer's wishes have been followed for nearly 50 years has greatly influenced both Mr. Hirshhorn and Mrs. Post in their decisions to give their collections to the Smithsonian.

The collectors who have given their most valued belongings to the old National Gallery and present National Collection have in doing so placed faith in both the Smithsonian and in its art museum that their wishes would be respected. As the museum's present director, I have inherited an obligation to treat these wishes with respect. I shall also have a hard time establishing confidence in prospective donors if we break faith with past donors.

In view of this, I feel the following principles are fundamental:

1. Works of art are to be disposed of or transferred only on the initiative of the director, and with the full consent of the curator concerned. (The use to which a work is put, its condition and value, are to be determined by the Director and Curator).

2. Works should be available for display in the context in which they are most useful. This context may be provided by another bureau than that of the original gift. Since the display may prove to be temporary, it may be better for the works to be sent on loan, subject to periodic review, with title remaining with the original bureau, so that it will return to its original collection when no longer needed.

3. Our collections are in serious need of reinforcement in the American field, and our only resource that can be used to promote this end are the valuable works which are not of high priority in our exhibition plans. It follows that it is important that we study ways of converting some of these art works into pieces that we need urgently for our Survey. This must be done most discreetly by the NCFA staff. For example, exchanges can be effected with other museums which will amount to long-term loans, without transfers of title, so that no one will be offended by our actually disposing of a gift entrusted to our care. Again, each instance involving trade, transfer, deposit or sale must be carefully studied and approved by the director and curator concerned.

4. If the director and curator decide that a work of art which is an unrestricted gift may be sold, the proceeds will be used for the purchase of art and works acquired will be credited to the generosity of the donor of the original work. Similarly, a work acquired through exchange with another institution will be credit to the generosity of the original donor to the National Collection.

DAVID W. SCOTT,
Director, National Collection of Fine Arts.

Cleveland Museum of Art,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 11, 1970.

Mr. Robert H. Simmons,
Chairman, Citizen's Committee on National Treasures,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Simmons: Our procedure with regards to the disposition of works of art in the permanent collection is relatively simple and is comparable to the procedure used for the acquisition of works of art. The curator and the director must both recommend that a work of art be sold, exchanged or otherwise disposed of. This recommendation, with justification—one of many duplicates; ruinous condition; inferior quality within a given category, etc., is then considered by the full board of trustees and the decision made by the board.

In general, we have disposed of works of art after much soul searching and research. Upgrading the collection is important for an art museum but it is
equally important that the works disposed of be definitely not of prime museum quality. To exchange one Picasso for an equally good one of a different type is merely to exchange one curator's or director's taste for another. This is not the way great collections are built over a period of generations. On the other hand, a mediocre Sung pot in the basement costs more to maintain each year than it is worth for any conceivable esthetic or educational purpose. Multiply the pot by a thousand and you have an administrative and storage problem which may be appropriate to a historical museum but not to an art museum. The built-in safeguard in our system is really the requirement that a joint recommendation be justified by both the curator and director.

I hope this is the information you require.

Sincerely yours,

SHERMAN E. LEE, Director.

Mr. BLITZER. Am I allowed to make a comment from the floor?

Mr. THOMPSON. Briefly, yes.

Mr. BLITZER. I would like to say that to my knowledge Mr. Simmons has never approached the Secretary or the Under Secretary or the General Counsel or me on any of these subjects.

Mr. SCHWENGER. Is that true, Mr. Simmons?

Mr. SIMMONS. There are other circumstances which I will describe in a statement concerning Representative Keith's request of the GAO and the GAO report. I am preparing a statement on that which I would like to insert in the hearings. It is taking a lot of time and I haven't actually gone to those people. One major reason was that I was locked out of the National Collection of Fine Arts. I believe it was known that I was at that time investigating these funny procedures.

(Supporting documents at end of testimony.)

Mr. SCHWENGER. Describe this situation. You say you were locked out.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes. That is another story. But I will describe it. I was working in the National Collection of Fine Arts, not as a member of the staff, but under a contract, preparing this exhibition of Henry Tanner. While I was there, it came to my attention that there had been a big party for anthropologists thrown in the National Collection's Lincoln Gallery sometime in May. I went up to the Gallery a couple of days later and saw it was still sort of a mess. A witness told me of very irregular procedures that happened in that event. This was described in an article that I wrote for the Washington Star on May 25, 1969.

When Mr. Ripley heard about this or read this letter, this article, he was infuriated, I suppose, because he felt it was not true. Letters came to him from various Members of Congress and he wrote back to the Members that my article was very irresponsible, completely. But my article was based on what people had seen, describing measures that people had taken to protect works of art in that gallery.

I would like to insert in the record those various articles, if you would like, when I find them. (See end of testimony.)

In June, I think on June 18, 1969, three letters appeared in the Washington Star, corroborating my report. These were letters from eye-witnesses to the events, and, the following day, I was locked out of the Museum. I was no longer able to continue the organization of this exhibition.

Mr. SCHWENGER. You mean you weren't allowed to go into the Museum?

Mr. SIMMONS. No longer allowed into anything except the public galleries. They confiscated one of my own paintings that I owned, worth about $1,200, and I didn't get this back until some time in
September. They furthermore confiscated all of my notes to a catalog, which was published in part through the efforts of the Smithsonian.

But I wasn't worried too much about that because the thing was all finished. But it was a very irregular practice, academically speaking, I believe.

Concurrent with this, I had discovered on June 16 a memo in the memo basket, in taking some of my own memos in to throw them in this basket, which was from Robert Tyler Davis to an art dealer in New York, saying that he was very pleased that an exchange had been effected between this gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts. He noted that it was an exchange of a Benjamin West painting for a Jan Massys painting. I requested people in the Registrar's Office to give me some information on these two paintings. I saw a photograph of the Jan Massys painting. I judged that this was worth about $30,000, whereas the price on the other painting was only $10,000.

At that time, I went to the Internal Revenue Service where I knew they had a board of review about this sort of thing, I guess on the 17th of June. They directed me to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, where I went and made a report on this. I also went to my Congressman, Mr. Keith, at that time, and had a long discussion with him in the evening of what I should do, because this possibly was a very funny irregularity.

So things were beginning to go in that direction at that time.

I believe it became known to members of the staff, because I told a friend of mine, who was involved in it, that I had gone to the FBI. So, I don't know whether I was locked out only because these letters appeared in the Washington Star or because I had gone to the Federal Bureau of Investigation with findings of irregularities.

But, whatever, I was locked out of the museum and so I had no reason ever to consult these people again. It was my feeling that there were basic irregularities.

Mr. Thompson, May I suggest now that you proceed with your statement and then such questions as arise, anyone on the committee will feel free to ask you.

Mr. Simmons, My statement is as follows:

What I have to say to you this morning is not pleasant. The primary purpose of my coming here is to put before the Congress, through this subcommittee, a sum of knowledge previously withheld from it—knowledge that should have been considered when reaching its decisions on certain legislation and amendments to legislation, and which surely will be necessary in the consideration of further amendments.

My secondary purpose is to bring to you information relevant to the purposes of the present hearings on aspects of the Smithsonian Institution.

Although the accomplishments of the dedicated research scientists and scholars of our national pride, the Smithsonian Institution, are founded in its mandate "for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men," and are justly celebrated, a careful analysis of the kind of knowledge diffused by its current administrators under the guidance of Secretary Sidney Dillon Ripley reveals a persistent lack of accuracy.

Inaccuracies for which the administration must assume responsibility range from errors in fact in articles published by the so-called Smithsonian Magazine to misinformation given to the Congress at hearings and in yearly budget justifications.
I have a number of instances of this misinformation brought to Congress which I would like to include. I have a stack here, which I would like to insert in the record.

(See end of testimony.)

Mr. Thompson. Before getting to that, would you proceed with your statement and then we will ask you about some of those.

Mr. Simmons. Surely, by "knowledge" that mandate intends "truth" and not misinformation, error, deception, and cynical distortion—or the kind of public relations half-truths that we have come to accept in television commercials. Whatever the value of window dressing and entertaining distractions, if this Institution does not represent in its every aspect the noble values of truth and education based on truth it fails in its public trust.

Such trust has been so often broken by the Ripley administration that an accounting is in order—an "audit" of information, or knowledge, diffused by its spokesmen.

By this I mean the spokesman of the administration and not of the scientists.

Mr. Powers. Just a minute. Is this an accusation of the breach of trust on the part of the administration of the Smithsonian? Are you using that in a legal sense or are you using simply the phrase in a philosophical way?

Mr. Simmons. I think my parlance is philosophical.

Mr. Powers. Thank you.

Mr. Thompson. That colloquy was between Mr. Peter Powers, General Counsel for the Smithsonian and Mr. Simmons.

Mr. Simmons. Perhaps the most flagrant violation of this public trust to adhere to truth has been in the promotion of that vast memorial complex covering one section of the Mall—the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

Although it is sometimes said that these structures are intended only to house the works of art of the Hirshhorn collection, the fact remains that in the Congressional Record Index, 1968, 90th Congress, 2d session, reference is made to "Joseph H. Hirshhorn, Remarks in House—Construct museum and sculpture garden in memory of, 14221." Since Webster's dictionary defines "memorial" as "Anything, as a monument, intended to preserve the memory of a person or event," one can infer that the intent of Congress is to memorialize Hirshhorn in these major structures on the Mall.

Mr. Thompson. Mr. Simmons, you were here when Mr. Blitzer testified; were you not?

Mr. Simmons. Most of it.

Mr. Thompson. I thought I heard him say that part of the Hirshhorn deed of trust or gift incorporates the authority to dispose of or trade in some instances sell under these conditions for works of other artists or from other collections.

Mr. Simmons. That clause, I believe, is in the act—or rather in the agreement. What do you mean by the question?

Mr. Thompson. Your first sentence here says:

Although it is sometimes said that these structures are intended only to house the works of art in the Hirshhorn Collection **

Mr. Simmons. What I meant goes only to—it is a museum and not a memorial.

Mr. Thompson. Please proceed.

Mr. Simmons. My point is in the quality of the memorial.
This is, indeed, the same kind of memorial as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts—formerly called the National Cultural Center. Hubert H. Humphrey, testifying before a House subcommittee on April 15, 1970, said:

It seems to me far more fitting to memorialize our Presidents by means of living institutions that serve to perpetuate their memories by serving men's needs rather than by erecting statues in cold bronze or marble.

He noted the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968 and the $5 million appropriated for Eisenhower College in Seneca, N.Y.

The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden complex is not only a memorial, it will be the most expensive Federally funded memorial ever built on the Mall—costing upwards of $16 million to construct, plus from $2 to $3 million per year to maintain forever—actually more than that, but not more than that has been expended on construction.

The bulldozers have dug a tremendous pit bounded by Independence Avenue and Jefferson Drive between Seventh and Ninth Streets Southwest. Pilings are being driven and foundations poured. Soon the bulldozers will move into the central portion of the Mall to cut a gigantic trench across it in the direction of the Archives Building. This depression will hold a reflecting pool, similar to that before the Taj Mahal, around which will be distributed an assortment of sculptures by Italian, French, English, and American artists. The museum building itself, in the shape of a gigantic gun turret, speckled with stone chips will “face” the Mall—its single horizontal aperture pointed across the pool at the National Archives Building, in which are housed the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Misinformation was given to Congress even at the beginning concerning this so-called third Mall axis, testifying before the House Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds on June 15, 1966. Secretary Ripley, who had been commended by the subcommittee chairman for his “deep contribution to art,” commented on the impending destruction of the registered national landmark—the Armed Forces Medical Museum—then standing on the Hirshhorn Museum site as follows:

It was not in the sense of destroying a historic landmark. It was rather in the sense of developing Eighth Street across the Mall axis which, as you know, was the original plan for Major L'Enfant for Washington. That axis goes through the Archives, and is proposed to go up Eighth Street to our new National Portrait Gallery. This was the original L'Enfant plan.

This statement is in error, and it is curious that Mr. James Bradley, who accompanied the Secretary at the hearing, did not catch the mistake. He was described by the subcommittee chairman as “an outstanding scholar.”

I wish to offer for the careful consideration of the members of this subcommittee this accurate reproduction of the original L'Enfant drawing of the Washington City plan, the plan that L'Enfant took to Mount Vernon in June 1791, to show to General Washington. There is no suggestion whatsoever of a third axis of the Mall. I have placed a red “X” at the site of the Hirshhorn Museum. North of it, at point “E,” L'Enfant designated “five grand fountains, intended with a constant spout of water.” These were placed at one of the intervals along Pennsylvania Avenue and had nothing to do with a third axis of the Mall.
"Plan of the City intended for the Permanent Seat of the Government of the United States, Projected agreeable to the direction of the President of the United States, in pursuance of an Act of Congress passed the sixteenth day of July, MDCCXC, 'establishing the Permanent Seat on the bank of the Potowmac,' by Peter Charles L'Enfant."

On the indicated hill at point "D," L'Enfant designated a national church; this is the approximate site of the old Patent Office Building and the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery today.

A canal is indicated along the present Constitution Avenue and at the site of the present Archives Building, just south of point "E," L'Enfant has designated a small barge and boat basin. Just south of the boat basin a small square is indicated, logically representing a wagon and carriage lot serving the basin. I base this on my own past experience of 20 years as a navigating officer on ships and about a year’s experience in ONI [Office of Naval Intelligence] working with charts.

Mr. Thompson. Isn’t it so that the L'Enfant plan of course was never completed. L'Enfant was in a sense fired, was he not?

Mr. Simmons. Yes; he was. But this whole plan was originally his and it was found in the late 1800’s and reproduced by the Government—the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The Subcommittee on Library and Memorials, if it is committed to the ethical evaluation of memorials, must recognize the profound symbolism of the design of the Mall. This hallowed area of our Nation’s Capital, approved by Washington and Jefferson themselves, extends west from the Capitol Building, housing the contemporary Congress, to the site of a monument to George Washington, first President of this Nation. At that point, L'Enfant introduced a second axis, extending north to the site of the house of the contemporary President, the White House.
In the first years of this century, when the marshy area west of the Washington Monument was filled in, when the Mall itself was cleared of encroachments and returned to this original design of L'Enfant's, it was decided to extend the Mall west to the site of the present Lincoln Memorial. Debates arose in the Congress and it was held that only Abraham Lincoln was worthy to be memorialized on a site of that importance, at the end of the Mall opposite the Capitol. A reflecting pool was constructed between the Nation’s memorials to the “father” of the country and the “savior” of the country. The esplanades around this pool, incidentally, form a perfect setting for sculpture.

The third axis was the invention of Nathaniel Owings, not L'Enfant. When he took on the job of redesigning Pennsylvania Avenue for President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1964, Owings decided that he might as well redesign the Mall, also. It was he who conceived the encroachment of the monstrous sculpture garden dedicated to Joseph H. Hirshhorn, slashing across the Mall destroying the prospect and the symbolism of the vast, unbroken expanse of grass between the Capitol and the Washington Monument.

It was hardly an accident that Gordon Bunshaft was finally awarded the contract to do this museum. He was a member of Owings' staff and also a member of the Commission on Fine Arts. Here is something a little more than merely the design of the building involved. No one can criticize, I think, the capabilities of Mr. Bunshaft, although he may make mistakes now and then, but the concern should have been at that time, I think, and still may be brought out, that Mr. Bunshaft was given a contract for design and supervision that amounted to about $1.4 million.

The man that gave that out to him was Mr. Hirshhorn, who was a private citizen. It was not, in my estimation, properly screened through Congress. I have documents here to prove this which I would like to enter into the record at this time.

(See end of testimony.)

In the agreement between Mr. Hirshhorn and the Joseph Hirshhorn Foundation, as co-donors—the foundation as you probably know is a chartered foundation set up in 1955 ostensibly to do work for mental health and also to engage in certain good things in art. But nothing much was done until 1960. It might also be noted that the Board of Directors that gives away foundation grants consists of Mr. Hirshhorn, his accountant, David Tarlow, and his lawyer, Sam Harris. There were no other directors involved.

Around 1960, Mr. Hirshhorn began to put into this foundation works of arts evaluated at $ numbers of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and he has been putting in more works of art consistently.

Today there is over $4 million worth of works of art transferred from his private collection into the foundation collection, at which time certainly, if he wanted to, he could take a tax deduction. I can’t say that he did.

In this agreement, that we have here, it states that—

The building will be in accordance with plans to be prepared by a firm of architects jointly chosen by the donor, Mr. Hirshhorn, and the Secretary of the Institution, which plans shall have been specifically approved by both the donor and the Secretary of the Institution.
That obviously gives this private citizen the right to give out a very substantial Government contract and oddly enough, although the announcement of Mr. Bunshaft was not made until 1967, it was well understood that Mr. Bunshaft was doing, or going to do, this building and sculpture garden.

I have here a sequence which I would like to enter into the record at this time. This was the press release announced on January 26, 1967, that Gordon Bunshaft was given the contract.

This is that section of the agreement.

Mr. Brademas. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question at this point? It is really for my own general illumination. The question that strikes me as quite extraordinary here, and I say it as one who has been a member of this subcommittee only during this Congress, is how is it that this subcommittee, which as I understand it has jurisdiction over the Smithsonian and over certain other memorials here in Washington, and would therefore, I assume, have jurisdiction over the Hirshhorn enterprise, or we wouldn’t be taking all of this time today, how is it nobody ever talked to us about these matters?

Mr. Thompson. As I understand the history of it, having been a member of this subcommittee for some time, when it was chaired by our former colleague, Mr. Jones of Missouri, the Hirshhorn proposal was developed and the legislation introduced in such a manner that it was sent by the Speaker to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. Brademas. I am a very suspicious man when it comes to that kind of an operation.

Mr. Thompson. I might say also that the National Cultural Center which later became the JFK Center for the Performing Arts, both of which pieces of legislation were originally authorized by myself, were similarly referred.

When I drafted the bill to make the Patent Office a part of the Smithsonian Institution, that also went before the Committee on Public Works.

The Committee on the Library and Memorials, until now, has never involved itself in the Hirshhorn project, in the Kennedy project or in the Patent Office project.

It has been directly involved with, and here again, it is a matter of legislative draftsmanship, and referral by the Speaker in consultation with the Parliamentarian. It has concerned itself with the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission, including the design. I am a trustee of that.

The gentlemen of this subcommittee were kind enough to report legislation passed only last week under suspension which gives $75,000 to that Commission to continue its work.

The Subcommittee on Library and Memorials also concerned itself with the Madison Memorial, which, as you know, is to be a part of the Library of Congress.

So, in a word, this subcommittee as a subcommittee had nothing to do with the Hirshhorn legislation or with the Kennedy legislation and in the usual course of events in the past probably would not.

When I assumed the chairmanship in this Congress, I was sensitive about this question since the Secretary of the Smithsonian must refer legislation such as the Museum Act and others to this subcommittee, which in over 100 years has never exercised oversight responsibility over the Smithsonian.
So, this is just one more history of referral of legislation to committees in the judgment of the Speaker and that judgment is very seldom questioned.

It is for that reason, for instance, that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for some mysterious reason has jurisdiction over medical and paramedical education. I have felt for years that that jurisdiction belonged to the Committee on Education and Labor.

So that really, except as Members of Congress who were here and voted for or against this proposition when the Committee on Public Works brought it to the floor, this subcommittee had nothing to do with it. That is not an apology. It is an explanation.

Mr. Brademas. I would just commend the chairman of the subcommittee for having initiated these oversight hearings. It is quite obvious to me that some memorials are more memorial than others. I would hope that the chairman will continue to be zealous in seeing to it, that on matters that affect the destiny of the Smithsonian, that members of this subcommittee are afforded an opportunity to look into whatever programs may be proposed, whether before this committee or to other committees, whenever those programs affect the Smithsonian.

Mr. Thompson. I assure the gentleman from Indiana that that is exactly my intention. because I don’t feel that I, as an elected representative with responsibilities, or my colleagues on this subcommittee, should be bypassed as we have in the years gone by.

And I feel that one of the reasons for consulting with Dr. Ripley and others with respect to these hearings, was so that at least those of us with the responsibility for oversight, exercise that responsibility.

Mr. Brademas. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Thompson. Please proceed.

Mr. Simmons. The second exhibit is a letter dated August 8, 1966, from James Bradley, Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, to Mr. Elton Rowe and the highlight of this is that he tells Mr. Rowe who wanted to design some kind of a fountain or sundial in the Hirshhorn Sculpture Garden, “When an architect has been selected, your letter will be given further consideration,” suggesting an architect had not been selected.

We look back to February 11, a year before the official announcement of the architect, from Sam Harris, to James Bradley, Smithsonian Institution, dated February 11, 1966.

Dear Jim: I enclose herewith two copies of a draft of a proposed form of agreement between Mr. Hirshhorn, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation prepared along the lines we have discussed.

Mr. Hirshhorn has reviewed the draft and has authorized me to forward it to him.

Mr. Hirshhorn and I are leaving for Europe on Saturday and will be gone most of the week. I would hope that we can have your comments sometime during the week of February 21.

This is a draft agreement that I would like to enter into the record, if you want to look at it.

Mr. Thompson. Without objection, those materials will be made a part of the record.

(See end of testimony.)
Mr. Simmons. "The design and construction of said Sculpture Garden and Museum and the landscaping of such site shall be substantially in accordance with the general plan and model thereof made by the architect, Gordon Bunshaft, and the architectural firm of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, copies of which are attached hereto."

This was changed, as you note, in the formal agreement finally to be an anonymous selection by Mr. Hirshhorn and Mr. Ripley, but here you have it in May and February that Mr. Bunshaft has in effect been selected by this private citizen for this $1.4 million contract.

Mr. Thompson. My understanding of the legislation, Mr. Simmons, and I would have to review it, was that the Congress in accepting this gift authorized the selection of the architect by the Secretary and by Mr. Hirshhorn. Is that correct?

Mr. Simmons. That is correct.

Mr. Thompson. Please proceed.

Mr. Simmons. I don't know if it actually stated that in the Act. Would you like to enter the Act?

Mr. Thompson. We will do that.

(See end of testimony.)

Mr. Simmons. The design of Mr. Bunshaft has come under sharp disapproval by critics of architecture. The special concern with the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials should be the ethical meaning of the fantastic museum-reflecting pool complex now under construction—for it plainly symbolizes that Joseph H. Hirshhorn will forever represent the third man, the third hero, of our "National Trinity of Honor," together with Washington and Lincoln.

Such consideration would seem to be the special duty, the special public trust, given to the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials.

This reproduction of the original LeEnfant plan—approved by Washington and Jefferson—provides the subcommittee with language for the ethical standard on which to base judgments relating to proper memorials. In the legend inscribed on the left side of the plan the purpose of memorial statues, obelisks, etc., erected on the public squares—and on the Mall even more so—is described:

To perpetuate not only the memory of such individuals whose counsels or military achievements were conspicuous in giving liberty and independence to this country, but also those whose usefulness hath rendered them worthy of general imitation: to invite the youth of succeeding generations to tread in the paths of those sages or heroes whom their country has thought proper to celebrate.

Secretary S. Dillon Ripley took the lead in championing Joseph H. Hirshhorn for this role. As early as December 18, 1964, he suggested the Mall site to Hirshhorn, saying, "The names of Mellon, Freer, and Hirshhorn would be associated together at the Nation's 'Court of Honor,' which is the Mall."

In testimony before the House Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, June 15, 1966, Secretary Ripley stated:

Mr. Hirshhorn represents the kind of catholicity of taste which I think is in the highest tradition... His outstanding collection includes West African Benin bronzes, which have influenced many of the painters, particularly of the post-impressionists, and Degas and early abstract.

He was in some error there in that the artist Degas and the post-impressionists were not influenced whatsoever by African sculptures, rather they were influenced by the Japanese painters and printmakers,
and the early abstracts, Picasso, Brach, Matisse, were influenced by African art, not by West Benin art, however, but by the art of the tribes around the Congo.

There are a few errors there. I don't suppose he is really pretending to be an expert in art.

At the same hearing, the Honorable Donald J. Irwin, former Representative of Hirshhorn's home State of Connecticut, called Joseph H. Hirshhorn "a man raised in this country and shaped by our institutions. Joseph H. Hirshhorn represents the opportunity and dynamism of America. He is an independent person who collects what captures his spirit."

And the Honorable Michael J. Kirwan, Representative of Ohio and a member of the Smithsonian Board of Regents, cried: "Like many people, Mr. Hirshhorn gave his blood, and I mean his blood."

Although the Smithsonian Institution is a research institution and has several historians on its professional staff, apparently no research whatsoever was conducted into the actual life of Joseph H. Hirshhorn—no attempt was made to give Congress the truth about the American "institutions" that shaped his life. Congress based its award of a memorial on the sacred area of the Mall, to be erected at the taxpayers' expense, upon public relations department releases and promotional propaganda. Not even the simple facts to be found in the public record were allowed to be brought before the Congress.

Mr. Bingham. I am afraid we may run out of time but I think this point deserves some discussion.

I know you don't refer to the fact, Mr. Simmons, that the Smithsonian Institution itself, named after Mr. Smithson, is on the Mall. Do you consider that the existence of the Smithsonian Institution on the Mall says anything whatsoever about the character of Mr. Smithson?

Mr. Simmons. I think that the word "Smithsonian" has pretty much left now the nature of the individual that it originally represented. It represents now, I think, more the truth and the research of the scholars and scientists who have been working for over 100 years to make that name a great name in science and art.

Mr. Bingham. Is it not true that Mr. Smithson was not a U.S. citizen?

Mr. Simmons. Correct. He was an Englishman.

Mr. Bingham. Do you think it was appropriate that the name of Mr. Smithson was given to the Institution?

Mr. Simmons. Historically, I think it is, yes. I think it was justified. You may note that, if you look back through the reports of the McMillan commission, it was occasionally stated that the Smithsonian was not for the Mall. In fact, they were considering tearing down the buildings, or one of the men suggested that this old building is going to fall apart.

Mr. Thompson. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Smithson could hardly qualify under the language which you quoted, individuals whose counsels or military achievements and so on. It is a fact that Mr. Smithson, you know, never even set foot in the United States.

Mr. Simmons. I think there is a good thing in that, though. I think his counsels were conspicuous in giving independence and liberty to the country in a way, at least in academic liberty and scientific liberty.
I think that is the intention of the mandate, to increase and diffuse knowledge and not to suppress knowledge, not to make it seem that something that is not factual is fact. I think that is very much indicated in the terms of his mandate.

I thank goodness for this man Smithson, because it set off a lot of things. You, too, I think should look into this and look carefully at what John Quincy Adams did. He was the man that stood up for really making out of the Smithsonian Institution what it is I think today or has been.

Mr. Bingham. It seems to me that the basis of a great deal of your criticism, and I have read your complete statement, is based on the assumption that naming a building after a man who makes a major gift is in some way a recognition of quality or distinction in that individual.

Is it not true that great institutions like Harvard University and Yale University are named after individuals who made some gift at a particular time and the university was associated with that name and it says nothing about the character or quality of those individuals?

I am slightly familiar with the history of Mr. Yale, he was a rather something of a business nabob in his time with a rather questionable reputation.

Mr. Brademas. As a Harvard man, I had always thought that, I might say.

Mr. Thompson. Mr. Bingham, speaking of the naming of universities, the president of a college which became Colgate University, when the Colgate gift was announced, was asked whether in exchange for the enormous gift the donors could name the university. He knew it was Colgate. He said, "I don't care. As long as we get the money, they can call it Cashmere Bouquet."

I think you had better proceed with your statement.

Mr. Simmons. It is surely necessary that this negligence be rectified and that at least the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials consider the public record of the career of Joseph H. Hirshhorn—and the proper relationship of that record to the significance of the most expensive and glittering memorial to be constructed by the Nation on the Mall in the current era.

According to "Who's Who in America," Joseph H. Hirshhorn was born on August 11, 1899, in Mitau, Latvia, then a province of Imperial Russia. He came with his family to this country at the age of 6, grew up in Brooklyn, and quit school at the age of 14 to go to work.

Although there are some discrepancies in the public record of this period, it is probably true that he worked as a messenger and at other tasks for members of the so-called "Curb Exchange" in downtown Manhattan. It is said that he made a great deal of money at the age of 17 or 18 in dealing himself on the market. During the twenties he made even more money and became a "broker's broker." He is said to have sold out his interests just before the crash of 1929.

When the Securities Exchange Commission was formed in 1933, Hirshhorn and other operators on the former Curb Exchange went to Toronto, where the securities business was much less regulated. He invested some of his money in certain mining enterprises, such as Gunnar Gold Mines.

On February 12, 1935, Joseph H. Hirshhorn made the front page of the Toronto Daily Star in this manner:
CALLS ON OTTAWA TO "PLUG" LOOPHOLES IN STOCK LAW—GODFREY FINDS THAT MARKET MANIPULATED BY HIRSHHORN IN GUNNAAR CASE—SERIOUS DEFECT

Finding that J. H. Hirshhorn had manipulated stock of Gunnar Gold Mines in such a way as to cause the price to rise to $1.43 and within two hours to drop to 94 cents, J. R. Godfrey, K.C., Ontario securities commissioner, in his report on his findings today, says that laxity in the Canadian law permitted this manipulation, and asks that the federal government take steps to block this loophole. Mr. Godfrey states that Hirshhorn, with 598,000 shares of Gunnar Gold at his disposal, bought and sold them in such a way as to create "an artificial market, or a price mirage." . . . The commissioner comments on "the peculiar angle of the law in Canada" under which it is criminal for a group to manipulate a stock, while "a lone wolf" may perform the manipulation and escape prosecution because he has not been guilty of conspiring with anyone. Mr. Godfrey estimates in his report that the public lost half a million dollars in a few hours on October 31.

At this point I would like to insert in the record the entire official report of this matter. This is a public document which I recently obtained from the Ontario Securities Commission. The title is "Report of the Ontario Securities Commission in the Matter of an Investigation into the Gunnar Gold Mines Limited." It is signed by John M. Godfrey, Ontario Securities Commissioner, Parliament Buildings, Toronto, February 12, 1935.

This report will give the members of the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials an accurate picture of Hirshhorn's sense of public morality as of that date.

(See end of testimony.)

Maclean's magazine, October 29, 1955, in an article by David MacDonald, reports further of that event:

A few days after the Godfrey report, Ottawa concluded that Hirshhorn was no longer what he had claimed to be, a nonimmigrant visiting the country for casual business or pleasure, but was an American citizen earning most of his bread in Canada. He was ordered deported. Hirshhorn appealed, was reclassified two months later as a landed immigrant making his home here, and was permitted to remain.

We can infer from this public information that Hirshhorn had at some time become a naturalized citizen of the United States, but at that time chose to give up his American citizenship to become again a citizen of a foreign country.

Against these facts, the subcommittee should consider Hirshhorn's remarks as recorded in the New York Times on May 18, 1966. On May 17, 1966, after receiving the accolades of President Lyndon B. Johnson in a noon ceremony in the Rose Garden of the White House on the occasion of the "acceptance" of the Hirshhorn Collection (although the Congress had not yet held hearings in the matter), Joseph H. Hirshhorn said:

You know I'm an American and I'm giving this to the Capital of the greatest Nation in the world.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE HIRSHHORN CEREMONY, MAY 17, 1966

This is a magnificent day for the nation's Capital, and for millions of Americans who will visit Washington in the years to come.

It is also an inspiring climax to a career devoted to art.

From the days of his youth in Brooklyn—when he first began collecting reproductions of art work—until this hour, Joseph Hirshhorn has been driven by a passion for painting and sculpture. Throughout the world he has sought the great art of our time—those expressions of man's will to make sense of his experience on earth, to find order and meaning in the physical world about him, to render what is familiar in a new way.
I know that Joseph Hirshhorn will go on seeking out the best in modern painting and sculpture for years to come. But he will never have a finer hour than this: for today he offers the fruit of a lifetime in the service of art to the citizens of a grateful Nation. Few men have been privileged to make such a gift to their generation and to those that will come after.

Several months ago Mrs. Johnson journeyed to Joseph Hirshhorn's home in Connecticut. She came back filled with awe and admiration for the great works collected there. She came back, too, with a sense of affection and respect for their owner. She has told me many times since then of her hope that Mr. Hirshhorn would make his collection available to the Nation.

Many suggestions were made to Mr. Hirshhorn about the disposition of his collection, as well there might be—for among private collections it is virtually without parallel in its field. That he has chosen the Nation's Capital is a cause for celebration, pride and deep gratitude.

Now we must build a museum worthy of the collection, and worthy of our highest aspirations for this beautiful city.

Washington is a city of powerful institutions—the seat of government for the strongest Nation on earth, the place where democratic ideals are translated into reality. It must also be a place of beauty and learning. Its buildings and thoroughfares, its schools, concert halls, and museums should reflect a people whose commitment is to the best that is within them to dream.

In the National Gallery collection, in the Freer and the Corcoran Galleries, in the museums of the Smithsonian, in the Kennedy Center that is to come, in the Pennsylvania Avenue plan—and now, in the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden—we have the elements of a great capital of beauty and learning, no less impressive than its power.

Mr. Hirshhorn, we accept your splendid gift to the American people. We shall treasure it and use it well—in giving pleasure and enlightenment to men and women of every age, from every walk of life.

Mr. Simmons. The context of the Ontario Securities Commission report should be considered. This was a time of the gravest economic emergency in the United States. The country was at the bottom of its worst depression, a state of affairs caused in part by just such fiscal irresponsibility as that described in the report.


(See end of testimony.)

In May of 1944 American troops were fighting on battlefields in Italy and the Pacific islands. Other American troops were waiting to land a few days later on the beaches of Normandy. The responsibilities of American citizens were clearly spelled out in the proclamation of President Franklin D. Roosevelt described in an editorial in the New York Times dated January 6, 1942:

EVERYBODY'S WAR

President Roosevelt's proclamation of February 16 as registration day for all previously unregistered men from 20 to 44 (actually those born between February 17, 1897 and December 31, 1921) inclusive dramatizes the fact that this is not youth's war, but everybody's war. The registration of men over 44 and under 65 will follow. We believe that the older men will register not only willingly, but eagerly. Few may reach the front line. All can do something and make some sacrifice. The burdens and the opportunities will be equalized as far as possible. The element of compulsion is present, yet it is a compulsion gladly accepted and far more democratic than the old system of volunteering. It unites us in a common purpose, gives each a place and a duty, and lends to citizenship a new and dignified meaning.
In 1944, while American boys were dying on battlefields in Europe and in the Pacific, the man who will be memorialized on the Mall, the man who “gave his blood” and who was “shaped by our institutions,” and who “represents the opportunity and dynamism of America,” was apparently engaged in the activities recorded in the *Toronto Daily Star*, June 26, 1945—to be found in the public records of the Library of Congress—as follows:

**TRIED TO EXPORT $15,000, LACKS PERMIT, FINED $3,500**

Pleading guilty to a charge of unlawfully attempting to export $15,000 in Canadian cash from Canada without a license from the Foreign Exchange Control Board, Joseph H. Hirshhorn of New York City was today fined $3500 and costs by Magistrate Pritchard in police court.

Hearings on six charges of selling securities in Canada without a license was adjourned until July 11 at the request of defense counsel. A charge of deceiving a customs official was withdrawn because it arose out of the charge to which accused pleaded guilty.

Crown Prosecutor J. J. Robinette asked that the case proceed summarily, S. A. Hayden represented Hirshhorn. The charge indicated the alleged attempt to export the cash occurred at Malton Airport on May 17, 1944.

Cpl. Ed McElhone of the R.C.M.P. was at Malton Airport when Hirshhorn was going through customs. The officer said he heard the customs officer ask accused if he had any more money with him than when he entered Canada. Accused said he had not, McElhone said.

“I intercepted him,” the R.C.M.P. officer said, “and I asked him to come to a private room at the other side of the building. I showed him my credentials and told him I would search his person and his baggage. He then volunteered the information that he had some money with him—about $15,000.

“He produced the money in two bundles, one of $10,000 in $100 bills and one of $5000 in $100 bills.

“Did he have any explanation?

“No.

“Mr. E. L. Howe said accused had in his possession a ticket to New York on American Airlines. He said he turned the money over to Inspector William McKEE of the Foreign Exchange Control Board. Inspector McKee told court the bills had been turned over to him by Cpl. McElhone were issued against two cheques.

“The first for $10,000 was on May 11 on S. R. McKellar and Co., members of the Toronto Stock Exchange, to H. Goldstein, in trust,” the Inspector testified. “That cheque was cashed at a downtown bank and $100 bills were paid out against it. On May 16 another cheque for $5,000 on the same brokerage firm and payable to the same person was cashed and paid out in $100 bills.”

The Inspector said he questioned Hirshhorn on May 18, when accused made a statement under oath. He told the Inspector he lived at 71 Washington Place in New York City, and said that he was in investments. “He called himself an intelligent speculator.”

The Inspector said accused told him he had the $15,000 to pay off a debt in Toronto. Magistrate Pritchard said there was no evidence yet to show Hirshhorn intended taking the money to the U.S. with him. Mr. Robinette said that the fact accused had pleaded guilty suggested the intent.

The subcommittee on Library and Memorials should carefully consider whether such a record during World War II indicates one of those “sages or heroes whom their country has thought proper to celebrate.”

On the front page of the *New York Times*, Monday, November 27, 1950, at a time when the nation was engaged in another war—to free Korea from its northern invaders—Joseph H. Hirshhorn was again mentioned prominently. The tenor of the article should by now be familiar.
TWO EX-ENVOYS TIED TO A STOCK INQUIRY—MCNUTT AND MARVEL, OFFICERS OF URANIUM CONCERN WHOSE SALES STATE IS STUDYING

Attorney General Nathaniel L. Goldstein announced yesterday that he was investigating the background and stock-selling operations of a company in which Paul V. McNutt, former Governor of Indiana and ex-Ambassador to the Philippines, and Josiah Marvel, Jr., former Ambassador to Denmark, are officers.

The concern is the American-Canadian Uranium Company, Ltd. The investigation is under the Martin Act or "blue-sky law," of New York State. A statement by Mr. Goldstein alleged that Maurice E. Young, who holds 454,050 shares of Pax Athabasca Uranium Mines, Ltd., which owns 1,800,000 shares of American-Canadian Uranium, "has a record for conviction and jail sentence in Canada for fraud and conspiracy in connection with stock manipulation."

The Attorney General's statement asserted also that Joseph E. Hirshhorn, listed as a promoter of American-Canadian Uranium and holder of 58,000 shares of its stock, "has a record of two convictions for violating the Foreign Exchange Laws of Canada . . ."

One of the outstanding facts is that the public is being invited to put up $1,750,000 but will get—at best a 17 percent interest in the company. The insiders have put up $90,098 and control at least 88 percent of the stock.

This event in the life of Joseph H. Hirshhorn was also recorded in a December issue, 1950, of Time magazine.

This information is respectfully submitted to the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials solely for "the increase and diffusion of knowledge" about the true career of a man who has been championed by the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution as worthy of an eternal memorial on the Mall of the U.S. Capital.

Mr. Thompson. We have very little time remaining this morning. Why don't we go to the 5-minute rule and each ask two questions. We will start with you, Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Schwengel. I sit on the Public Works Committee and I raised this question not for the record. Mr. Ripley or some of his staff may remember. You say, "Although the Smithsonian Institution is a research institution and has several historians on its professional staff, apparently no research whatsoever was conducted into the actual life of Joseph H. Hirshhorn—no attempt was made to give Congress the truth about the American 'institutions' that shaped his life."

What is your evidence?

Mr. Simmons. I simply find nothing in the hearings of the two Public Works Committees that indicate any genuine knowledge of what Mr. Hirshhorn had been up to in his life. I note in both hearings that the experts in the field of art, for example, were not brought in. There were no art experts there. This is a question I didn't really want to get into. But there were no art experts at all.

Dr. Sherman Lee, director of the Cleveland Museum of Art, did send a letter to a Member of Congress which was inserted in the record. [See testimony of Sherman Lee.] But nobody appeared. The experts that had any evaluation, any understanding of art, were not there. They asked people who didn't know anything about art to testify on these matters.

As to the question of his life, which you are talking about here, there is nothing in the record about his life there. I know for a fact that some people—I was concerned at that time in 1966 about giving a monument on the Mall to a man who made a lot of money and was giving a big gift. The intention of my remarks about the L'Enfant design here and the meaning of the Mall is this. It means a great deal
more to us now than it did 100 years ago, perhaps when it was just a big swamp down there.

This is a highly symbolic area in this country. It is the one most sacred place in the whole United States. We cannot, in my poor humble opinion, erect a monument to a man with the kind of past that is found in the public record of Joseph H. Hirshhorn. This kind of past—I don't know. I have not looked into Mr. Yale. I don't know what Mr. Harvard and others' pasts were. But they are not on the Mall.

The event of erecting the Freer Gallery was not involved in the same thing at all. The reason they put the Freer Gallery there is at the time they were looking for some land. That land was available down there. So they stuck it there. It wasn't because he was considered to be one of our heroes. The reason Smithson got his name on the Mall, as I said—it possibly could have been taken off—was sort of by accident.

This is a tremendous memorial. We had plans for a national sculpture garden. This national sculpture garden has now been renamed the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Sculpture Garden. We had in mind a national museum of modern art some years ago. That notion was transferred to the National Collection of Fine Arts. This national museum of modern art, however, now is to be called the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum, and the plan seems to be to make it so important that in 1976, which is the 200th anniversary of the Independence—

Mr. Schwengel. You are missing my point here.

While there may not be anything in the record, I think the committee members, from the public press and other sources, knew something about Hirshhorn. If there had been any suggestion of his disreputable character, I think there would have been some action. But there was none.

Insofar as I know, you didn't make any application to come and be heard before the committee. You would have had, as far as I know, a chance, because everybody that wanted to be heard before the Public Works Committee could have been heard.

I had some pretty tough wrestles also. The gentleman—Mr. Thompson—said he was author of the cultural center. I am in support of the cultural center. I think it is wrong if it is misplaced.

I also opposed naming it the Kennedy Memorial Center, because I felt like it was too soon to build a memorial to Kennedy. If we had waited a little time, we probably would have a more adequate memorial.

Mr. Thompson. Or none at all.

Mr. Schwengel. I think history people deserve recognition pretty well. I call your attention that Allen Nevins wrote a pretty eloquent book about the moguls in which he didn't speak very complimentarily on some of their activities and early history and the way they accumulated their fortunes.

But I am thankful to live in America that somehow something bore on their conscience that what they accumulated was put to good use.

We have libraries all over the country named for a man who some people say in many ways was a scoundrel in our history. Yet we took their money.

We have the Mellon Gallery, called the National Gallery of Art. And we know where it came from. When he gave that gift, he was being indicted by his Government for some tax troubles.
Now I would like to have you put into this record at this point what you believe is disrespectful or wrong about Mr. Hirshhorn and why we shouldn't have named it that.

Mr. Simmons. I haven't made a value judgment in my statement. What I am doing is simply bringing facts before this subcommittee which I think should be done for the committee to make value judgments on memorials, you see.

It may be true that 25 percent of the people in the United States might be scoundrels. They, perhaps, should be represented on the Mall, you know. There may be this kind of argument. But you do have to make up your mind about that.

I say that the public has never been introduced to the facts that I have dug up after months and months of research, after hours and days and weeks scouring newspapers, Canadian newspapers, in the Library of Congress, which is a source of information to the Smithsonian and to Congress, you see, scouring for these facts that I finally dredged up about this man's actual past.

He, Mr. Schwengel, has had clever men who have been public relations men for his companies. He is a powerful man. He is said to have a fortune of $100 million. I don't know that. You read that occasionally.

But the man, if these moneys are based on the kind of things that I am trying to report in this record here, on stock manipulation, which he, in a report, in a newspaper report or in a magazine report, dismisses as saying they are trying to hang him, you see. Whereas, this Gunnar Gold Mines, Ltd., investigation of the Ontario Securities Commission back in 1935 named him as a stock manipulator, you see.

I think that is pretty serious, especially today, in what we have up in Wall Street and this turmoil in our economy today, which is in part caused, as we read in every newspaper, by people who have little sense of public morality.

You can read this, please, I will enter this entire report of the Ontario Securities Commission in the record.

I would like to add also two more articles from the Toronto Daily Star concerning Mr. Hirshhorn's activities during World War II, when you and I and the others of us here were doing something for our country.

I was in New Guinea in May 1944, when Mr. Hirshhorn was engaged in what was termed in the Daily Star as "illegal securities sales" up in Toronto, when he was arrested out at the airport in Toronto attempting to smuggle a little money across the border. And even when he was taken to the room to be interrogated, he didn't confess up.

He finally said, "I have $15,000 in my pocket."

This activity is something to consider.

Mr. Thompson. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Schwengel's 5 minutes has expired.

Mr. Schwengel. You have taken most of it.

Mr. Thompson. Mr. Brademas?

Mr. Brademas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My major conclusion, Mr. Chairman, from the discussions that we have had so far with Mr. Simmons and from what I have been able to read about the whole Hirshhorn enterprise is one of profound
criticism of the process by which the decision to go ahead with the Hirshhorn Museum was made.

I hope that my observation is not taken as some sort of petty jurisdictional chauvinism. But I do find it extraordinary that a museum and sculpture garden that represents so significant an undertaking here in the Nation's Capital, and with respect to which the Smithsonian must play such a central role, should have been embarked upon without public hearings or the slightest degree of consultation, at least so far as I am aware, with the members of the subcommittee that presumably have jurisdiction over the Smithsonian.

I hold before me the Act [Pub. L. 89-788, Nov. 7, 1966] which provides for the authorization of the Hirshhorn Museum. I note that the act provides for the establishment in the Smithsonian Institution of a board of trustees, sets forth the characteristics of the membership of that board, and contains a wide variety of other legislative authorizing provisions with respect to this enterprise.

But we did not hear anything about this legislation in this subcommittee.

It may well be, Mr. Chairman, that the only way in which members of this subcommittee are going to be able to exercise some influence on these decisions is a series of most searching public inquiries into this kind of activity. I, for one, want to express my dismay at the procedure which has been followed.

I make no judgment at this point, about what we have heard. I shall be perfectly willing to make some judgments after having heard more evidence. I make no judgment as to the accuracy or the validity of the contentions which Mr. Simmons has brought before us. I don't think that would be appropriate.

One reason I don't think that would be appropriate is that nobody has taken the trouble to talk to the subcommittee that has jurisdiction over these matters. I would express the hope to Dr. Ripley and his associates that we shall not see a repetition of this kind of operation again with respect to any enterprise so central to the operation of the Smithsonian.

Mr. Schwengel. I think we should say here at this point "alleged."

Mr. Brademas. Yes, I made that point clear, that I pass no judgment on the validity of the allegations that have been made. But I do pass judgment, at least for one member of this subcommittee, on the process by which these decisions have been arrived at.

I, for one, resent them and hope that the chairman of our subcommittee will continue to be as tenacious in asserting the oversight authority of this subcommittee as it is evident he is determined to be.

Mr. Schwengel. On that point, I join the gentleman.

Mr. Thompson. The chair might say that the mishmash of jurisdiction brings about this unhappy situation.

This subcommittee has the oversight responsibility insofar as the Smithsonian exists. It does not have authority to pass on legislation that sets aside a specific plot of land or to authorize actual construction of a building for the Smithsonian. This is done elsewhere.

The jurisdictional lines are not clear. And I am very strongly in agreement with you, that they should be cleared up. I believe the concept of a museum and its intended purposes definitely belong in the purview of this subcommittee.
In the instance of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial, the time was running out. And members of that distinguished commission asked me if I could move it for approval, the establishment of the Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars, again under the Smithsonian, out of the Committee on House Administration.

I was then the second ranking member of this subcommittee. I got permission of the chairman, reported the legislation out, and it passed under suspension of the rules. But it didn't require the acquisition of any property, since it was to be housed in and by the Smithsonian.

So subsequently they might shop around for a piece of property. They have that authority, it is my recollection, but we didn't set any land aside.

But I want to assure you that I agree thoroughly with what you have said. And Dr. Ripley and Mr. Bradley and his staff are aware of my concern and, in a very large sense, share it.

I make no comment either on the statement which I heard this morning, except to say that it is my firm belief that as a citizen, Mr. Simmons has a perfect right to be here. He has finally gotten his opportunity to be heard on this subject and has obviously done a great deal of work on it.

Mr. Bingham?

Mr. Bingham. Mr. Chairman, while I agree that the procedure followed here, as I look at this law, was an inappropriate one, and that this subcommittee should have had a lot more to do with it than it apparently did, I detect to some extent in Mr. Brademas' remarks a reflection on the direction of the Smithsonian in this regard, which I don't believe to be justified.

The Smithsonian was dealing with the Congress. And I think if there is criticism, it attaches to the Congress and to the members of the subcommittee who didn't—and I was one of them—who didn't raise the question on the floor when this bill came before us.

Mr. Brademas. If my colleague will yield, indeed I was about to observe that I don't intend my remarks to be a criticism of Dr. Ripley or of his associates. This is an organizational jungle here on Capitol Hill. There is no reason that he should be better equipped with machetes than anybody else who works away from Capitol Hill.

But, on the other hand, Dr. Ripley knows where some of the machetes are kept. And I think he will probably have observed from our conversation here this morning that in the future, even if he is not quite sure of jurisdictional lines, he might stop by Mr. Thompson's office on his way to the Public Works Committee.

Mr. Bingham. Mr. Simmons, I have read your statement. I would like to know from you, are you recommending that legislation be passed changing the name of this museum in recognition of the fact that to do so would obviously be a major breach of the agreement that was entered into with Mr. Hirshhorn and would deprive the U.S. Government of this collection? Are you recommending that?

Mr. Simmons. I think that would be part of the legislation.

Mr. Bingham. I see nothing in your statement recommending any legislative action at all. I will tell you, Mr. Simmons, that reading your statement and listening to you, I think your primary purpose here is to discredit Dr. Ripley and the management of the Smithsonian.

Mr. Simmons. Mr. Bingham, I have additional information which
I wanted to submit, but just don't have time, backing up in this allegation that there has been misinformation.

Mr. Bingham. No, but my question to you is, What do you recommend by the way of legislative action because your statement contains no recommendation?

Mr. Simmons. Yes, I think there can be no compromise as far as I can see. There are many other problems involved besides this one in this whole thing. And to permit this structure to be erected, and this whole complex of the museum sculpture garden with its administration to go on forever, is a very unfeasible thing to let happen.

I think the whole thing should be stopped.

Mr. Bingham. So you are recommending that the whole thing be stopped, including the acquisition of this collection by the Government?

Mr. Simmons. Yes, sir.

Mr. Bingham. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thompson. Mr. Schwengel?

Mr. Schwengel. In the beginning of your statement, you identified yourself and said there were volunteer citizens with you, some organizations. Could you give us the names and qualifications of these citizens?

Mr. Simmons. I can. I can give them. But I prefer not to make them public.

Is that permissible?

Mr. Thompson. No.

Mr. Schwengel. This is a public hearing.

Mr. Thompson. You mentioned them. I think it is only reasonable that therefore you give us those names.

Mr. Simmons. It is a very small group. One is Prof. Seymour Sarason, of Yale University, who is extremely interested in art.

I am interested in art, incidentally. I studied art history and art education at the University of California.

There are some manifestations of art which are extremely important in development of human beings. This is Seymour Sarason's interest in it.

Another one is a graduate student at the University of Delaware, Miss Linda Crocker.

That is us, three people. I have asked a few more people, but I am still adding.

I would like to disband this group.

I think that is possible now, since the Board of Regents has taken the measures that I wanted, most of them, although I am still critical of the safeguards that they have adopted.

Mr. Schwengel. There are just three of you?

Mr. Simmons. Three of us so far, yes.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you, Mr. Simmons.

In conclusion, I would like to state that I have read your statement. I didn't know until this morning that you were the one who caused the inquiry by Representative Keith, which was a perfectly legitimate inquiry, which is going to be made a part of the record.

I, too, will withhold any judgment. Obviously, you wanted this opportunity to be heard. You have been heard.
You make no specific substantive legislative recommendations. In all candor, I expected you to be critical, and you have a right to be, of Dr. Ripley and of others. It was my feeling, and I felt very strongly that it would be better before a properly constituted, responsible subcommittee of the Congress, that any criticisms or any accolades aimed at the Smithsonian should be done publicly.

This, in my view, offers a much greater opportunity in a sense for rebuttal than exchanging newspaper stories.

Mr. Schwengel. I was on the Public Works Committee. I am interested in the historical things, in the Smithsonian. I have tried to help it along, guide it, direct it, and influence it.

Were you aware that Mr. Hirshhorn was about to give a gift and that there was some legislation on the Hill at the time? Did you ask to be heard by our committee?

Mr. Simmons. I didn't know anything about these committees at that time. I was not as cognizant of these procedures in Congress as I think I am now.

Mr. Schwengel. But you did know about it?

Mr. Simmons. I didn't know specifically about these. I may not have even been in the country.

Mr. Schwengel. Did you write to anyone in the Congress?

Mr. Simmons. I know I wrote a letter to some newspaper.

Mr. Schwengel. But nobody in Congress?

Mr. Simmons. I am not sure I sent it. I know it was not printed. These things pass like that, you know. I have been concerned ever since then. My researches in the last year have really borne out my concern.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bingham. Might I ask just one further question?

Mr. Thompson. Certainly.

Mr. Bingham. In relation to whether it was wise to proceed with the acquisition of the Hirshhorn collection, on the conditions laid down in the gift, which you have mentioned and which were clear that the museum be named after the donor, isn't it true that in the art world generally, in the museum world generally, the acquisition of this collection for the U.S. Government was considered a great coup, a great achievement?

Mr. Simmons. No; not by all.

Mr. Bingham. Could you substantiate your negative answer on that, because my impression is that many museums were trying to acquire the collection, that this was considered quite a coup. As a matter of fact, I heard some criticism at the time that there had been sort of unfair competition on the part of the Government in getting this collection for the U.S. Government.

Mr. Simmons. I would like to add to the record, if I may, further substantiation on my statement right now. But at that time, it was a kind of a promotional stunt, that whole business of Israel wanting to build a museum and the Queen of England and Canada wanting to build a museum, and the Governor of New York offering $10 million in appropriated funds for a museum.

All of this was talk with very little behind it. Certainly it is a great collection in part, but not in total. There are things that I have not seen at all. But I have looked over the catalogue listings. And who has
seen it all? I have heard from people, a few people, who have. There are very many qualifications.

At that time, one museum director, who does know an awful lot about it and who had seen the collection, Dr. Sherman Lee, who has been called most distinguished museum director in the country by the New York Times, said it was a bad bargain, that with all the contingencies involved in it—what I have gone through now is a very small part of this whole thing. But there were all the contingencies.

Mr. Thompson. The chairman might say, Dr. Lee will be one of our later witnesses.

Mr. Simmons. Another one was Dr. Charles Cunningham, Director of the Art Institute of Chicago, who is also against it, not because of the quality of the artists' works.

The point is, with all the contingencies, we are getting a bad bargain. Instead of dedicating a museum to honor American artists and our country, what we are doing is dedicating works of art to honor Joseph H. Hirshhorn. This is a kind of procedure that I don't think is proper.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you very much.

---

Materials Submitted by Robert H. Simmons for the Record in Support of His Testimony


Art: The Social Behavior of Man and the Beast

(By Robert H. Simmons)

Boxes piled against a Francis Bacon painting. Boxes stacked against a Dewasne enamel. Steam tables of hot food next to a Ronald Kitaj mural. An art museum used like a cafeteria. Concerned protest by the museum's director, David W. Scott. The director fired for insubordination. The secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, S. Dillon Ripley, expansive after his coup in ousting the director, painting to the artistic heritage of America while billows of cigarette smoke enveloped paintings by Ryder, Cassatt, Eakins, Whistler, Cropsey, and Cole. Carpets burned underfoot by carelessly dropped cigarette butts. Liquor and coffee spilled on the floor. Glasses smashed on the marble tiles where Lincoln danced at his 1865 Inaugural Ball.

Such was the scene Friday night, May 16, in the Lincoln Gallery of the National Collection of Fine Arts. The occasion, appropriately enough, was the final night's dinner party for the Smithsonian's symposium on "Man and Beast: Comparative Social Behavior."

"We behave culturally," one symposium speaker had said the day before, "because it is in our nature to behave culturally." Being an anthropologist he did not mean the same thing by "culture" that a lot of us mean.

Least of all, apparently, did he mean to include in the term works of art that an art museum of any stature is committed to preserve as the heritage of future generations.

If he did, he would have been as concerned as Scott and the staff of the NCFA were. As professional art museum people they had objected to the secretary's party, knowing that the proper use of an art museum is to be an art museum. To protect paintings and sculptures from chance damage in uncontrolled circumstances.

It is different from a natural history museum, with its cases of stuffed birds and its spectacular mounted elephants. You can always get more birds (except for robins—down 75 percent because of DDT).

It is not the same with paintings—one of the products of the cultural animal, as an anthropologist would say. They issue from the human imagination and are as fragile as a dream. One scratch can change the meaning of a painting. Smoke damages the surface. A marble sculpture tipped over and broken by a partying anthropologist would never be quite the same.
You cannot expect an ornithologist, even one so intelligent as Ripley, to understand these differences without careful instruction. That is why we have certain rules and regulations which even the secretary of the Smithsonian cannot modify to suit his whim.

These paintings, like the birds and animals in nature, are not one man's property to do with as he wishes. They belong to all of the people of America. They are our artistic heritage. Destroy them, modify them, and you modify each and all of us.

It will be difficult for the Smithsonian to find a genuine museum director to take over Dr. Scott's post at the NCFA. No professional museum director wants to play sitting duck to an ornithologist.


National Collection of Fine Arts, National Collection of Fine Arts, Smithsonian Institution, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The attached communication, or pertinent extracts thereof, is sent for your consideration. Please investigate the statements contained therein and forward me the necessary information for reply returning the enclosed correspondence with your answer.

Any assistance you can properly render toward accomplishing the objective stated in the enclosure will be appreciated.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

Joel T. Broyhill, M.C.


Dear Congressman Broyhill: Thank you for sending me the letter concerning the National Collection of Fine Arts that you received from Linda Crocker. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on it.

Let me say in the first place that I wholeheartedly share Miss Crocker's admiration for the National Collection of Fine Arts and her hope that it will more and more come to be recognized as a major institution for the preservation of our nation's artistic heritage. I am, therefore, particularly sorry that Miss Crocker was misled by the inaccuracies of the articles in the Washington Star of May 25 by Frank Getlein and Robert Simmons.

The banquet about which Mr. Simmons wrote, and to which Mr. Getlein referred, was held in connection with the Smithsonian's Third International Symposium. Our use of the Lincoln Gallery for this dinner was dictated not, as Miss Crocker suggests, by "a need for a dining room"—since we have given dinners in many parts of many of our museums—but rather by our desire that this distinguished international group of scholars might have an opportunity to see the National Collection of Fine Arts. I might add that Mr. Simmons' irresponsible account of the dinner bears no relationship to facts and is scarcely worthy of comment by me. I would only say that the guests at the dinner behaved with the decorum one would expect of such a group and that no damage was done.

We hope soon to be able to announce the appointment of a new Director for the National Collection of Fine Arts and I can assure you, and Miss Crocker, that the man we choose will be devoted to the realization of the goal which I have always sought as Secretary of the Smithsonian—the establishment of the NCFA as a leading national center for the appreciation of American art—and that he will receive my full support in pursuing this goal.

Sincerely yours,

S. Dillon Ripley, S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary.
SIR: I wish to commend Robert H. Simmons for his article "Art: The Social Behavior of Man and the Beast" which appeared recently in The Sunday Star. On the afternoon of the symposium banquet, I witnessed the conditions in the gallery where the Ronald Kutař mural hung in close proximity to a steam table and wooden crates were stacked within inches of the Jean Dewasne and Francis Bacon paintings. I might add that these paintings and the others in the gallery do not belong to NCFIA, but are currently on loan from various museums and private collections in Europe. I was not present at the banquet that evening in the Lincoln Gallery, but the accounts of other staff members would seem to verify Mr. Simmons' concern for the safety of the collections.

WILLIAM H. TRUETTNER,
Associate Curator of Painting and Sculpture, National Collection of Fine Arts, Smithsonian Institution.

SIR: Much damage has already been done! David Scott is leaving as the Director of the National Collection of Fine Arts. His was the concept of a great museum, owned by the American government and dedicated to the collection and preservation of American art. Such a museum should have a place of high honor and prestige, embodying an artistic heritage as well as national spirit which particularly at this time is vital to the re-establishment of a pride in America for Americans.

Instead, Dillon Ripley has eroded the position of a man whose imagination and seriousness of purpose have been an inspiration to many who have worked with him. The great physical and artistic heart of the National Collection of Fine Arts, Lincoln Hall, has been degenerated to a convention dining hall where smoke, steam and carelessness have imperiled priceless numbers of paintings belonging to us. The collection and building does belong to the American public, and the presumption of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution to use them for his whims is indeed appalling. Even more distressing is the thought that he might choose to exclude them entirely from public view.

Something must be done. My congratulations to your art critic, Frank Getlein, for attempting to bring the situation to light.

LORRAINE CARREN,
Chairman of Documents, National Collection of Fine Arts.

SIR: I thoroughly agree with Robert H. Simmons. He told it like it was. I saw the steam tables, etc., he wrote about, and it was a pretty ghastly and dangerous scene. I saw it because I work there; yet I feel Simmons was right in everything he said.

BARBARA DUNN.

To Capt. Hollis Dobson.
Re Robert Simmons,

Mr. Robert Simmons must not be admitted to any office or service areas during open hours, and is not to be admitted at any time when the museum is closed to the public.

The room 253 which has he been using as an office is closed to him at all times. (There is no key to this room.) If he has left any personal belongings behind, these will be given to the guard at the main entrance where he can pick them up.

If he comes to the building again, please try to get any other keys he may have. (He has already turned in key to room 281.)

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.
June 20, 1969.

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: Thank you for your letter of June 20th concerning the letter you received from Dr. and Mrs. Roger Palmer of Claremont, California.
I have seen a letter that Dr. and Mrs. Palmer wrote to Senator Murphy, which I assume must be similar to the one you received.

It seems clear from the Palmers' letter that the source of their information about the dinner held in the Lincoln Gallery on May 16th, and the source of their concern, was an article by Robert Simmons that appeared in the Washington Star on May 25th. If Mr. Simmons' article were in any way an accurate account of that dinner, the Palmers would have every reason to be disturbed. I am happy to be able to tell you, and through you the Palmers, that Mr. Simmons' account in fact bears no relation to what happened at the dinner on May 16th; indeed, so far as I have been able to discover, Mr. Simmons was not present at the dinner.

The facts are as follows: As long ago as January of 1966 it was agreed that the installation of paintings and other works of art in the Lincoln Gallery of the National Collection of Fine Arts would be of such a temporary and flexible nature as to permit the use of the gallery for occasional, important ceremonial events; in February of 1969 the Director of the NCFA was asked to work with our Buildings Management Department and our Office of Special Events to make such preparations for a banquet on May 16th as would insure the safety of the gallery and the works of art; the banquet on May 16th was held in connection with our Third International Symposium and was attended by a distinguished international group of scientists and scholars; the banquet was a serious, pleasant, and decorous occasion, unmarrled by burned carpets, smashed glass, etc.; so far as I am aware, there was no damage to any work of art and no unusual wear and tear on the gallery itself as a result of the banquet. Although Mr. Simmons' irresponsible article has elicited a number of letters, none of these has been written by anyone who attended the banquet and none has specified any alleged damage to any work of art.

In short then the Lincoln Gallery was used on May 16th for an appropriate purpose that had been contemplated for at least sixteen months, the Director of the NCFA was given three months in which to make any necessary arrangements for safeguarding the works of art under his care, and in fact no damage was done. I can quite understand the Palmers' concern, and yours, over inaccurate reports of the banquet on May 16th. I appreciate your giving us this opportunity to comment and I hope that my comments will reassure both you and the Palmers.

Sincerely yours,

S. Dillon Ripley,
Secretary.

Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank,

Mr. James Bradley,
Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Jim: I enclose herewith two copies of draft of proposed form of agreement between Mr. Hirshhorn, the Smithsonian Institution and the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, prepared along the lines we have discussed. Mr. Hirshhorn has reviewed the draft, and has authorized me to forward it to you.

Mr. Hirshhorn and I are leaving for Europe on Saturday and will be gone most of next week. I would hope that we can have your comments some time during the week of February 21st.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

Sam Harris.

Confidential Draft February 9, 1966

Agreement dated the ______ day of ______, 1966 by and between Joseph H. Hirshhorn (hereinafter sometimes referred to as the "Donor"); the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, Inc., a membership corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York (hereinafter sometimes referred to as the "Hirshhorn Foundation"); and The Smithsonian Institution, an establishment created and existing under and by virtue of an Act of Congress of the United States of America, approved August 10, 1846 (hereinafter referred to as the "Institution").
Whereas, the Donor has for many years been acquiring important paintings and sculpture, with particular emphasis upon the works of contemporary artists, and is desirous of encouraging and developing a greater understanding and appreciation of modern art; and

Whereas, the Institution believes that the establishment of a sculpture garden and a museum in Washington, D.C., where modern art could be exhibited and studied, would enrich the culture of the nation; and

Whereas, the Donor and the Trustees of the Hirshhorn Foundation have proposed to the President of the United States that the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation donate their collections of art to the Institution for the benefit of the people of the United States and the Donor has proposed that he contribute one million dollars to the Institution for the purpose of acquiring additional works of art of contemporary artists; and

Whereas, the President of the United States has directed the Secretary of the Institution to make appropriate arrangements whereby the proposed gift by the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation of their collections of works of art and the Donor's proposed gift of one million dollars to the Institution, may be consummated; and

Whereas, agreement has now been reached between the Donor, the Institution and the Hirshhorn Foundation with respect to the terms and conditions upon which said gifts will be made by the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation, and accepted by the Institution; now,

Therefore, It is agreed by and between the undersigned as follows:

1. The Donor hereby agrees to transfer and deliver the collection of works of art listed in the inventory attached hereto and marked Exhibit A, and to pay the sum of One Million Dollars ($1,000,000), to the Institution, and the Hirshhorn Foundation agrees to transfer and deliver to the Institution the collection of works of art listed in the inventory attached hereto and marked Exhibit B, and the Institution hereby agrees to accept said gifts from the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation, in trust, however, for the uses and purposes and subject to the provisions and conditions hereinafter expressed.

2. It is a condition of the gifts by the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation that the Congress of the United States shall have enacted, and the President of the United States shall have approved, no later than December 31, 1966, legislation to the following effect:

(a) The area bounded by Seventh Street, Independence Avenue, Ninth Street, and Madison Drive, Northwest, in the District of Columbia, shall be appropriated to the Institution as a site for a sculpture garden and museum to be known and designated perpetually as the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden;

(b) The design and construction of said sculpture garden and museum and the landscaping of said site shall be substantially in accordance with the general plan and model thereof made by the architect, Gordon Bunshaft and the architectural firm of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, copies of which are attached hereto and marked Exhibit C;

(c) Funds in an amount sufficient to construct the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden in accordance with such general plan and model shall be duly authorized and appropriated:

(d) The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden at said site shall be the permanent home of the collections of works of art given by the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation and shall be used exclusively for the storage, exhibition and study of works of art, and for the administration of the affairs, of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden;

(e) The faith of the United States shall be pledged that the United States will provide such funds as may be necessary for the upkeep, operation and administration of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden (including, without limitation, the protection and care of all works of art therein) to the end that said Museum and Sculpture Garden shall at all times be properly maintained, and the works of art contained therein shall regularly be exhibited with dignity to the general public free of charge;

(f) There shall be established in the Institution a Board of Trustees to be known as the Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, which shall provide advice and assistance to the Board of Regents of the Institution on all matters relating to the administration, operation, maintenance and preservation of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, provided, however, that the said Board of Trustees shall have the sole and exclusive authority (i) to purchase or otherwise acquire (whether by way of gift, exchange
or other means) works of art for the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden (ii) to determine the method of display of the works of art contained in said Museum and Sculpture Garden, and (iii) to loan, exchange, sell or otherwise dispose of the said works of art (but in no event shall any sculpture be loaned for periods longer than 120 days), and provided further that all proceeds from the sale of said works of art shall be used solely for the purpose of acquiring works of art for the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden;

(g) The Board of Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be composed of the Secretary of the Institution, who shall serve as an ex-officio member, and eight general members who shall be chosen as follows: The general members first taking office shall be appointed by the President of the United States and shall have terms expiring one each on July 1 of 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973 and 1974, as designated by the President. Four of the general members first taking office shall be appointed from nominations submitted by the Donor, and four shall be appointed from nominations submitted by the Board of Regents of the Institution. Successor general members (who may be appointed from among members whose terms have expired) shall serve for a term of fourteen years, and shall be chosen by a vote of not less than three-quarters of the then acting members of the Board of Trustees; except that a successor chosen to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of office of his predecessor shall be chosen only for the remainder of such term; and

(b) The Board of Regents of the Institution shall be empowered (i) to appoint and fix the compensation and duties of a director of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, which appointment, compensation and duties shall not be subject to the Civil Service Law or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, provided, however, that the first director shall be designated by the Donor with the consent of the Secretary of the Institution; and (ii) to employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for the efficient administration, operation and maintenance of said Museum and Sculpture Garden.

3. Immediately following the due enactment of legislation containing provisions substantially as set forth in Paragraph 2 hereof, the Donor shall pay the sum of $1,000,000 to the Institution, and title to the collections of works of art listed in Exhibits A and B hereof shall pass to and be vested in the Institution; provided, however, that pending the completion of the said Museum and Sculpture Garden, the said collections of works of art shall remain in the custody of the Donor and The Hirshhorn Foundation, respectively. During such period of custody the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation will respectively care for the said works of art and will keep the same insured in favor of the Institution against loss or damage by fire, theft or burglary, in such amounts and with such parties as the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation in their discretion may determine, if and to the extent that such insurance may be obtainable. The Donor shall pay all costs, premiums and other charges incident to such care and insurance. Upon the completion of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, said collections shall be delivered to the Institution at the expense of the Donor, and thereafter shall remain under the exclusive control of the Institution, subject to the provisions of this agreement.

4. The gift of one million dollars by the Donor hereunder shall be used solely to acquire works of art for the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. Pending the use of said funds for such purpose, the Institution may invest such funds in such manner as it may determine from time to time, provided that such funds and/or investments, and the income derived therefrom, shall be segregated and maintained as a trust fund for the benefit of the said Museum and Sculpture Garden, separate and apart from the other funds and investments of the Institution.

5. The Institution may accept, hold and administer gifts, bequests or devices of money, securities, or other property for the benefit of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, provided that no works of art shall be accepted for such Museum and Sculpture Garden without the prior consent and approval of the Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

6. The Institution covenants that the said sculpture garden and museum in the area bounded by Seventh Street, Independence Avenue, Ninth Street, and Madison Drive, Northwest, in the District of Columbia, shall be known and designated perpetually as the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden to which the entire public shall forever have access without charge, subject only to reasonable regulations from time to time established by the Institution.
7. In the event that legislation containing provisions substantially as set forth
in paragraph 2 hereof is not duly enacted by December 31, 1966, this agreement
shall be null and void and the proposed gifts by the Donor and The Hirshhorn
Foundation shall not be consummated.

In witness whereof, Joseph H. Hirshhorn has caused this Agreement to be
executed by his hand and seal; The Smithsonian Institution, pursuant to a
resolution duly adopted by its Board of Regents, has caused this Agreement to be
signed and its official seal to be hereunto affixed by its Secretary; and The Joseph
H. Hirshhorn Foundation, Inc., pursuant to a resolution duly adopted by its
Board of Directors has caused this Agreement to be signed and its official seal
to be hereunto affixed by its Secretary, all as of the day and year first above
written.

JOSEPH H. HIRSHHORN,
The Smithsonian Institution,

By ————
Sec. Secretary.

The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, Inc.

By ————
Sec. Secretary.

REPORT OF THE ONTARIO SECURITIES COMMISSION ON GUNNAR GOLD MINES, LTD.

This inquiry was instituted as a result of a precipitous drop in the price of the
shares of the above Company on the 31st of October, 1934. On that date the shares
opened at a high of $1.43 and in two hours sank to a low of 94 cents with very
heavy trading. In other words, the shrinkage in value of this stock in the public
market in these two hours was $1,127,000. It was obvious that an event of this
kind causing so substantial a loss (at least on paper) would result in a con-
siderable public outcry. It was stated freely that the debacle was caused by an
organized raid on the stock by bear raiders. It was also attributed to short
selling. It was also charged that insiders had suddenly thrown on the market a
large quantity of vendors' shares. Names were freely bandied about and at least
two responsible newspapers published a statement derogatory to the President
of the Company, Mr. Gilbert LaBine. As a result of this Mr. LaBine requested the
Commission to make an investigation in order that the real facts concerning
the drop in the price of these shares might be determined. This has occupied a
considerable time and has involved an investigation which has extended far
beyond the downward rush of these shares on that day. It has dealt with prac-
tically the whole story of this Company since its incorporation at the beginning
of November, 1933.

The mining claims owned by the Company were originally staked about the
year 1918. In the month of May, 1933, they were owned by Gunnar Berg and
his associates Walton and Quennell. Mr. Berg's Christian name was chosen
as the name for the property. In that month Messrs. Gilbert and Charles LaBine,
two well known mining operators, entered into an agreement with Mr. J. H.
Hirshhorn, a gentleman with offices in New York and Toronto, to take an option
on the property at the price of $110,000. This option was to be exercised on or
before the first of November, 1933, and the payments were to continue over a
period of two years. During the Summer of 1933 they spent the sum of $12,000
in exploratory and development work. This money was originally furnished
by Mr. Hirshhorn but the LaBines subsequently paid their share of the ex-
 pense. Before the expiry of the time for exercising the option, the LaBines and
Hirshhorn decided as a result of their exploratory work to take up the option.
Consequently they entered into negotiations with the owners and as a result
the purchase price was reduced to $100,000 and 150,000 shares in the Company
to be formed. This money was paid, the Company "Gunnar Gold Mines Limited" organized and the property transferred to the Company. Of the capital stock,
1,500,000 shares were to be issued for the benefit of the Treasury. The remaining
1,500,000 shares, commonly called vendors' shares, were divided as follows: one
hundred and fifty thousand shares to the owners Berg, Walton and Quennell,
the LaBines receiving fifty-five per cent (55%) and Hirshhorn forty-five per
cent (45%) of the remainder. The number of shares finally allocated to the
LaBines was seven hundred and forty-two thousand (742,000) and the number
to Hirshhorn five hundred and ninety-eight thousand (598,000). By agree-
ment all the vendors' shares were pooled and were to remain in pool until the treasury had been financed to the amount of four hundred thousand dollars ($400,000).

Eight hundred thousand (800,000) shares of treasury stock were then offered for sale to the public through several well known and responsible brokerage houses. They were sold to the public at fifty-five cents (55c) to net the treasury fifty cents (50c). By the middle of January the 800,000 shares were sold and the treasury had in cash $400,000. From the point of view of mining finance the proposition was up to this time clean-cut and legitimate. It had an interesting prospect for which the promoters had paid a substantial sum of money. The public had financed the treasury at a price which was not unreasonable and the cost of procuring the financing was moderate, being only ten per cent.

To clear the record so far as Gilbert and Charles LaBine are concerned it can now be stated that they had no connection with, or responsibility for the alleged raid on the stock on October 31st. Throughout the whole promotion of the Gunnar Gold Mines Limited I can find nothing to criticize in the conduct of Gilbert or Charles LaBine. They did not sell any of their shares on the 31st of October, but on the contrary in an effort to support the market, Gilbert LaBine and his friends bought 15,000 shares at prices ranging from $1.00 to $1.14. When the pool was broken the LaBines received their share of the vendors' stock. After distributing a considerable quantity of this among their employees and business associates they each had left two hundred and forty-two thousand (242,000) shares. In addition to that they each bought forty thousand (40,000) shares of the treasury issue at fifty cents (50c) per share. The investigation shows that they still have these shares. The LaBines stated that having faith in the property they did not sell, and for the same reason they do not propose to sell. It is obvious that if the Company turns out to be a profitable undertaking they will make a substantial fortune. If it is a failure they will lose the money which they have invested in the enterprise.

Mr. Hirshhorn, however, had a different view of the situation. Apparently he was not prepared to wait and make his profit out of this mine. It must not be overlooked that he has substantial sums invested in the development of other Ontario Mining properties. When his 598,000 shares came into his hands free to do with as he pleased he gave away to friends and employees 134,500 shares. Most of these shares, however, were to be held by him and not released for one year. He states that for the most part these were Christmas gifts to present and former employees and personal friends, but shares given to certain market traders might indicate that he possibly had in mind his future operations in connection with this stock.

After a long and complicated investigation the evidence is perfectly clear that starting at the end of January, 1934 and continuing to August of the same year, Mr. Hirshhorn was engaged in an operation which can only be described as the manipulation of this stock; that as a result of this manipulation he created an artificial market into which was lured the unsuspecting public, and that the purpose of the manipulation was the disposal of his own shares at the highest possible price. The process of manipulation is by buying and selling to create in the public mind the impression of great activity in the stock. It soon gets abroad that there is something doing. The public is attracted and joins in the activities of the manipulator thereby making it possible for him gradually to force the shares to a point far beyond their real value. This Mr. Hirshhorn succeeded in doing with very great skill, even losing substantial blocks of his own shares on the way up. On July 19th the shares reached a high of $2.50. Mr. Hirshhorn's last sale was at $2.48, which might be considered a profitable transaction in view of the fact that the shares had cost him originally about eight cents (8c).

From the high point the stock began to recede. From time to time the brakes were applied by further purchases, but Mr. Hirshhorn was able steadily to get rid of further substantial quantities of his shares. The support was gradually but surely being withdrawn. For instance, during the months of September and October he was able to sell 105,000 shares, and, to prevent them from going down grade too fast, he was required to buy only 22,600 shares, showing a net disposal of stock of 82,400 shares. It is obvious, however, that nearing the end of October he decided to withdraw all support from the market.

With this background it is not difficult to discover what happened on the 31st of October. The drop in the stock was not the result of an organized bear raid, nor was it caused by short selling or the throwing on the market on that date of a large quantity of vendors' shares. As we have stated before, the LaBines
did not sell any of their stock on that date or at any other time. Mr. Hirshhorn was certainly too wise to endeavor to dispose of too much of his stock at one time. On the 31st of October his total sales were 3,800 shares.

Among the members of the Stock Exchange there are a number who engage in what is called “floor trading”. These members buy and sell shares throughout the day, using their judgment to endeavor to make a profit by coming out ahead on the day’s transactions, but concluding their day’s operations without having taken a position in the stock, or, in the terms of the market, they arrange to be “flat”. These traders had, of course, sensed the fact that Gunnar was being supported. An analysis of the trading on the 31st October discloses the curious fact that the sudden drop in the stock was caused in its initial stages by buying and not by selling. The day before there had been a recession in the shares of about seven cents. The floor traders thought that on the 31st there would be support to the market which would send the shares up a few points. For this reason many of them began to buy the shares at the opening. They soon discovered, however, that while shares were being offered for sale no one was bidding for the stock. They immediately began to feel the market out and found there were practically no bids. To save themselves from loss they began to sell and they also notified their offices that Gunnar was not being supported. The offices in turn called their clients and the clients who had to protect their margins began to sell. By noon and before the panic was over the stock had reached a low of ninety-four cents (94c). In the afternoon Mr. LaBine entered the market with his purchase of 15,000 shares which prevented further loss and caused an upward movement in the stock.

The story of Gunnar Gold illustrates the old game we used to play when children. Someone would throw a brick into the air and shout:

“Whatever goes up is bound to come down
If you don’t look out you’ll be hit on the crown.”

The main question raised by this Inquiry is whether Hirshhorn is liable to prosecution under the criminal code. After giving the matter very careful consideration I have come to the conclusion that Hirshhorn has not committed any criminal act. The only section of the Code which deals with manipulation is 444 which is as follows:

“Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to seven years’ imprisonment who conspires with any other person by deceit or falsehood or other fraudulent means to defraud the public or any person, ascertained or unascertained, or to affect the public market price of stocks, shares, merchandise, or anything else publicly sold, whether such deceit or falsehood or other fraudulent means would or would not amount to a false pretence as hereinebefore defined.”

Manipulation per se is not a crime. It is the conspiring with one or more persons to manipulate which is punishable. Formerly manipulation was accomplished by wash or fictitious sales between two brokers. In that case it would not be difficult to find that there was an illegal conspiracy. With the complicated mechanism of the modern stock exchange, however, manipulation can be accomplished in a perfectly legal way. The manipulator can sit in the centre of his operations surrounded by telephones, and by using a three or four way jumney, as it is called, can buy and sell stocks without brokers who are doing the buying and selling, knowing that the manipulation is in process. One broker may know only that a certain party is buying; another broker may know only that a certain is selling. A skillful manipulator can cover his tracks so that the brokers he uses in the transaction may never have a guilty knowledge of his operations and without that guilty knowledge there can be no unlawful conspiracy.

It is obvious, however, that there is a serious defect in our criminal law. Manipulation with intent to deceive the public should be a crime.

In the recent case of United States vs. Brown et al (5 F. Supp. 81) decided November 23rd, 1933, the question of manipulation is discussed. As this decision follows the leading English cases it would, in my opinion, undoubtedly be held to be good law in Canada.

To indicate why stock manipulation must be suppressed Judge Woolsey states:

“When an outsider, a member of the public, reads the price quotations of a stock listed on an exchange he is justified in supposing that the quoted price is an appraisal of the value of that stock due to a series of actual sales between various persons dealing at arm’s length in a free and open market on the exchange and so represents a true chancering of the market value of that stock thereon under the process of attrition due to supply operating against demand.
"If, however, the market for the stock listed on an exchange is a manipulated or controlled market, in which a group of insiders, in order to enable themselves profitably to dispose of their holdings, are artifically raising the quoted price of the stock on the only market to which any man who wishes to purchase that stock would inevitably resort, and an outsider buys in that market he obviously pays more—how much more perhaps cannot be estimated and, in a criminal case of this kind is not material—that he would have paid in a free and open market, and, hence, is a victim of unfair dealing by the insiders. But he is entitled to fair dealing and should get it. . . . For even a speculator is entitled not to have any present fact involving the subject matter of his speculative purchase or the price thereof mis-represented by word or act.

"The slightest step over the line of absolute fair dealing takes them into a zone of condemnation by the Courts and the doctrine applicable is the new maxim,—\textit{caveat vendor.}

"It is obvious that when two or more persons, by a joint effort, raise the price of a listed stock artifically, they are creating a kind of price mirage which may lure an outsider into the market to his damage."

In view of the fact that stock manipulation in Canada has not been an uncommon practice, it is inconceivable that the criminal code has not before this been amended so as to make the manipulator who operates without collusion with others, personally liable.

Under the present law the lone wolf may commit any depredation. It is only when he hunts with the pack that he becomes a criminal. The law, however, is clear that conspiracy can be proved by inference from certain facts, and anyone who proposes to engage in manipulative operations may not be successful in concealing from those whom he employs in the operation a knowledge of what he is doing; and in that case he may be liable to prosecution under section 444 of the Code. As this involves an amendment to the criminal code the Province has no jurisdiction and it will have to be dealt with by Dominion Legislation. It is to be hoped that the Dominion Parliament as a result of its present reforming mood may at this session pass the necessary legislation to give the public protection, that there may not again be a recurrence of such an operation as this which caused so much damage to the investing public. It has been estimated that over nine hundred citizens of Canada are holding shares of Gunnar Gold purchased at a price of $1.50 and up and that the loss sustained by these speculators by reason of manipulation was approximately half a million dollars.

In any new legislation it should be made clear that sponsoring a stock or supporting a market at a reasonable price are quite legitimate. It is not difficult to distinguish stock sponsoring and market supporting from manipulation. In fact when a stock is sponsored and supported, manipulation is made extremely difficult.

The legality of market support is recognized in the English case of Sanderson & Levi vs. British Westralian Mines, reported in the London Times of November 10, 1898. Lord Justice A. L. Smith in delivering his Judgment in the Court of Appeal found "that the North Star Gold Mines Ltd., the company whose shares were dealt in, was in a sound condition and honestly managed, and that the price at which the pool was to sell the shares thereof to support the market was a fair price considering the then current state of the market, and, hence, that the public could not in fact be cheated or defrauded. . . . I apprehend that a person may sell his property in a market at what price he likes, supposing he does not use fraudulent means to induce others to purchase."

\textit{John M. Godfrey,}
\textit{Ontario Securities Commissioner.}

\textit{[From the Toronto Daily Star, June 27, 1945]}

\textbf{Tries To Export $15,000, Lacks Permit, Fined $3,500}

Pleading guilty to a charge of unlawfully attempting to export $15,000 in Canadian cash from Canada without a license from the Foreign Exchange Control board, Jo-eph H. Hirshhorn of New York city was Tuesday fined $3500 and costs by Magistrate Pritchard in police court.

Hearing on six charges of selling securities in Canada without a license was adjourned until July 11 at the request of defence counsel. A charge of deceiving
a customs officer was withdrawn because it arose out of the charge to which accused pleaded guilty.

Crown Prosecutor J. J. Robinette asked that the case proceed summarily. S. A. Hayden represented Hirshhorn. The charge indicated the alleged attempt to export the cash obtained at Malton airport on May 17, 1944.

Cpl. Ed McElhone of the R.C.M.P. was at Malton airport when Hirshhorn was going through customs. The officer said he heard the customs officer ask accused if he had any more money with him than when he entered Canada. Accused said he had not, McElhone said.

"I intercepted him," the R.C.M.P. officer said, "and I asked him to come to a private room at the other side of the building. I showed him my credentials and told him I would search his person and his baggage. He then volunteered the information that he had some money with him—about $15,000. He produced the money in two bundles, one of $10,000 in $100 bills, and one of $5000 in $100 bills."

"Did he have any explanation?" "No."

McElhone said accused had in his possession a ticket to New York on American Airlines. He said he turned the money over to Inspector William McKee of the Foreign Exchange Control board. Inspector McKee told court the bills that had been turned over to him by Cpl. McElhone were issued against two cheques. The inspector said accused told him he had the $15,000 to pay off a debt in Toronto.

Hirshhorn took the stand and was asked by Mr. Hayden if a substantial part of his business was in Canada. Witness replied that most of it was.

"In connection with those business interests do you have occasion to transfer U.S. funds to a Canadian account?" "I do."

A record was produced which showed that Hirshhorn had had $163,500 in U.S. funds transferred to Canada between 1942 and the present. All the money, witness said, was invested in Canadian securities. He told his counsel that that amount represented only a "very small part" of his Canadian interests.

Witness said he was "active" in Canada from 1925 to 1932 and "very active" from 1932 until now "in Canadian mining."

He told the court that he was unable to dispose of the $15,000 before going to New York and that while he planned to take it with him he intended bringing it back to Toronto where he would settle a debt. He said that at that time he was not transferring funds from Toronto to New York. He told Mr. Robinette that he did not take out of Canada, in Canadian funds, any of the money that came into Canada from the U.S.

Mr. Robinette: "I have to urge the seriousness of the offence on your worship. I leave it to your worship whether he be imprisoned, but I do ask strenuously for the maximum fine."

Mr. Hayden said there was no evidence to support Mr. Robinette's inference that Hirshhorn either intended taking the money out of Canada himself or that someone else take it out.

Magistrate Pritchard, passing sentence, said he did not accept accused's evidence "for one minute" that he had the money in his pocket and was bringing it back to pay someone in Toronto.

[From the Toronto Daily Star, July 12, 1945].

FINED $5000 ON 3 BREACHES OF FOREIGN EXCHANGE RULES

Fines totalling $5000 were levied against Joseph Hirshhorn of New York, who appeared before Magistrate Pritchard in police court Thursday on six charges of selling securities in Canada without a license from the Foreign Exchange Control board.

Represented by S. A. Hayden, with J. J. Robinette as special crown prosecutor, Hirshhorn pleaded guilty to three of the charges. The other three were withdrawn.

There were two fines of $2000 and one of $1000, all with costs. With each of the $2000 fines there was the alternative of one year in jail, and with the $1000 fine the alternative of six months in jail—the sentences to run concurrently. Mr. Hayden asked for and was granted 24 hours to pay the fines.

The first charge involved securities transactions totalling, between March 2, 1943, and June 24, 1943, $62,068.25; second charge, between June 29, 1943, and Sept. 8, 1943, $28,277.31; Third charge, between Sept. 15, 1943, and Feb. 8, 1944,
$46,943.15—totalling $137,288.71. On the first and third accused was fined $2000 and on the second $1000.

Magistrate Pritchard said the evidence indicated that Hirshhorn was "a substantial man operating a legitimate stock transaction business, and that the companies with which he has been associated with are substantial companies." He said the evidence indicated that many of the companies were active mining companies at the present time.

"The court," he went on, "is concerned only with breaches of the Foreign Exchange Control Board regulations. I can appreciate the difficulties in which accused finds himself as expressed by his counsel. But those difficulties may have arisen in a manner in which the accounts with the various brokerages were kept."

William McKee, a Foreign Exchange Control board inspector, said he had examined Hirshhorn under oath. Investigations showed, he testifies, that S. R. McKellar and Co. held five accounts of Hyman Goldstein, in trust. Witness said that Hirshhorn told him that he owned the accounts. McKee testified that Hirshhorn, a resident of New York, was a non-resident of Canada.

Magistrate Pritchard said he could not, on the evidence, decide whether the transactions complained of were deliberate or not. He explained that on each of the charges accused was liable to a fine of $5000 and 12 months imprisonment.

"I do not think it is a case for application of the maximum penalty on those charges," the bench declared.

Mr. Robinette, in asking for the maximum penalty, said: "If one were to look at the records alone, everything appeared fine. But when you are told that H. Goldstein is holding the accounts in trust for a non-resident, the immediate violation appears." This "scheme," he argued, was intended to prevent the Foreign Exchange Control board from seeing that a permit was necessary.

"The amounts involved are substantial," he stated. "The order-in-council says that no non-resident shall, without a permit from the board, sell to anyone in Canada. It is there for a purpose."

At the opening of the hearing, Mr. Robinette said that under the order it was an offence for a non-resident, without a permit from the board, to sell any securities in Canada—or to sell any securities for delivery in Canada.

Mr. Hayden asked Inspector McKee if the $137,000 figure related to all the sales in the various accounts. Witnesses said it did.

"You have said that those sales were to residents and without a permit? Did you know that in some cases in the securities detailed in the accounts there were board permits issued to the vendor?"

Witness said he did not know that. There were not permits in connection with the $137,000 figure under investigation, he declared.

[From Time magazine, Dec. 4, 1950]

HIGH FINANCE—URANIUM STRIKE?

On sale in Wall Street last week was an over-the-counter stock with an impressive name: American-Canadian Uranium Co., Ltd. Even more impressive were the company's top officials. The president was white-haired, handsome Paul V. McNutt who, as War Manpower Commissioner and High Commissioner to the Philippines, was a king in the New Deal deck. Vice President was Josiah Marvel Jr., onetime Ambassador to Denmark and recently appointed by President Truman to the International Claims Commission. McNutt, Marvel & Co. hoped to sell 500,000 shares of American-Canadian stock at $3.50 apiece (par value: 10%).

But New York State's Attorney General Nathaniel Goldstein looked behind this impressive front to see if the state's security laws were being violated. What he found caused him to run up a danger signal for would-be investors. Two of the company's chief stockholders and promoters, said Goldstein, had police records. One was Maurice E. Young, who was convicted and jailed 20 years ago in Canada for stock manipulation. The other was Joseph H. Hirshhorn, twice convicted and fined "for violating the foreign-exchange laws of Canada."

Young and Hirshhorn, Goldstein said, had come into the McNutt company by virtue of a deal with a Canadian company called Pax Athabasca Uranium Mines, Ltd. which Young and Hirshhorn control. Last summer they swapped the company's Saskatchewan land claims for 1,800,000 shares of American-Canadian. News of the swap, said Goldstein, had sent Pax Athabasca's stock soaring.
(recent price: $28 v. 5¢ in 1949). Counting the shares in American-Canadian Uranium held by Pax Athabasca, said Goldstein, insiders owned 83% of American-Canadian’s stock. All told, they had put up $90,000, or an average of less than 4¢ a share.

To market American-Canadian’s stock, a new company called First International Securities Co., Inc. had been set up. On an investment of only $10,000, said Goldstein. First International Securities stood to make a $250,000 commission if all the stock was sold.

Goldstein granted that American-Canadian had called its stock a “speculation” in its registration statement filed with the Securities & Exchange Commission. Said he: “It is certainly a speculation—on the public’s part only. If an important strike were made the insiders could cream off 83% while the public was getting 17%.”

**Agreement Between Joseph H. Hirshhorn, the Joseph I. Hirshhorn Foundation, Inc., and the Smithsonian Institution, May 17, 1966**

Agreement dated the 17th day of May, 1966 by and between Joseph H. Hirshhorn (hereinafter sometimes referred to as the “Donor”); The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, Inc., a membership corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York (hereinafter sometimes referred to as the “Hirshhorn Foundation”); and The Smithsonian Institution, an establishment created and existing under and by virtue of an Act of the Congress of the United States of America, approved August 10, 1846 (hereinafter referred to as the “Institution”).

Whereas, the Donor has for many years been acquiring important paintings and sculpture, with particular emphasis upon the works of contemporary American artists, and is desirous of encouraging and developing a greater understanding and appreciation of modern art; and

Whereas, the President of the United States and the Institution believe that the establishment of a sculpture garden and a museum in Washington, D.C., where modern art could be exhibited and studied, would enrich the culture of the nation; and

Whereas, the Donor and the Trustees of the Hirshhorn Foundation have proposed to the President of the United States that the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation donate their collections of art to the Institution for the benefit of the people of the United States and the Donor has proposed to the President that the Donor contribute One Million Dollars ($1,000,000) to the Institution for the purpose of acquiring additional works of art of contemporary artists; and

Whereas, the President of the United States has directed the Secretary of the Institute to make appropriate arrangements whereby the proposed gifts by the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation of their collections of works of art and the Donor’s proposed gift of One Million Dollars to the Institution, may be consummated; and

Whereas, agreement has now been reached between the Donor, the Institution and the Hirshhorn Foundation with respect to the terms and conditions upon which said gifts will be made by the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation, and accepted by the Institution;

Now, therefore, it is agreed by and between the undersigned as follows:

First. The Donor hereby agrees to transfer and deliver the collection of works of art listed in the inventory attached hereto and marked Exhibits A and A–1, and to pay the sum of One Million Dollars ($1,000,000), to the Institution, and the Hirshhorn Foundation agrees to transfer and deliver to the Institution the collection of works of art listed in the inventory attached hereto and marked Exhibits B and B–1, and the Institution hereby agrees to accept said gifts from the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation, in trust, however, for the uses and purposes and subject to the provisions and conditions hereinafter expressed.

Second. It is a condition of the gifts by the Donor and The Hirshhorn Foundation:

A. That the Congress of the United States shall have enacted, and the President of the United States shall have approved, no later than ten days after the close of the 90th Congress, legislation to the following effect:

(1) The area bounded by Seventh Street, Independence Avenue, Ninth Street and Madison Drive, in the District of Columbia, shall be appropriated to the Institution as the permanent site of a museum and sculpture garden to be used exclusively for the exhibition of works of art.
The Board of Regents of the Institution shall be duly authorized to remove any existing structure, to prepare architectural and engineering designs, plans and specifications, and to construct a suitable museum and sculpture garden for the use of the Institution within the area designated in Subparagraph "(1)" hereof.

The museum and sculpture garden hereinbefore provided for shall be designated and known in perpetuity as the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and shall be a free public museum and sculpture garden under the administration of the Board of Regents of the Institution.

The faith of the United States shall be pledged that the United States shall provide such funds as may be necessary for the upkeep, operation and maintenance of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be the permanent home of the collections of art of Joseph H. Hirshhorn and The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, and shall be used exclusively for the storage, exhibition and study of works of art, and for the administration of the affairs of The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

There shall be established in the Institution a Board of Trustees to be known as the Board of Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, which shall provide advice and assistance to the Board of Regents of the Institution on all matters relating to the administration operation, maintenance and preservation of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden; and which shall have the sole authority (a) to purchase or otherwise acquire (whether by gift, exchange or other means) works of art for the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden; (b) to loan, exchange, sell or otherwise dispose of said works of art; and (c) to determine policy as to the method of display of the works of art contained in the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

The Board of Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be composed of ten members as follows: (a) The Chief Justice of the United States and the Secretary of the Institution, who shall serve as ex officio members and (b) eight general members to be initially appointed by the President, four of whom shall be appointed from among nominations submitted by Joseph H. Hirshhorn and four of whom shall be appointed from among nominations submitted by the Board of Regents of the Institution. The general members so appointed by the President shall have terms expiring one each on July 1, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, and 1975, as designated by the President. Successor general members (who may be elected from among members whose terms have expired) shall serve for a term of six years, except that a successor chosen to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of office of his predecessor, shall be chosen only for the remainder of such term. Vacancies occurring among general members of the Board of Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be filled by a vote of not less than four-fifths of the then acting members of the Board of Trustees.

The Board of Regents of the Institution may appoint and fix the compensation and duties of a director and, subject to his supervision, an administrator and two curators of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, none of whose appointment, compensation or duties shall be subject to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Board of Regents may employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for the efficient administration, operation and maintenance of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

There shall be authorized to be appropriated, and there shall be appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of such legislation, including all sums necessary for planning and constructing the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

The said Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall have been constructed and completed in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement.

Third. Upon receipt of appropriate authorization from the Congress and the appropriation of funds as provided in Paragraph Second hereof, the Institution shall, with all due dispatch, construct the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden on the site described in Subparagraph A(1) of Paragraph Second hereof, and landscape said site, in accordance with plans to be prepared by a firm of architects jointly chosen by the Donor and the Secretary of the
Institution, which plans shall have been specifically approved by both the Donor and the Secretary of the Institution.

Fourth. Immediately following the construction and completion of the said museum and sculpture garden as herein provided, and the taking of such other steps as counsel for the Donor and counsel for the Institution shall deem necessary to give effect to the gifts contemplated hereunder, the Donor shall pay the sum of One Million Dollars ($1,000,000) to the Institution and title to the collections of the works of art listed in Exhibits A and A–1 and Exhibits B and B–1 shall pass to and be vested in the Institution, and such collections shall be delivered to the Institution at the expense of the Donor and the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, respectively, and thereafter shall remain under the exclusive control of the Institution, subject to the provisions of this Agreement.

During the period between the date of this Agreement and the time when title to said collections of art shall pass to and be vested in the Institution, or when this Agreement shall terminate, whichever shall be earlier, the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation shall respectively care for the said works of art and shall keep the same insured against loss or damage by fire, theft or burglary, in such amounts and with such parties as the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation in their discretion may determine, if and to the extent that such insurance may be obtainable; it being understood, however, that in no event nor under any circumstances, shall the Donor or the Hirshhorn Foundation be liable for any loss or damage to any of the works of art, however caused, which is not compensated for by such insurance. The Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation shall respectively pay all costs, premiums, and other charges incidental to such care and insurance.

Fifth. The gift of One Million Dollars by the Donor hereunder shall be used solely to acquire works of art for the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. Pending the use of said funds for such purpose, the Institution may invest such funds in such manner as it may determine from time to time, provided that such funds and/or investments, and the income derived therefrom, shall be segregated and maintained as a trust fund for the benefit of the said Museum and Sculpture Garden, separate and apart from the other funds and investments of the Institution.

Sixth. The Institution may accept, hold and administer gifts, bequests or devises of money, securities, or other property for the benefit of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, provided that no works of art shall be accepted for such Museum and Sculpture Garden without the prior consent and approval of the Board of Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

Seventh. The Institution covenants and agrees that:

A. It will, at all times, properly maintain the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, protect and care for all works of art therein, and regularly exhibit works of art contained therein with dignity to the general public free of charge.

B. In no event shall any sculpture of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden be loaned for periods longer than three hundred sixty (360) days.

C. The funds received from the sale of works of art of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be used solely for the purpose of acquiring works of art for said Museum and Sculpture Garden. Pending the use of said funds for such purpose, the Institution may invest such funds in such manner as it may determine from time to time, provided that such funds and/or investments, and the income derived therefrom, shall be segregated and maintained as a trust fund for the benefit of the said Museum and Sculpture Garden, separate and apart from the other funds and investments of the Institution.

D. The first director of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be designated by the Donor with the consent of the Secretary of the Institution.

E. The said sculpture garden and museum in the area bounded by Seventh Street, Independence Avenue, Ninth Street, and Madison Drive, in the District of Columbia, shall be known and designated in perpetuity as the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden to which the entire public shall forever have access without charge, subject only to reasonable regulations from time to time established by the Institution.
Eighth. Anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding, from and after the date of this Agreement and until title to the collections of works of art shall pass to and be vested in the Institution, (a) the Donor may transfer any of the works of art listed in Exhibits A or A–1 to the Hirshhorn Foundation, and all works of art thus transferred shall remain subject to this agreement as if originally listed in Exhibits B or B–1 instead of Exhibits A or A–1 hereto; and (b) the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation may loan or sell (for such consideration as the Donor or the Hirshhorn Foundation, as the case may be, shall in his or its sole discretion deem appropriate) any of the works of art listed respectively in Exhibits A, A–1, B or B–1 hereto and may also exchange the same for other works of art. No loan of such works of art shall be made for a period in excess of 180 days. The Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation respectively may invest and reinvest the net proceeds arising from any such sale of his or its works of art by acquiring additional works of art and/or purchasing obligations of the United States Government. All works of art so acquired by purchase or exchange shall become subject to the terms of this Agreement as if originally listed in Exhibits A, A–1, B or B–1 in the place and stead of the works of art sold or exchanged as aforesaid. After title to the collections of works of art shall pass to and be vested in the Institution, any obligations of the United States Government acquired as aforesaid and the balance, if any, of net proceeds not used for the acquisition of works of art or obligations of the United States Government shall be transferred and paid over to the Institution to be used solely for the purpose of acquiring works of art for the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and pending such use, such funds and obligations shall be administered as provided in Paragraph Fifth hereof. Any insurance proceeds realized under policies carried by the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph Fourth hereof shall be treated in the same manner as net proceeds arising from the sale of the works of art of the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation as provided in this Paragraph Eighth.

Ninth. In the event that legislation containing provisions substantially as set forth in Paragraph Second hereof is not duly enacted by the Congress of the United States and duly approved by the President no later than ten (10) days after the close of the 90th Congress, or in the event that said Museum and Sculpture Garden shall not have been constructed and completed as provided in Paragraph Third hereof within five years after such legislation shall have been enacted and approved, this Agreement shall be null and void and the proposed gifts by the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation shall not be consummated.

Tenth. This Agreement shall be binding upon the heirs, executors and administrators of the Donor.

In witness whereof, Joseph H. Hirshhorn has caused this Agreement to be executed by his hand and seal; The Smithsonian Institution, pursuant to a resolution duly adopted by its Board of Regents, has caused this Agreement to be signed and its official seal to be hereunto affixed by its Secretary; and The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, Inc., pursuant to a resolution duly adopted by its Board of Directors, has caused this Agreement to be signed and its official seal to be hereunto affixed by its Secretary, all as of the day and year first above written.

s/ Joseph H. Hirshhorn.

[Seal]

By s/ S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary.

[Seal]

By s/ Sam Harris, Secretary.

Public Law 89–788, 89th Congress, S. 3389, November 7, 1966

AN ACT To provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

Section 1. (a) The area bounded by Seventh Street, Independence Avenue, Ninth Street, and Jefferson Drive, in the District of Columbia, is hereby appropriated to the Smithsonian Institution as the permanent site of a museum and the area bounded by Seventh Street, Jefferson Drive, Ninth Street, and Madison Drive, in the District of Columbia is hereby made available to the Smithsonian Institution as the permanent site of a sculpture garden, both areas to be used for the exhibition of works of art.
(b) The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution is authorized to remove any existing structure, to prepare architectural and engineering designs, plans, and specifications, and to construct a suitable museum within said area lying south of Jefferson Drive and to provide a sculpture garden for the use of the Smithsonian Institution within the areas designated in section 1(a) of this Act.

Sec. 2. (a) The museum and sculpture garden provided for by this Act shall be designated and known in perpetuity as the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and shall be a free public museum and sculpture garden under the administration of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. In administering the sculpture garden the Board shall cooperate with the Secretary of Interior so that the development and use of the Garden is consistent with the open-space concept of the Mall, for which the Secretary of Interior is responsible, and with related development regarding underground garages and street development.

(b) The faith of the United States is pledged that the United States shall provide such funds as may be necessary for the upkeep, operation, and administration of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

(c) The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be the permanent home of the collections of art of Joseph H. Hirshhorn and the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, and shall be used for the storage, exhibition, and study of works of art, and for the administration of the affairs of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

Sec. 3. (a) There is established in the Smithsonian Institution a Board of Trustees to be known as the Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, which shall provide advice and assistance to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution on all matters relating to the administration, operation, maintenance, and preservation of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden; and which shall have the sole authority (i) to purchase or otherwise acquire (whether by gift, exchange, or other means) works of art for the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, (ii) to loan, exchange, sell, or otherwise dispose of such works of art, and (iii) to determine policy as to the method of display of the works of art contained in said museum and sculpture garden.

(b) The Board of Trustees shall be composed of the Chief Justice of the United States and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, who shall serve as ex officio members, and eight general members to be appointed as follows: Four of the general members first taking office shall be appointed by the President of the United States from among nominations submitted by Joseph H. Hirshhorn and four shall be appointed by the President from among nominations submitted by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. The general members so appointed by the President shall have terms expiring one each on July 1, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, and 1975, as designated by the President. Successor general members (who may be elected from among members whose terms have expired) shall serve for a term of six years, except that a successor chosen to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of office of his predecessor shall be chosen only for the remainder of such term. Vacancies occurring among general members of the Board of Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be filled by a vote of not less than four-fifths of the then acting members of the Board of Trustees.

Sec. 4. The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution may appoint and fix the compensation and duties of a director and, subject to his supervision, an administrator and two curators of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, none of whose appointment, compensation, or duties shall be subject to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Board of Regents may employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for the efficient administration, operation, and maintenance of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

Sec. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $15,000,000 for the planning and construction of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and such additional sums as may be necessary for the maintenance and operation of such museum and sculpture garden.

Approved November 7, 1966.
Legislative history: 1966.
House Report No. 2222 (Comm. on Public Works).
Senate reports: No. 1588 (Comm. on Public Works) and No. 1583 (Comm. on Rules and Administration).
Congressional Record, Vol. 112 (1966); Sept. 1: Considered and passed Senate.—No rolcall. Oct. 17: Considered and passed House.—No rolcall.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM HEARINGS ON DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1971, VOL. 4

Mr. Hansen. I want a legal opinion on [expending Federal funds on the Hirshhorn collection], and if you are not prepared to give it at this time, I want you to have your General Counsel start work on it immediately so that it can be included in this record. The question has been raised as to the legality of expending Federal funds on the Hirshhorn art objects before they actually became the property of the United States.
If I recall the agreement correctly, title to the art collection would not be transferred to the United States until construction of the museum to house it had been completed.
Dr. Ripley. Yes; it will be provided.
(The information follows:)

USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS IN PREPARING WORKS OF ART FOR THE OPENING OF THE JOSEPH H. HIRSHHORN MUSEUM AND SCULPTURE GARDEN

Public Law 89-788, 20 United States Code, sections 76aa-ee, established the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, effective November 7, 1966, under the basic authority of the Board of Regents for "the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men." 20 United States Code, sections 41, 42. Appropriations were specifically authorized for the operation of the museum, and the Regents were empowered to employ a director, an administrator, and two curators for the "efficient administration" of the museum. 20 United States Code, sections 76dd, 76ee.
Contemporaneously with the passage of Public Law 89-788, and pursuant to this express congressional mandate to open and operate the museum, the Smithsonian submitted to the Bureau of the Budget a request for the first increment of funds for the 5-year program necessary to staff the museum and prepare for the opening. These funds, as well as those requested and appropriated for fiscal years 1969 and 1970, were clearly identified in the budget submissions to the Appropriations Committees, specifying the purposes, including cataloguing, research, and the selection, conservation, and restoration of about one-sixth of the collection for the initial opening to the public.
This interpretation and implementation of the requirements of Public Law 89-788 has been accepted by the Smithsonian from the outset and has been consistently reaffirmed by the Congress in the 3 years following the passage of the act. Any other course of action would have required a finding that Congress intended the museum building, constructed at public expense, to remain closed to the public for as much as 5 years after its completion. Such a view is without any support whatever in the language of the act or in its legislative history.
On the narrower question of the legality of expending appropriated funds for preparing for exhibit a portion of the collection before legal title thereto is fully vested in the Smithsonian, such expenditures are proper where they "reasonably appear to be incident to and essential in the accomplishment of the authorized purposes of the appropriation." 42 Comp. Gen. 480 (1963) at p. 485; See also 46 Comp. Gen. 25 (1966). Clearly the preparation of the works of art is essential to the opening of the museum to the public. A case in point is the opening of the National Gallery or Art, where, during construction of the building and prior to the transfer of the Mellon collection to the Smithsonian in 1941, appropriations were authorized and expended for these same purposes in 1939 and 1940.
In summary, there is no legal bar to the appropriation and expenditure of funds for the expeditious opening and operating of the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, including the preparation of selected works of art for exhibition.
22 April 1970.

Peter G. Powers,
General Counsel, Smithsonian Institution.
OWNERSHIP OF THE HIRSHHORN COLLECTION

Now, as to who owns the collection, the collection is owned by Mr. Hirshhorn, subject to certain conditions when he gave it. He has the title, but it is as if a house had a mortgage on it. There is a very substantial lien on his collection in favor of the Smithsonian Institution. Mr. Hirshhorn offered the collection. The President of the United States accepted the collection, both agreeing to certain conditions. The conditions were in a very few words that we produce a museum building in Washington to house it. But there were a lot of other conditions and we have met everyone of them. We have one more to meet, namely construction, and now thanks to this committee in no small part, we are about to meet the last one. The museum is under contract. The museum is under construction.

Mr. Hirshhorn at the last minute made that possible.

We have a letter dated March 23, 1970, that we would like very much to introduce in the record wherein Mr. Hirshhorn gave the last $1 million, in order to make it possible to sign a construction contract after the General Accounting Office found that it was possible to admit, under the rules of the General Services Administration, an error of three-quarters of a million dollars in the low bid.

(The letter follows:)

MARCH 23, 1970.

HON. S. DILLON RIPLEY,
SECRETARY, THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We refer to your letter of March 9, 1970, in which you request, on behalf of the Smithsonian Institution, that the agreement between it, Joseph H. Hirshhorn and the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, Inc., dated May 17, 1966, be modified so as to permit the $1 million cash gift which was to be used as an art acquisition fund to be used instead, to the extent necessary, to meet costs of completing the building.

The proposal as set forth in your letter of March 9, 1970, is acceptable to the undersigned; and the above-mentioned agreement of May 17, 1966, shall be deemed amended accordingly.

Under the agreed amendment to the basic agreement of May 17, 1966, the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden will no longer begin its operations with an art acquisition fund of $1 million. The purpose of that fund was to augment the collection as described in the inventory of works of art which was set forth in the agreement of May 17, 1966. It is our hope that this purpose may be served by the contribution of additional works of art and to that end we wish to inform you of our intention to transfer to the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, upon its construction and completion additional works of art having a total value of approximately $1 million.

We appreciate that the Institution has been doing its utmost to meet the letter and spirit of our agreement and we are pleased to cooperate in a kindred manner to bring the project to fruition.

Sincerely yours,

THE JOSEPH H. HIRSHHORN FOUNDATION, INC.
JOSEPH H. HIRSHHORN.
BY SAM HARRIS, SECRETARY.

MEMORANDUM

June 27, 1967.

Re: Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum.

To: Mr. Bradley.

From: S. Dillon Ripley.

I suggested to Mr. Hirshhorn that we stage something of a rear echelon for him in fiscal '68. He needs:

(a) a clerk of some sort here (for Lerner), help in carding, indexing, etc.
(b) warehouse space.

This is an aftermath of the Rickey affair. I believe we must create a formal entity here in Washington to backstop Lerner.

Perhaps McClelland could be detailed part-time to supervise this office?

S.D.R.
[From the Washington Evening Star, May 9, 1969]

SCOTT QUITTING AS CHIEF OF FINE ARTS COLLECTION

(By Frank Getlein)

Dr. David W. Scott has resigned as director of the National Collection of Fine Arts.

At a meeting this morning, Scott told his staff he would leave as of May 31.

The NCFA has just finished celebrating its first year in the refurbished Old Patent Office Building, a mid-19th century architectural monument once slated for destruction last night, the NCFA opened a retrospective exhibition of the art of Yasuo Kuniyoshi, the latest in a series of shows of 20th century American masters.

Scott gave his staff no reason for his resignation and was not available for comment later in the day.

It is believed that profound differences between the director and S. Dillon Ripley, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, on the future of NCFA within the Smithsonian may lie behind the resignation.

On Monday afternoon, at an executive meeting of the Art Commission of the Smithsonian, Ripley told the seven members present that Scott would soon take a sabbatical year's leave of absence and would not be coming back. He said that he and Scott were "two strong personalities" who were unable to work together.

The fact that Scott is not taking a sabbatical leave but resigning immediately underlines the differences between the two men. According to long rumor within the Washington art community those differences are epitomized in a deep disagreement over the future of NCFA employe Donald R. McClelland, once in charge of the NCFA's art for the White House offices program and now virtually unemployed but still on the payroll. McClelland is reported to be Ripley's choice as assistant director for NCFA and eventual director.

Earlier this year McClelland announced he had left the White House program and was to become director of the new Renwick Gallery, housed in the old Court of Claims Building next to Blair House on Pennsylvania Avenue. Then President Lyndon B. Johnson gave the building to NCFA. Scott developed a plan for a museum of American handicrafts to be viewed by visiting heads of state and other dignitaries, who are often lodged at Blair House. The museum is also to be open to the public.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, Washington, D.C.

Selection of Gordon Bunshaft as architect and Abram Lerner as Director of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden has been announced by S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, which will administer the newly established unit.

Mr. Bunshaft, 57, a partner in the New York-based firm of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, has designed a number of significant buildings, including the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library which will rise on the University of Texas campus in Austin.

Among the 11 completed buildings of which he has been in charge of design are the Lincoln Center Library and the Lever House in New York; the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University; the Reynolds Metals Company in Richmond, Virginia; and Banque Lambert in Brussels, Belgium.

Born in Buffalo, New York, and educated at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Bunshaft is a member of the Commission of Fine Arts in the nation's capital.

The selection of Mr. Bunshaft was made jointly by the Smithsonian and Joseph H. Hirshhorn, who donated his $25,000,000 art collection to the United States in May 1966. When completed, perhaps by 1970, the Museum and Sculpture Garden which bears Mr. Hirshhorn's name will be situated on the Washington Mall.

Mr. Lerner, 53, has for the past 10 years served as curator of the Hirshhorn Collection and was charged with the awesome task of cataloging the 4000 paintings and 1500 pieces of sculpture that comprised the most valuable collection of its kind in private hands. In announcing Lerner's appointment, Secretary Ripley said:
“That the Hirshhorn Collection is a monument to contemporary American art and a unique dossier of European moderns is, in large measure, a tribute to Abram Lerner who influenced its growth and continuity.”

The native New Yorker holds a B.A. degree in art history and education from New York University. He also had five years of subsequent study in various art schools in the City.

Lerner was among those who advocated that the Collection be turned over to the U.S. and located in Washington, D.C. Said Lerner: “The new Museum will give the Nation’s Capital a fresh look at 20th century American art and focus its attention on recent developments here and abroad. In addition, the Museum will house an unequaled survey of sculpture from the middle of the 19th century to the present.”

The Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden will embrace many of the things other Washington galleries have been trying to put together, and, as Lerner emphasized, “it will complement and add new perspectives to the fine collections that already exist in the National Capital.”

As Director, Lerner envisions a program of rotating exhibitions from the permanent collections, special exhibitions reflecting current trends in painting and sculpture in the United States and Europe, and an active educational program directed towards meeting the enormous new public interest in the visual arts.

Mr. Lerner also expects that the new Museum will become an important center of modern sculpture with international exhibitions in this medium held at regular intervals.

In November President Johnson, who was instrumental in Mr. Hirshhorn’s decision, signed the act to establish the Museum and Sculpture Garden and an authorization of up to $15,000,000 to be appropriated for planning and construction. The new Museum also carries with it a $1,000,000 contribution from Hirshhorn for the purchase of additional works of art.

January 26, 1967.

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

The Washington Merry-Go-Round—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 trouble-shooter 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 Hirshorn 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, Hirshorn’s stock flaging came under fire in the Saskatchewan legislature where Liberal Alex Cameron called him a “racketeer.” But Hirshorn’s 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 Hirshorn’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 Hirshorn “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 Hirshorn collection in Greenwich, Conn., to “Oh” and “Ah.”

This column has a copy of another crucial letter, which Hirshorn 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 sculptured 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 hornswogged into immortalizing Hirshorn 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.”
STATEMENTS OF ABRAM LERNER, DIRECTOR, JOSEPH H. HIRSHHORN MUSEUM; STEPHEN GOLDMAN, ATTORNEY FOR JOSEPH H. HIRSHHORN; JAMES BRADLEY, UNDER SECRETARY, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION; AND CHARLES BLITZER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. Thompson. We would like to hear now from Abram Lerner, director of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum, and James Bradley, under secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Chairman, there is also an attorney, Stephen Goldman, who is representing Mr. Hirshhorn.

Mr. Thompson. Gentlemen, you may proceed as you wish. What firm are you connected with?

Mr. Goldman. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank, & Kampelman.

Mr. Thompson. Of New York?


Mr. Bradley. I realize our time is going to be short, and I will try to move as quickly as possible and call on these other participants.

Mr. Thompson. I might say to you, Mr. Bradley, and to the other gentlemen, that some very serious questions have been raised. We will afford you full opportunity, even at another time, if you would like, to reply to them.

Mr. Bradley. Thank you very much, sir.

A letter was sought by us and sent to Hon. Frank Thompson, you, sir, by Harvard Arnason, dated recently, July 18, in which, as a specialist in the field, Mr. Arnason spoke of his estimation. Mr. Arnason gave us a copy of that letter, and with your permission, I would like to highlight it.

Mr. Thompson. Without objection, the letter will be entered in the record in full at this point.

(The letter referred to follows:)


HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Library and Memorials, Committee on House Administration, U.S. House of Representatives

Dear Congressman Thompson: I have been asked by Mr. Ripley's office of the Smithsonian Institution to write you an objective opinion on the Hirshhorn Collection of modern and American art. I have known this collection well for more than fifteen years and have exhibited large selections of the sculpture on two separate occasions, as well as organizing a travelling exhibition of paintings from the collection.

May I indicate briefly some of my qualifications for expressing my opinion. I am an art historian with some thirty years of experience in the fields of modern and American art. Between 1947 and 1960 I was professor and chairman of the department of art at the University of Minnesota. Between 1951 and 1960 I was also director of the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis, one of the leading American museums of modern art. Between 1960 and 1970 I was vice president for art administration of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation which administers the Guggenheim Museum in New York. I am the author of books, monographs, exhibition catalogues, and periodical articles on modern art and artists. Recently I published a comprehensive History of Modern Art (New York, Harry N. Abrams, 1968), which is now used as a text book in Colleges and Universities throughout the United States.

As indicated, in the mid-fifties I exhibited a large selection of the Hirshhorn sculpture collection at the Walker Art Center. In 1962 I organized an even more comprehensive exhibition of the sculpture at the Guggenheim Museum. This exhibition, including over four hundred items, was accompanied by a book,
Modern Sculpture from the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Collection, for which I wrote the text. This text was, in effect, a brief history of modern sculpture, written entirely in terms of works from the Hirshhorn collection.

When Mr. Hirshhorn began collection in the twenties and thirties, he concentrated on American painting; and during the last forty years he has built up the most comprehensive collection of American painting of the twentieth century in existence. This includes representation of every major American painter of this century, frequently with many examples of each painter's works. The collection also includes a great number of examples by lesser artists or by artists, such as the social realists and regional painters of the thirties and forties who are now out of fashion. These artists, nevertheless, are an important part of the history of modern American art, and without them any picture of American art of this century would be incomplete.

Mr. Hirshhorn began collecting modern sculpture principally in the period after the second world war, and almost from the beginning he bought European as well as American sculpture. The result, today, in my opinion and that of most other specialists in the field, is the most important collection of modern sculpture in existence. I think this is a fair statement, since I do not believe that any museum of modern art, including the Museum of Modern Art in New York, possesses as comprehensive and important a collection of modern sculpture as is now contained in the Hirshhorn collection.

During the 1960's Mr. Hirshhorn began to expand his painting collection to include examples of contemporary European painting, and some examples of the earlier masters of modern painting. While he entered the field of early twentieth century European painting too late to be able to acquire great masterpieces, he has put together an important selection with some unique concentrations of works, such as those by the surrealist leader, Andre Masson. The American collection is also in process of expansion to include masters of the nineteenth century, such as Thomas Eakins. The Hirshhorn Eakins collection is the most important in private hands, probably the most important outside of the Philadelphia Museum.

To recapitulate, it is difficult to evaluate the total importance of the Hirshhorn because of its vastness. There is no question in my mind that there are enough first class works by modern American painters and by modern American and European sculptors to fill the exhibition halls of a large museum. The secondary works; sculptures, paintings—oils and watercolors—and drawings, will constitute a unique study collection for teachers and students of modern art.

You are aware that major museums throughout the world have long been attempting to acquire the Hirshhorn collection. Different countries and leading art centers throughout the United States have offered to build and endow a major museum building to house the collection. I am delighted that it should have gone to Washington, not only because it belongs there, but, more important, because it will give the United States the foundation for a National Gallery of American and Modern Art, a modern museum such as most of the leading nations possess, and such as the United States should have possessed before this.

There are obviously gaps in the collection, particularly in the field of modern European painting, but this gift should attract many other gifts to fill these gaps; and I understand that Mr. Hirshhorn will continue to buy and to donate further works to the collection.

I am pleased to be able to write this comment on the Hirshhorn collection, since I believe its donation to this nation is a matter of such significance for the development of American art and for international modern art. If I can be of any further assistance in answering specific questions, please do not hesitate to call on me.

May I apologize for the typing of this letter. It is written at my country place where I do not have the services of a secretary.

Sincerely yours,

H. HARVARD ARNASON.

Mr. Bradley. He says:

I have been asked by Mr. Ripley's office at the Smithsonian to write you an opinion of the Hirshhorn collection of modern and American art.

I have known this collection well for more than 15 years and have exhibited large selections of the sculpture on two separate occasions, as well as organizing a traveling exhibition.
Then Mr. Arnason gives his qualifications. He is an art historian, with 20 years of experience in the fields of modern and American art. He was professor and chairman of the department of art at the University of Minnesota. He was director of the Walker Art Museum, and was vice president for art administration in the Guggenheim Foundation, which administers the Guggenheim Museum. He is an author and a lecturer.

He continues:

... in the mid-fifties I exhibited a large selection of the Hirshhorn sculpture collection at the Walker Art Center.

In 1962 he organized an even more comprehensive exhibition of the sculpture. This exhibition, including over 400 items, was accompanied by a book, "Modern Sculpture From the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Collection," for which he wrote the text. This was, in effect, a history of modern sculpture, written entirely in terms of works from the Hirshhorn collection.

When Mr. Hirshhorn began collecting in the '20s and '30s, he concentrated on American paintings. And during the last 40 years he has built up a most comprehensive collection of the American painting of the 20th century in existence. This includes representation of every major American painting of the century, frequently with many examples of each painter's works, and so forth.

Mr. Hirshhorn began collecting modern sculpture principally in the period Second World War. And almost in the beginning he bought Europeans as well as American sculptures. The result today in my opinion and that of most other specialists in the field is the most important collection of modern sculpture in existence. I think this is a fair statement, since I don't believe that any museums of modern art, including the Museum of Modern Art in New York, possesses a comprehensive and important collection of modern sculpture as contained in Hirshhorn.

Mr. Schwengel, isn't it true also that Mr. Hirshhorn sought the best talent available to evaluate objects before he acquired them?

Mr. Bradley. He did, sir. Mr. Arnason concludes by saying:

I am pleased to be able to write this comment on the Hirshhorn collection, since I believe its donation to this nation is a matter of such significance for the development of American art and for international modern art. If I can be of any further assistance in answering specific questions, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the time is about up.

Mr. Thompson. I intend to go until the first quorum call. That should be 15 minutes or so.

Mr. Bradley. Much question has been raised about, shall we say, the review and acceptance of the collection. To summarize and to conserve time, we have developed a chronology of the significant events that led up to today, as follows:

(Chronology of events follows.)

Smithsonian Institution.
Washington, D.C.

Chronology of Events

The following chronology of significant events in the matter of the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden is offered for convenient reference:

The President of the United States on May 17, 1966, transmitted to the Congress the recommendation of legislation enabling the Smithsonian Institution to accept the Joseph H. Hirshhorn collection of contemporary sculpture and paintings and to establish and construct the museum. (I am reliably informed that an inquiry was made by the White House prior to the acceptance by the President of Mr. Hirshhorn's offer of gift.)
The Act of November 7, 1966, authorized the construction of the museum, designated the Mall site and provided that the museum and sculpture garden should be known as the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden under the administration of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Act of November 2, 1966, authorized a new headquarters building for the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology in order to clear the approved Mall site for this museum.

Selection of Gordon Bunshaft of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill as architect was announced on January 26, 1967.


The architectural plans were approved by the Fine Arts Commission on July 13, 1967.

The architectural plans were approved by the National Capital Planning Commission on December 22, 1967.

The Act of December 8, 1967, appropriated construction funds for a building for the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology.

The Act of July 26, 1968, provided an appropriation of construction funds in the amount of $2,000,000 and provided contract authority in the amount of $14,197,000 for construction of the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

Competitive bids were received by the General Services Administration and with the approval of the Comptroller General a construction contract has been awarded for construction of the museum and sculpture garden on February 27, 1970.

By letter of March 23, 1970, Mr. Hirshhorn has agreed to give $1 million toward construction of the building.

Funds for the necessary curatorial and administrative staff have been appropriated for fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970.

Construction is now under way and completion is scheduled for September 1972.

Under the terms of the Agreement between the Smithsonian Institution and Joseph H. Hirshhorn dated May 17, 1966, it is formally provided that upon completion of the building, title to the art collection shall be transferred to the Smithsonian Institution together with an additional gift of works of art valued at $1 million.

Now that actual construction is under way, it is timely to request the President to appoint the Board of Trustees authorized by the Act of November 7, 1966.

In accordance with that Act, nominations for appointments have been submitted to the President for his consideration. The Chief Justice of the United States and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall serve as ex officio members.

It is evident that a considerable record of affirmation by the Congress has been established in furtherance of the Act of November 7, 1966.

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary.

Mr. Bradley. The President of the United States in May of 1966 transmitted to the Congress a recommendation for legislation enabling the Smithsonian to accept the Hirshhorn collection.

(The recommendation follows:)


THE WHITE HOUSE MADE PUBLIC TODAY THE FOLLOWING LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

Hon. John W. McCormack,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: (Dear Mr. Speaker:) One of the greatest privately owned collection of contemporary sculpture and paintings in the world has been offered to the people of the United States by Mr. Joseph H. Hirshhorn of New York City, and the Hirshhorn Foundation.
I commend to the consideration of the Congress legislation enabling the Smithsonian Institution to accept this gift on behalf of all our people.

GIFTS OF THE PAST

The Nation has been fortunate in the great tradition of private contributions which have enriched the cultural life of its Capital City. James Smithsonian's bequest, for the increase and diffusion of knowledge, led to the establishment of the Smithsonian Institution in 1846, and thus to the foundation of a national center of learning and the arts. Willian Corcoran made an enduring contribution to the life of the Capital by founding, in 1859, the gallery that bears his name. Early in this century Charles Freer donated to the Institution the splendid collection of Oriental art that since 1922 has been housed in the Freer Gallery.

In 1937 Congress accepted the magnificent gift of Andrew Mellon that led to the erection of the National Gallery of Art. Then in 1938, farsighted legislation laid out the program of the National Collection of Fine Arts, which is joining the National Portrait Gallery in the Smithsonian's restored Patent Office Building.

Washington is emerging as a major cultural center, befitting the capital of a great nation. During recent years, the tempo of this development has quickened, and our citizens have caught the vision of a Washington equal in beauty and learning to the power of its institutions. Encouraging evidence of this is the outpouring of gifts for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

THE HIRSCHHORN GIFT

Now a superlative collection of works of contemporary art, enough to furnish an entire museum, has been offered to the Smithsonian Institution. It affords Washington a brilliant opportunity to broaden and strengthen its cultural offerings.

That we may seize this opportunity I am transmitting, for the consideration of the Congress, the attached bill to provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. This legislation would provide an appropriate Mall site on which the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution would be authorized to construct a gallery of art and a garden of sculpture, to be known as the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

The Hirshhorn Collection is the fruit of a lifetime of dedicated effort and discerning judgment, and its presentation to America is a testament to the generosity and public spirit of its donor. More than fifteen hundred pieces of sculpture and over four thousand eight hundred paintings and drawings, with a total value in excess of twenty-five million dollars, have been offered, together with a million dollars for the purchase of additional works.

The enjoyment of our people, and the contributions to knowledge that will result from the acceptance of this grand offer, are truly beyond price. Millions of Americans will soon be able to see, within walking distance of the National Gallery and its masterpieces of painting from earlier centuries, the work of those who have shaped the art of our time.

Thus Joseph Hirshhorn's gift will enrich, not only the city of Washington, but the citizens of every State who visit their nation's Capital.

I urge the Congress to respond to this magnificent offer by adopting the measure I am forwarding today.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. BRADLEY. I am reliably informed—this letter was sent out over the signature of the Secretary—that an inquiry was made by the White House prior to the acceptance of the Hirshhorn gift by the President.

Then the act of November 7, 1966, authorized the construction of the museum.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, what happened, as was brought out by both Mr. Brademas and Mr. Bingham, is that we submit a draft bill and it goes where the Speaker routes it—in this particular case it went to Public Works.

We have had other museums—I think the Museum of History and Technology came out of Public Works. On the Senate side, the Hirsh-
horn bill went to Public Works, and they referred it also to Rules and Administration.

So you will find in the Senate a report from both our substantive committee, Rules and Administration, and the Public Works Committee.

The Congress in 1966 authorized the construction. And those hearings, Mr. Chairman, were extensive. I lived through it personally, and so did Mr. Ripley. Mr. Ripley testified on the House side, and I testified on the Senate side from the summertime well until the date of enactment in November of 1966. So there was ample time to gain such testimony as might be worthy.

The legislation designated the Mall site and provided that the museum and sculpture garden should be known as the Hirshhorn Museum under the administration of the Smithsonian.

Mr. Thompson. Mr. Bradley, the bill authorizing the museum was based on a contract between the Smithsonian Institution and Mr. Hirshhorn, was it not?

Mr. Bradley. That is correct.

Mr. Thompson. Has that contract been changed in any way since the enactment of the legislation?

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Chairman, only in one respect, in that we had a built-in timetable which asked for approvals and appropriations first. The only thing that occurred was the technicality, as it turned out to be, that instead of getting the full construction appropriation, we received from the Congress a partial appropriation for construction. But in express language, a contract authorization was provided in the act itself, known as a "contract authority"—in other words, the GSA administrator, who is our agent for the construction and also for negotiating with the architect for the job, was expressly authorized to enter into a contract in the full amount of $14,197,000.

Mr. Thompson. Where did the additional $1 million for construction come from?

Mr. Bradley. Sir, that came from Mr. Hirshhorn as a gift.

Mr. Thompson. Was there any transfer involved of the works of art? Or was this just an additional million dollars taken out of whatever sources Mr. Hirshhorn may have given to the Government?

Mr. Bradley. I would rather you interpret that, sir.

Specifically what happened, first Mr. Hirshhorn gave us a letter stating he would contribute $1 million to the construction of the building, which we needed to get on with construction.

Second, since Mr. Hirshhorn in the agreement had pledged to give $1 million for future additions to the collection at the time that we moved into the building, he provided for $1 million in works of art, a second $1 million—there are two involved.

Mr. Thompson. That was in the contract?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir. He pledged he would give works of art equal to that second $1 million.

Mr. Thompson. The $1 million in the contract to be in cash. Is that correct?

Mr. Bradley. It was to be in cash; yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. Is it in cash?

Mr. Bradley. He has pledged to give it. He hasn't given it yet, because we do not at this moment need it.
Changes in Agreement Between Hirshhorn and the Smithsonian

The Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen: In our Agreement of May 17, 1966, we have made gifts to The Smithsonian Institution which are to be consummated upon conditions, certain of which have not been fulfilled. We appreciate that prevailing circumstances make difficult the timely fulfillment of all such conditions. We desire to cooperate in effecting the purposes of our Agreement consistent with the exigencies of the nation.

To this end, we hereby waive noncompliance with Subparagraph A.(9) and Paragraph B. of Article Second and with Article Ninth of our Agreement of May 17, 1966, on and subject to the following conditions:

1. That the Congress of the United States shall have enacted, and the President of the United States shall have approved, no later than ten days after the close of the 90th Congress, legislation appropriating not less than Two Million Dollars ($2,000,000) for planning and constructing the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

2. That the Congress of the United States shall have enacted, and the President of the United States shall have approved, no later than ten days after the close of the first session of the 91st Congress, legislation appropriating, for the construction of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, such sums as shall, together with all sums previously appropriated for said purpose, equal Fifteen Million Dollars ($15,000,000), and such additional sums, as provided in our Agreement of May 17, 1966, as may be necessary for the maintenance and operation of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

3. That by December 31, 1972, the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall have been constructed and completed in accordance with the terms of Article Third of said Agreement.

In the event that any of these conditions are not met, the waiver contained herein shall be null and void and our gifts shall not be consummated. No terms or conditions of our Agreement of May 17, 1966, shall be deemed to be waived except as expressly herein provided. This waiver shall be binding upon the heirs, executors, and administrators of Joseph H. Hirshhorn.

If The Smithsonian Institution is agreeable to proceeding under our Agreement of May 17, 1966, as modified by this waiver, please so indicate in the space provided below.

Very truly yours,

Joseph H. Hirshhorn [L.S.]
The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, Inc.,
By Sam Harris, Secretary.

Agreed:
The Smithsonian Institution,
By S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary.

Joseph H. Hirshhorn,

Hon. S. Dillon Ripley,
Secretary, The Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: We refer to your letter of March 9, 1970, in which you request, on behalf of The Smithsonian Institution, that the Agreement between it, Joseph H. Hirshhorn and The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, Inc., dated May 17, 1966, be modified so as to permit the $1,000,000 cash gift which was to be used as an art acquisition fund to be used instead, to the extent necessary, to meet costs of completing the building.

The proposal as set forth in your letter of March 9, 1970, is acceptable to the undersigned; and the above-mentioned Agreement of May 17, 1966, shall be deemed amended accordingly.

Under the agreed amendment to the basic Agreement of May 17, 1966, the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden will no longer begin its operations with an art acquisition fund of $1,000,000. The purpose of that fund was to augment the collection as described in the inventory of works of art.
which was set forth in the Agreement of May 17, 1966. It is our hope that this purpose may be served by the contribution of additional works of art and to that end we wish to inform you of our intention to transfer to the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, upon its construction and completion, additional works of art having a total value of approximately $1,000,000.

We appreciate that the Institution has been doing its utmost to meet the letter and spirit of our Agreement and we are pleased to cooperate in a kindred manner to bring the project to fruition.

Sincerely yours,

JOS}H H. HIRSHHORN.
SAM HARRIS, Secretary.

Mr. Bradley. To proceed, Mr. Chairman, then we had some appropriations. In 1967 we were appropriated funds for the planning of the Hirshhorn Museum. Really, we had the full gamut of approvals.

The architectural plans were approved by the Fine Arts Commission on July 13, 1967. The architectural plans were approved by the National Capital Planning Commission. And both of those commissions are interested in the Mall.

If time permits, I would like to show you the way the Hirshhorn fits into an orderly and appropriate development of the Mall.

Mr. Thompson. If I may ask another question about this $1 million, Mr. Hirshhorn hasn't given it yet. Let's suppose for the moment that it develops that he is unable to give it. What will happen? Where will it come from?

Mr. Bradley. That gets to be a legal question. And I shouldn't answer that. But we consider it to be air-tight, a pledge on the part of a donor who has already given us a very substantial additional gift to give us $1 million.

Mr. Thompson. But if that weren't forthcoming, wouldn't the situation be such that you would have to come back and either raise it privately or come back to the Congress for it?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir. A short answer is yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. Does the act authorize solicitation of private contributions?

Mr. Bradley. No, sir. It doesn't, other than gifts of art. But we [the Smithsonian] have substantive law that authorizes us to accept gifts and bequests of money and other property.

Mr. Thompson. The GSA is starting, has started construction. Is that right?

Mr. Bradley. That is right. [Construction began March 23, 1970.]

Mr. Thompson. I would assume that they have counted that million dollars as being fully available so that they can proceed.

Mr. Bradley. Exactly. We have pledged that to GSA.

Mr. Thompson. The Smithsonian has?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. In the event there is any forfeiture, is the Smithsonian liable?

Mr. Bradley. Subject to correction in the record, on advice of counsel, I would say yes.

Mr. Thompson. Thank you.

Mr. Bradley. The architectural plans were approved by the Nation Capital Planning Commission which is concerned with the Mall. Then we have received construction funds in the cash amount of $2 million and contract authority of $14 million total, net additive, but a total of $14,197,000.
Bids were received by GSA. The approval of the Comptroller General was sought and obtained in regard to the bid. A contract has been awarded for construction, which was awarded in February of this year.

(The bids and letters follow:)

JOSEPH H. HIRSHHORN MUSEUM AND SCULPTURE GARDEN CONSTRUCTION BIDS—1ST BID, MAY 27, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low bid</th>
<th>Hyman</th>
<th>Piracci</th>
<th>Blake</th>
<th>Norair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$17,650,000</td>
<td>$16,298,000</td>
<td>$17,678,000</td>
<td>$15,198,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td>-1,275,000</td>
<td>-1,303,000</td>
<td>-1,262,000</td>
<td>-522,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,415,000</td>
<td>14,995,000</td>
<td>16,416,000</td>
<td>14,675,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Bid disqualification pending.
2 Low bid is based on Italian marble.

Note: Funds available, $12,999,000; all bids too high.

JOSEPH H. HIRSHHORN MUSEUM AND SCULPTURE GARDEN CONSTRUCTION BIDS—2D BID, DEC. 18, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lump-sum bid</th>
<th>Hyman</th>
<th>Piracci</th>
<th>Blake</th>
<th>Norair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$11,874,000</td>
<td>$14,372,000</td>
<td>$14,398,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Corrected to $12,633,278.43 and approved by Comptroller General. (See attached explanation.)

MAX E. GREENBERG, TRAYMAN, HARRIS, CANTOR, REISS & BLASKY, ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS AT LAW, NEW YORK, N.Y., DECEMBER 22, 1969.

Subject: Invitation #GS-038-16254, Project No. 49356, Joseph Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Gardens.

Mr. T. L. PEYTON, Jr., Contracting Officer, Region #3, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have been authorized on behalf of my client, Piracci Construction Company, Inc. to submit to you a request for correction of its bid for the construction of the Joseph Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Gardens. The aforementioned bid was submitted on December 18, 1963 pursuant to subject invitation.

The error is clerical in nature and occurred initially on the enclosed sheet No. 6 of the Recapitulation Sheet for Poured in Place Concrete. The sheet originally contained under the column headed "Material and Sub Contractors" a series of pencilled prices constituting the cost of material for various designated items. The price for Exposed Swenson Pink Granite Aggregate Mix, listed as "Exposed 5,000 # [lbs]" was indicated on the sheet in the amount of $754,375.00, representing the total of 5702 cubic yards at the vendor's quoted net price of $132.30. Because of several changes in the quantities for this item during the final analysis review, several erasures occurred, weakening and tearing slightly the paper at this particular line. For this reason the final quantity and price for this particular item was dropped one line on the sheet. Thereafter this sheet along with the others was given to a Mrs. Marjorie Slattery, an employee in the Bookkeeping Department, who was instructed to add the various columns of figures to arrive at a total price for the concrete work.

Because of this break in the column caused by the erasure and the dropping down of one line, Mrs. Slattery erroneously assumed that the $754,375.00 figure (the correct figure for exposed aggregate) was a total figure representing the sum of the figures that preceded it. She then added the figures that preceded it, and arrived at a new total of $438,009.00 which she incorrectly assumed was the correct total. She erased then the $754,375.00 figure, which she had incorrectly assumed was an erroneous figure, and substituted the $438,009.00 figure.

The result of this error, clearly demonstrable on the face of Sheet #6, was then transposed to the enclosed Sheet #10, where the figure for Page 6 is stated at $438,009.00. This figure of $438,009.00 does not include the exposed aggregate figure of $754,375.00. The correct figure for Page 6 is $1,192,384.00 (or $754,375.00...
more than indicated on the work sheets). Taking into consideration bond premium at .065% ($4,904.43), the bid submitted was $759,278.43 lower than it should have been, the correct bid being $12,633,278.43 rather than $11,874,000.00. Paragraph 1-2.406-2 of the Federal Procurement Regulations provides that any clerical mistake apparent on the face of a bid may be corrected by the contracting officer prior to award if the contracting officer has first obtained from the bidder verification of the bid actually intended. We consider that the mistake that has occurred here falls squarely within the purview of this regulation and that the material that we have submitted does in fact constitute verification of the bid actually intended. Affidavits attesting to the error are attached for your information.

We request, therefore, that the base bid submitted by Piracci Construction Company, Inc. be corrected so that now it reads $12,633,278.43, and that award be made to Piracci Construction Company, Inc. of subject contract in that amount. I am also authorized in behalf of Piracci Construction Company, Inc. to advise you that the contractor desires to perform the contract at the corrected amount, and would oppose as unwarranted and illegal an award to it of the contract at the erroneous bid price.

In the event any further information is desired by you we will be pleased to furnish it on request.

Sincerely yours,

Harold F. Blasky.

Mr. Bradley. Then by the letter of March 23, 1970, Mr. Hirshhorn agreed to give $1 million for construction of the building to make it possible.

Funds for the necessary curatorial and administrative staff had been appropriated, in fiscal years 1968, 1969, 1970, and now 1971.

Construction is underway and completion is scheduled for September of 1972.

Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden

View looking north. Archives Building directly opposite.
Mr. Thompson. Does GSA have control of that appropriated money now?

Mr. Bradley. As we transfer it, yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. What are you doing, transferring it on the basis of its need as the construction advances?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir, exactly, for contract earnings.

Mr. Thompson. Where is it deposited? Or is it in the General Treasury and you transfer it by the authority given?

Mr. Bradley. It would be in the Treasury and come to us as an appropriation warrant and then goes to GSA. I would assume, by check or by transfer of an appropriation warrant, and then back into the Treasury, but into a different account.

Mr. Goldman (attorney for Joseph Hirshhorn). If I may say, for the record, counsel for the Smithsonian and I have conferred briefly, and both agree that the pledge from Mr. Hirshhorn both of the $1 million cash and the addition of art, worth not less than another $1 million, is a legally enforceable pledge, the breach of which would entitle the Institution to use all its legal remedies.

Mr. Thompson. I see.

In other words, it is in writing, and it doesn’t violate the statute of frauds.

Mr. Goldman. Yes, indeed.

Mr. Bradley. Now that the actual construction of the building is underway, it has been thought to be appropriate to request the President to appoint the Board of Trustees authorized by the original act of 1966. In accordance with that act, nominations for appointment have been prepared and submitted both by the Smithsonian and by Mr. Hirshhorn to the President for his consideration, as required by the law.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Secretary of the Smithsonian serve as ex officio members.

Mr. Chairman, I had to take that at a gallop. But I wanted to give you the whole chronology of reviews, repeated submissions, and repeated affirmations of what we were doing.

Mr. Thompson. I thank you very much. I certainly am no art expert, but having scrutinized the inventories very carefully, I think that it certainly can be said, although there is controversy about the merits of all art collections, that this indeed seems to be a splendid one.

Mr. Simmons referred to criticism of the architecture. I have never known of a building of any size being designed by one architect that wasn’t criticized by dozens of others.

Model of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden Looking South Across the Mall

The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden will bisect the Washington Mall on a north-south axis, on a site bounded by Madison Drive, Independence Avenue and 7th and 9th Streets. The projected Smithsonian Institution gallery and sunken sculpture court (here represented by a model) will display Joseph H. Hirshhorn’s collection of more than 6,000 works of art. Ground was broken for the building January 8, 1969. Completion of the museum and sculpture garden is expected in 1972. In this view of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, the Federal Aviation Administration building appears beyond the museum. On the right is the Smithsonian’s Arts and Industries Building.

(Photo and caption supplied by Smithsonian Institution)
Mr. Bradley. Mr. Lerner, would you like to make some remarks?

Mr. Lerner. Mr. Chairman, I hope that at a subsequent session—I believe on Thursday—I will be able to inform the committee a little more about the nature of the collection, the content of the collection, so that the criticisms can be weighed against what actually exists.

Mr. Thompson. You may do that only if you want. The purpose of his hearing isn't to make artistic judgment. I don't know of any committee in the Congress capable of doing that. The only thing that we can do is say what we like and don't like. I know of no one in the Congress who is qualified really, as an art expert.

Mr. Lerner. Criticism was introduced just a few moments ago. And support for such criticism was named, for example, Mr. Sherman Lee, who will appear here, no doubt.

But to keep the record straight, Mr. Sherman Lee never saw the collection, as was stated a few minutes ago, nor Mr. Cunningham. Nor did they ever apply to my office for permission to see the collection or to discuss it with me.

Mr. Thompson. I can't anticipate what they are going to say.

As the curator of the collection, what are your current responsibilities?

Mr. Lerner. Basically, the responsibility is to prepare the collection for exhibition at the museum building.

Mr. Thompson. How are you doing that?

Mr. Lerner. We are forming a staff, to begin with. We have since 1968 begun the formation of a staff, which has been small to date. We have gone through the regular procedure of a museum in cataloging, photographing, recording, documenting, restoring, et cetera, painting and sculpture which will be shown at the museum.
Mr. Thompson. How large is your staff?

Mr. Lerner. My staff at the present moment consists of eight regular members.

Mr. Thompson. How are they funded?

Mr. Lerner. Through appropriation. [Fiscal funds]

Mr. Thompson. It is my understanding that some work is being done in New York and Connecticut on the collection.

Mr. Lerner. No, sir. There is no work being done in Connecticut at all. The office of the Hirshhorn Museum is located in New York City. Part of the collection is in New York City at a warehouse, where it is stored. And part of it is still at Mr. Hirshhorn's estate, because he can accommodate large pieces of sculpture, which we can't possibly look after in a warehouse. No work is done in Connecticut on the collection at all, except by Mr. Hirshhorn, who pays for the care and maintenance of the pieces of sculpture and has people wax them.

Mr. Thompson. Is work done in New York?

Mr. Lerner. Work is done in New York constantly.

Mr. Thompson. By your people?

Mr. Lerner. By my people and contractors.

Mr. Thompson. And contractors for which the Federal Government is paying?

Mr. Lerner. That is correct.

Mr. Thompson. Isn't it my understanding from the legislation that the maintenance of the entire collection, title to which has yet to pass to the United States, is to be done at the expense of Mr. Hirshhorn and the endowment?

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Chairman, there is a provision such as you enumerate. But the particular words bear out this interpretation, that Mr. Hirshhorn is responsible and does provide warehousing and guarding and insurance. Those responsibilities we interpreted to meaning "care." The preparation for exhibition, and we do this in all of our galleries—is quite another matter. We have some examples which we can show you—I dare say we are spending less than 1 or 2 percent of the value of the works of art in the interest of their being reframed, cleaned, touched up, and made ready for exhibition in this building in 2 years.

Mr. Thompson. Nevertheless, you are expending funds for their maintenance or preservation, are you not?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir; for their preservation.

Mr. Thompson. You are doing this, as I understand it, under your interpretation of the statute.

Mr. Bradley. That is correct.

Mr. Thompson. Notwithstanding that the statute says clearly that Mr. Hirshhorn is responsible for its maintenance and protection until title passes.

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir.

And we submit to you, sir, that they are doing——

Mr. Thompson. I don't question what they are doing. What I am trying to determine is whether or not, in light of the fact that title has not passed, the appropriateness of the expenditure of any amount of money, whether it be 1 percent, less or more—I raise this question not totally on my own initiative, but because of some criticism.
Mr. Bradley. Back in 1940 and 1941, prior to the date it received appropriations for its normal operations, the National Gallery of Art in a parallel situation received in 1940 an amount of $159,000, which today, multiplied by any factor you want, say, three or four times to bring it up to 1970 dollars, and in 1941 an amount of $300,000 was appropriate, which factored up to today's dollars to be comparable to these dollars we mentioned would be very substantial.

Mr. Thompson. I have no question of that, except that those funds were authorized by specific special legislation.

Mr. Lerner, how much is it going to cost to prepare this collection for exhibition?

Mr. Lerner. You mean in terms of conservation and framing and so on?

Mr. Thompson. Yes; whatever needs to be done.

Mr. Lerner. About $600,000.

Mr. Thompson. Total?

Mr. Lerner. Yes.

Sir, these expenditures are being made simply to preserve the paintings. We know that they are the property of the Smithsonian of the United States.

Mr. Thompson. You know that they are?

Mr. Lerner. This is a gift to the Government of the United States.

Mr. Thompson. But title hasn't passed?

Mr. Lerner. That is a legal question that I can't answer.

Mr. Thompson. You know, I am a lawyer. These legal questions bother me. I have had some unfortunate experiences with contracts which, unfortunately, haven't worked out my way.

(The information follows.)

From Testimony of Smithsonian Institution Before Subcommittee on Appropriations for Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1970: Vol. 4

Smithsonian Institution—"Salaries and Expenses," Fiscal Year 1971

Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object class</th>
<th>1970 base</th>
<th>Increase requested</th>
<th>1971 estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of permanent positions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Personnel compensation</td>
<td>$129,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$179,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Personnel benefits</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Travel and transportation of persons</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Transportation of things</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Rent, comm., and utilities</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Printing and reproduction</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Other services</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
<td>$176,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Supplies and materials</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Equipment</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$347,000</td>
<td>$379,000</td>
<td>$726,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of total

Pay increases | $8,000 | $4,000 | $12,000 |

Program | $339,000 | $375,000 | $714,000 |

Specification of Increase (Program): Preparation of Collections to meet Opening Deadline (7 positions, $375,000)

Twelve hundred of the choicest paintings and pieces of sculpture have been chosen from the more than 7,000 items in the gift collection for exhibit when the Museum opens. These paintings and pieces of sculpture, valued at $20 million, must be examined, photographed, cleaned, and, in some cases, restored prior
to exhibit. The total cost of this effort, not including any additional paintings that might be contributed by Mr. Hirshhorn, is estimated at $460,000 of which $160,000 are requested in fiscal year 1971. In addition to the restoration effort, the staff must receive and process the more than 500 new works of art being added to the collection each year by Mr. Hirshhorn, conduct research and documentation for the opening; catalog the collection; and meet public inquiries such as requests for loans, photographs, and information. To do this, the Museum requires an increased staff consisting of a curator, two exhibit technicians, three museum technicians, and a clerk-typist ($50,000). Additional funds are required for travel ($14,000), transportation of objects ($12,000), rental of storage space ($44,000), printing ($2,000), supplies and materials ($34,000), equipment ($13,000), and other services ($16,000).

1968 actual ____________________________ $62,000
1969 actual ____________________________ 149,000
1970 estimate ____________________________ 347,000
1971 estimate* ____________________________ 726,000

*NOTE.—Of the $726,000 request for FY 1971, an amount of $416,000 was approved by the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden will display the collection of fine art donated by Joseph H. Hirshhorn to the United States for the benefit of the people. The Hirshhorn Collection is a unique collection of sculpture and paintings. The sculptures range historically from antiquity to the works of today’s young creators. It’s fine representation of African art is highlighted by a superb group of Benin bronzes. The Collection’s paintings focus on the 20th century. From the works of precursors such as Thomas Eakins and Winslow Homer to the canvases of today, the course of painting in America is covered in depth. Complementing the American section is a strong selection of paintings by modern European masters and young contemporaries.

An increase of $375,000 is requested to continue the preparation of the Collections. An additional $4,000 are requested for necessary pay increases.

Need for Increases.—Plans and specifications for the construction of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden have been revised to scale down the project to ensure that it does not exceed the available funds. A bid award is expected in February 1970 with construction to begin in March. Based on this information, a thorough review of work necessary to complete the Museum and place it in operation has been made. It was on the basis of this information that reprogramming of $150,000 for the use of the Hirshhorn Museum was requested and approved. It is clear that in order to bring this major new museum into existence, a dramatic step-up of operating program activity must take place during the two-year building construction period. This will require a very substantial increase in program funds over this period if a public opening date of October 1972 (nine months after the completion of the building) is to be met.

Major additional funding requirements are in two categories: preparation of the collections, and the acquisition of furnishings and special equipment for the building. In fiscal year 1971, the Museum is seeking additional funds to accelerate preparation of the collections.

Some 1,200 paintings and pieces of sculpture of the total gift collection of 7,000 items must be readied for exhibition. These will be the choicest pieces with an estimated value of $20 million. Of these 1,200 items, 700 are paintings and 500 are sculpture pieces. A careful survey of the restoration and framing requirements of these items has disclosed the following:

1. 100 large paintings (6 to 15 feet) will need major restoration at an average cost of $1,000 each ($100,000) and 50 will require work at $300 each ($15,000).
2. 350 smaller paintings will require restoration at prices ranging from $250 to $500 ($150,000).
3. 500 paintings must be framed at prices ranging from $45 to $200 for a total cost of $57,000.
4. 400 sculpture pieces, including about 150 which are classed as monumental, will need restoration at prices ranging from $100 to $750. Estimated total cost of the job will be $170,000 which includes protective display cases for the smaller pieces of fragile sculpture, and the construction of bases for approximately 170 items.

To meet part of these costs, an additional $160,000 are requested to meet the Museum’s opening date. This work must be greatly accelerated and a production
rate of at least one item a day must be maintained. Since conservators are in short supply and one piece may take many weeks to restore, premium prices may have to be paid, although an intensive search will be made to locate additional conservators.

A commensurate increase in professional and technical staff is required to prepare for the Museum's opening and subsequent exhibition and research programs. This staff must: receive and process the approximate 500 new works of art being added to the collection each year by Mr. Hirshhorn; negotiate with conservators and other contractors, and follow up on work progress; conduct research and documentation for the opening exhibition as well as continue with the cataloging of the entire collection; and continue the Museum's present public services such as loans, photographic requests, and research queries. Conservation, photography, and storage facilities also must be planned. Museum administrative budget, personnel, and fiscal business must be handled. This increased staff will cost $50,000 and will include a curator, two exhibits technicians, three museum technicians, and a clerk-typist. A gradual phased buildup of essential staff members over the next two years makes sense in lieu of current and future Museum needs.

An additional $165,000 are requested for other contractual service costs related to the collections, the rental of warehouse space and warehouse services (moving items in and out of storage for inspection, conservation, framing, etc.), photography to document the collections for exhibits planning and research purposes, and protective packing for shipping once restoration has been performed. Major trips to art museums and galleries for research will be necessary as well as trips to various collection storage areas.

Mr. Bradley. As an administrator and not as a lawyer—but I have to carry out the law—let me say this is a conditional gift. It was subject to our accomplishing certain things. We have accomplished—we, the United States, the Congress—thank goodness, the President did his part—everyone has passed no less than a dozen different checkpoints, where we had to do something to keep the conditional gift alive. We are right with it.

This represents a collection, title to which has not been passed, but title to which must be passed—there is nothing optional about this—upon our completion of the building, which is under construction, and on which we have a total contract to complete.

Mr. Thompson. I understand that.

I might say that, after a rather cursory examination of the list of artworks in the Hirshhorn collection, I entered a statement in the record at that time saying that I thought it seemed to be a splendid collection. I am simply trying to clarify to the greatest possible extent any public criticism that there has been since then. It isn't my intention to harass you.

I want these questions answered because it is my responsibility.

Mr. Blitzer. Might I quote a paragraph written by our General Counsel?

On the narrower question of the legality of spending appropriated funds for preparing for exhibit that portion of the collection before legal title thereto is fully vested in the Smithsonian, such expenditures are proper where they "reasonably appear to be incident to and essential in the accomplishment of the authorized purposes of the appropriation."

Clearly, the preparation of the works of art is essential to the opening of the museum for the public. A case in point is the opening of the National Gallery of Art, where during construction of the building and prior to the transfer of the Mellon collection to the Smithsonian in 1941, appropriations were authorized and expended for these same purposes in 1939 and 1940.

Mr. Thompson. I would like that letter for a matter of the record. (The letter referred to follows:)
USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS IN PREPARING WORKS OF ART FOR THE OPENING OF THE
JOSEPH H. Hirshhorn MUSEUM AND SCULPTURE GARDEN

Public Law 89–788, 20 U.S.C. §§ 76aa–ee, established the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, effective November 7, 1966, under the basic authority of the Board of Regents for “the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men.” 20 U.S.C. §§ 41, 42. Appropriations were specifically authorized for the operation of the Museum, and the Regents were empowered to employ a director, an administrator, and two curators for the “efficient administration” of the Museum. 20 U.S.C. §§ 76dd, 76ee.

Contemporaneously with the passage of Public Law 89–788, and pursuant to this express Congressional mandate to open and operate the Museum, the Smithsonian submitted to the Bureau of the Budget a request for the first increment of funds for the five-year program necessary to staff the Museum and prepare for the opening. These funds, as well as those requested and appropriated for Fiscal Years 1969 and 1970, were clearly identified in the budget submissions to the Appropriations Committees, specifying the purposes, including cataloguing, research, and the selection, conservation, and restoration of about one-sixth of the collection for the initial opening to the public.

This interpretation and implementation of the requirements of Public Law 89–788 has been accepted by the Smithsonian from the outset and has been consistently reaffirmed by the Congress in the three years following the passage of the Act. Any other course of action would have required a finding that Congress intended the museum building, constructed at public expense, to remain closed to the public for as much as five years after its completion. Such a view is without any support whatever in the language of the Act or in its legislative history.

On the narrower question of the legality of expending appropriated funds for preparing for exhibit a portion of the collection before legal title thereto is fully vested in the Smithsonian, such expenditures are proper where they “reasonably appear to be incident to and essential in the accomplishment of the authorized purposes of the appropriation.” 42 Comp. Gen. 480 (1963) at p. 485; See also 46 Comp. Gen. 25 (1966). Clearly the preparation of the works of art is essential to the opening of the Museum to the public. A case in point is the opening of the National Gallery of Art, where, during construction of the building and prior to the transfer of the Mellon collection to the Smithsonian in 1941, appropriations were authorized and expended for these same purposes in 1939 and 1940.*

In summary, there is no legal bar to the appropriation and expenditure of funds for the expeditions opening and operating of the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, including the preparation of selected works of art for exhibition.

April 23, 1970.  Peter G. Powers,
General Counsel, Smithsonian Institution.

I note that the legislation calls for the appointment of trustees, Mr. Bradley. They have not been appointed, have they?

Mr. Bradley. Not yet, sir, no. They are in process in that names have been submitted to the White House. There has been some discussion about biographies and so forth.

*This reference to the National Gallery as a parallel case was based on Section 3 of the Act of March 24, 1937, which states that: “Upon completion of the National Gallery of Art, the board shall accept for the Smithsonian Institution as a gift from the donor a collection of works of art which shall be housed and exhibited in the National Gallery of Art.” 20 U.S.C. 73, and on the amendment to that Act, approved April 15, 1939, which states that “For these purposes, and to provide prior to the completion of the National Gallery of Art, for the protection and care of the works of art in said Gallery and for administrative and operating expenses and equipment preparatory to the opening of the Gallery to the public, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.” 53 Stat. 577. It has been brought to my attention that, notwithstanding the specific provisions of the Act, title to the Mellon collection was transferred to the Smithsonian on June 24, 1937, and that the funds appropriated, under the amendment, to the National Gallery of Art for fiscal years 1940 and 1941 were spent not on the works of art themselves, but rather on the preparation, staffing, and maintenance of the building, title to which was transferred to the Smithsonian on November 30, 1940. However, since this opinion is based on the provisions of the Act of November 7, 1966, to provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden (Public Law 89–788, 20 U.S.C. 76aa–ee), and on the cited opinions of the Comptroller General, the premises and conclusion of the opinion are not affected by the differences between the present case and that of the National Gallery.

August 18, 1970.

Three terms have expired at this point. And yet no one has been appointed a trustee. What efforts have you people made to have the trustees appointed by the President?

Mr. Bradley. We have corresponded with Mr. Hirshhorn, who has nominated enough candidates so that four may be appointed by the President.

We have alerted the Board of Regents, and they have agreed upon a certain number, possibly 13, from which the President can appoint four. We have two ex-officio members, the Chief Justice and the Secretary of the Smithsonian.

Mr. Thompson. Yet of those not to be appointed by the President, but appointed from other sources, none have been appointed?

Mr. Bradley. All of them are appointed by the President initially.

Mr. Thompson. So, in effect, what you are doing is performing the functions of the board of trustees in the absence of one. Is that correct?

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Thompson, I don't think that we are performing the actions of the board of trustees. We have had a long experience in getting a museum actually under construction. It was our judgment that we didn't need a board of trustees until we had something for the board to do.

Mr. Thompson. You do interpret, notwithstanding that you don't yet have title to the collection, that there is a museum in fact, do you not?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. Under that interpretation, you have made a determination that what you are doing with respect to curatorial work and so on is perfectly legitimate, there being a museum in existence?

Mr. Bradley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. And yet, it would seem to me that if there is in fact a museum in existence as you interpret it, that certainly then it should be imperative that the trustees be appointed.

Mr. Bradley. Sir, may I examine just quickly?

Mr. Thompson. Let me follow with the question. You made reference to Mr. Hirshhorn and his nominees. He hasn't yet nominated anyone?

Mr. Bradley. He has, sir, to the White House.

Mr. Thompson. They are being screened?

Mr. Bradley. Oh, yes, to be sure.

I think the basis I would like to offer you is this. The function of the trustees run to matters of art, not to matters of administration. Administration is vested in the Secretary under the regents.

There have been that I know of no trading in art, no determinations made as to the policy about art, and no determinations made about the exhibition of art.

Mr. Thompson. How, then, is the distinguished curator, Mr. Lerner proceeding?

Mr. Bradley. He is proceeding with an existing collection, plus a supplemental collection that Mr. Hirshhorn is going to give to us.

Mr. Thompson. But doesn't this involve working with art?
Mr. Bradley. Indeed, it does, sir.
Mr. Thompson. Then I don’t understand what you just said.
Mr. Bradley. Then I would like to say it again.

The trustees are vested rather uniquely with final determination in matters of art. The donor is proceeding to purchase art. He could purchase art whether we had a board of trustees or not and offer it. If they don’t want it, they don’t take it.

Mr. Thompson. As a matter of fact, he could until title passes purchase a work of art and put into the collection and take one out; could he not?

Mr. Bradley. He could.

Mr. Thompson. Let’s assume you determine, or the curator does, that he is preparing things now or looking after things now. Let’s assume he works on five works of art. And before title passes, Mr. Hirshhorn says, “I think I will take those out, replace them with five others.” He could do that; could he not?

Mr. Bradley. He could, sir.

The act also provides that any money that results from any exchange, purchase or sale of works of art remains to the credit of the Hirshhorn collection.

Mr. Thompson. Would that cover any possible losses, although that is highly doubtful?

Mr. Bradley. It would carry whatever the proceeds turned out to be. We would hope that they would not be losses.

Mr. Thompson. If there were losses, Mr. Hirshhorn would replace those losses?

Mr. Bradley. I don’t think that that follows: I think it is this. When you get through, if you do any trading, whatever cash is available stays with the fund for the use of the board of trustees when they come.

Mr. Thompson. I assume in the absence of a board of trustees it would stay in escrow until such time as you have them. Otherwise no valid, no legal action could be taken with respect to it.

What percentage of this collection, Mr. Lerner, is being prepared for exhibit?

Mr. Lerner. We expect to open the building with approximately 1,200 works of art—I don’t know the percentage—1,200 out of approximately 7,000.

Mr. Thompson. For your preparation, you expect to expend approximately $600,000?

Mr. Lerner. Yes, for the preparation of the works of art.

Mr. Thompson. Your theory being obviously that as soon as that building is completed and you can get it open with works of art in it, you intend to do so?

Mr. Lerner. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thompson. What is the projected completion date?

Mr. Bradley. Sir, the fall of 1972. And then there would be a pause while we try to move in and get things hung. So it might be 6 to 9 months later, early in 1973, calendar 1973, to open to the public.

Mr. Thompson. When the building is complete and you are ready to move into it, you are going to move these works of art from New York and/or Connecticut—the sculpture, in particular—to Washington.

Mr. Hirshhorn under the contract would pay that expense, would he not?
Mr. Blitzer. Sir, he is committed to deliver the collection to the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. Thompson. Obviously he is committed to deliver it from Connecticut or New York to Washington?

Mr. Blitzer. I haven't really faced that question.

Mr. Bradley. We are troubled by a technicality.

In trying to be accurate, let me say, we do accept deliveries in Arizona, Cambridge, and the Panama Canal Zone and elsewhere. I think that, since we have in Washington, in this instance, the building here, it would call for delivery to Washington.

(The information follows:)

The Smithsonian later informed the subcommittee that deliveries are accepted in Arizona, Cambridge, Mass., the Panama Canal Zone, New York, Washington, D.C. and satellite tracking stations and foreign currency research sites worldwide.

Mr. Thompson. At Mr. Hirshhorn's expense?

Mr. Bradley. Exactly.

(The letter referred to follows:)

Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampleman,

Hon. James Bradley,
Under Secretary,
Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Bradley: This firm, as you know, serves as counsel to Joseph H. Hirshhorn and to The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, Inc. and, as such, assisted in the drafting of the Agreement of May 17, 1966 between the Smithsonian Institution, Mr. Hirshhorn, and The Hirshhorn Foundation.

We understand that at the recent hearings of the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials, a question was raised as to the payment of expenses of delivering the Hirshhorn collections to the Smithsonian at the time of completion of the museum building and passage of title to the collections. The Agreement provides, in pertinent part, that the collections "shall be delivered to the Institution at the expense of the Donor and the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation" [Article Fourth]. Because the Smithsonian operates both in and out of Washington, D.C., and because the Agreement is silent as to the city in which delivery is to be made, the question has been raised as to whether or not Mr. Hirshhorn and The Foundation will pay the expenses of delivery to the Institution in Washington, D.C.

It is our opinion, and I am authorized to state that Mr. Hirshhorn and The Foundation fully share this opinion and intend to proceed accordingly, that the expenses of delivery of the collections to the Smithsonian in Washington, D.C. are to be borne entirely by Mr. Hirshhorn and The Hirshhorn Foundation.

Sincerely yours,

Stephen P. Goldman.

Mr. Thompson. This has been very interesting. But I am afraid the second bells of the quorum having rung, we should adjourn. The subcommittee does not have permission to sit during general debate today.

We will adjourn to meet tomorrow, in room 2257.

Would you gentlemen like to continue tomorrow? Or do you think that you have finished?

Mr. Bradley. We are at your pleasure, sir.

Mr. Thompson. Why don't we consider for the moment, at least, and with appreciation, that we will go on to other subjects. And if any subsequent questions arise, we will ask you to come back.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Roger Stevens has a written statement which he would like placed in the record. It will be included at this point.
(Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene on Wednesday, July 29, 1970.)

(The statement referred to follows:)

**Statement of Roger L. Stevens, Chairman, Board of Trustees, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Before the Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials, of the U.S. House of Representatives**

Mr. Chairman, I have put my remarks into written form, because at the time of preparing this statement, it does not appear that I will be available to testify in person on the days of the hearings.

I understand there has been some criticism at your committee hearings on the Smithsonian Institution regarding the proposed Hirshhorn project. I think instead of criticism, the Smithsonian should be given a great deal of credit for having pulled off an artistic coup of major importance, and special credit should go to Dillon Ripley for his part in securing the artistic treasures of Joseph Hirshhorn for the City of Washington, as well as the Nation.

As you may remember, at the time of the negotiations I was Assistant to President Johnson on the Arts and felt strongly that this collection should belong to the Nation's Capital. I therefore arranged for Mr. Ripley to meet Mr. Hirshhorn at his house in Connecticut. Mr. Ripley and I both devoted considerable time from then on in finalizing an arrangement with Mr. Hirshhorn, and it was only because of the assurance of backing from the Smithsonian that we were able to secure the collection for Washington. Ironically, the greatest obstacle in working out arrangements with Mr. Hirshhorn was the fear on the part of both him and his attorney that unreasonable political attacks might be made on Mr. Hirshhorn.

Needless to say, I wanted to be assured of the quality of the collection and checked it out with Alfred Frankfurter, who was considered at that time to be one of the most knowledgeable art critics in the country and editor of the prestigious Art News. He told me at that time that in his opinion Mr. Hirshhorn owned the finest collection of modern sculpture in private hands and that he also owned many fine paintings. Since Mr. Frankfurter was a close friend of mine, I did not ask him to put his opinions in writing. There did not seem to be any need for this at the time. Incidentally, Mr. Frankfurter died shortly after the arrangements with Mr. Hirshhorn had been worked out, making it impossible to secure a written opinion now.

You have undoubtedly heard that official representatives of the British Government were very anxious to secure the collection and offered a plot in Regents Park for a museum which would be named after Mr. Hirshhorn. Also, the Israeli Government was making very attractive offers to Mr. Hirshhorn, as well as the cities of Rome and Florence. In this country, the Los Angeles Museum was making every effort to secure the collection, as was the Museum in Baltimore—and finally the toughest competition of all came from Governor Rockefeller on behalf of the State University of New York. Certainly, if anyone would know the value of a collection of modern art, Governor Rockefeller would, as he was at one time the head of the Museum of Modern Art and is an important collector.

Since there has been some criticism of the museum being named after Mr. Hirshhorn, even though there is the precedent of the Freer Gallery and the Smithsonian itself, I must point out that this is the one condition that Mr. Hirshhorn wanted for parting with a collection that was his life-long hobby and love, and any of the contenders mentioned above would have been willing to grant that condition.

I might add that this important collection, along with that of the National Gallery, the Freer, the Corcoran, the Phillips Gallery, the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts, provide Washington with artistic resources that are only excelled by New York City, which, after all, is the world's leading Center for the visual arts at the moment.

I do hope, after investigation, that your Committee will give proper recognition to Mr. Hirshhorn for his important contribution to the City of Washington and to Dillon Ripley, whose persuasiveness and salesmanship finalized the acquisition.