portant things, as arranging to keep the library open at all hours for the staff. Previously it was closed nightly at 10 p.m. and during weekends. (When Ripley arrived at the Smithsonian, he found many curious practices in effect. For example, as Secretary he was required to sign all checks for supplies and services—about 1500 a month. One of these included a 7-cent refund to Harvard. It took 4 months of negotiations with the U.S. Treasury to transfer this function to a check-signing machine.)

"The great strength of the Institution," Ripley said in a recent interview, "is its ability to renew itself at its own springs and sources. In the early days, we were a research institute, in contrast to the colleges that then existed. The levels have risen, and now it should be our function to serve as an institute for advanced study.

"Where would I like to see the Smithsonian 10 years from now? I would like to see it as a center for research and scholarship. I would like to see our collections used creatively and across disciplinary lines. You know, a skillfully presented anatomical exhibit can be as meaningful as a book. Collections should be a tool; they should not rule you.

"There are many contributions that we are uniquely equipped to make to contemporary science. Our young people have been led to believe that systematic and environmental biology are exhausted fields. I think it is criminal that this impression is being sold to them. There are vast areas about which we know little or nothing. Throughout the world, more and more genetically distinct systems are being eliminated by man-made environmental changes before we have a chance to study them. The Smithsonian pioneered in studying our west before it was overrun by man; I would like us to lead the way in studying the tropics, where vast man-made changes are now in the works, before whole species are eliminated without our ever having known of their existence.

"I think we are the organization to do this. But we cannot do it until we begin to think of ourselves as a research institution. We should not be dominated by our collections, or 'in' boxes, or the scientific apathy that settled on this place."

In his quest to restore the Smithsonian to an influential position in scientific research, Ripley is the beneficiary of a number of fortunate circumstances.

On 17 and 18 September, the 200th anniversary of the birth of James Smithson, founder of the Smithsonian Institution, will be observed in Washington with a gathering of scientists and scholars from throughout the world. The speakers will include J. Robert Oppenheimer, Lewis Mumford, G. Evelyn Hutchinson, Jerome Bruner, Herbert Butterfield, Kenneth Clark, and Fred L. Whipple. More than 700 persons from at least 90 countries are expected to attend.

First of all, universities have pretty well dropped out of systematic biology —to a large extent simply because of the amount of space required for useful collections—and, as a result, the Smithsonian's efforts to expand in this area do not threaten any existing institution. In addition, no government agency has any reason to feel threatened by the Smithsonian's ambitions; to the contrary, some of the research-supporting agencies feel a bit guilty about having neglected the area of concern staked out by Ripley, and they are happy to see someone come forward to do something about it. Finally, the Smithsonian enjoys a unique relationship with Congress, and Ripley can reasonably count upon congressional support for his request to raise the institution's annual appropriation for operations from the present $15.4 million to $20.8 million. (The institution also received $8.4 million in grants and contracts last year, as well as separate funds for its long-range construction program.)

The basis of the Smithsonian's good relationship with Congress rests on the fact that Congress tends to think of the Smithsonian as its own charge, rather than as a branch of the Executive. The institution's board of regents is appointed by joint resolution of Congress, and in recent years the regents have included the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the subcommittee that handles the Smithsonian's budget. Furthermore, like museums in most large cities, the Smithsonian plays something of a chic role in Washington social life. When it opened a new bird house at the Zoo last month it marked the occasion with a black-tie reception which a large part of official Washington happily attended.

It also appears that official Washington has taken a liking to S. Dillon Ripley. He has a degree of urbanity, wit, and fine tailoring that is not commonplace in the trade of science administrator. One of his first moves was to restore to mid-19th-century decor the executive suite that once served as Joseph Henry's home in the Lombard Romanesque Smithsonian "castle" on Washington's Mall. It now contains a rolltop desk for one of Ripley's secretaries, wooden shutters, Victorian chairs in red damask and patterned velvet, carpets specially woven from period patterns, a Tiffany clock, and burnished brass and glass chandeliers. The ladies, and not a few of the men, of official Washington love it, and, to a remarkable extent, they seem to be under the spell of the man who brought it about and who plans to restore the Smithsonian to the place of influence that it once occupied in American science.

—D. S. GREENBERG

Space: A White House Endorsement and a NASA View on the Attitudes of Scientists toward the Program

When Lyndon Johnson was Senate Majority Leader he sponsored the legislation that established NASA. And when he was Vice President he presided over the National Space Council. In that position he played a key part in setting the moon-landing goal and in boosting NASA from a $2-billion to a $5-billion-a-year budget.

Now that Johnson is President, how does space stand in his affections? According to Vice President Humphrey, it couldn't be higher. Standing at the President's side in Washington at a recent public briefing on the Mariner spacecraft now en route to Mars, Humphrey made it clear that critics of the space program aren't likely to find any support in the White House. The President, he stated, is the "father" of the space program. "He has put his heart into it, his spirit into it, his hands into it and his mind to it. And the fact that he was the author of the Space Act and not only authored it but shepherded it to success and then nourished it into fulfillment is, I think, the real strength, the real underpinning of this program.

"The President of the United States, with all of his many duties, still has

this great program close to his heart," Humphrey declared. "He has told me many times that of all the endeavors in this government that were fascinating, interesting, and would have impact on the future, the space program was it. And he has admonished me to take a keen interest in it."

Meanwhile, for the remaining doubters, Edgar M. Cortright, NASA's deputy associate administrator for Space Science and Applications, has offered answers to 13 "tough" questions about space. His forum was last week's meeting in Los Angeles of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics. On the question, "Do many scientists really oppose the space program," Cortright answered as follows:

"No, most of them support it. The hundreds of scientists actually conducting flight experiments in the space sciences are, of course, enthusiastic supporters. Thousands who are not directly involved are also strongly behind the program. I believe they recognize that the space program is a terrific shot-in-the-arm for science, engineering, and education in this country. Anyone who doesn't believe this need only talk to a typical youth of today.

"Some opposition, however, comes from sincere men on intellectual grounds. They may object," Cortright continued, "to the way some aspect of space science is being handled, or they may object to the emphasis on space science vis-a-vis other branches of science.

"The only opposition that is really annoying is that based on self-service or misinformation. In one recent critique which made the front pages across the country, the scientist certainly failed to apply the scientific method. He criticized a major new project for confining itself to a particular objective and neglecting other areas which, in his judgment, held a higher probability of scientific return. All of our public announcements, however, had clearly stated that his recommended objectives were an integral part of the program. When asked, he was unaware of this fact. Fortunately, these problems are relatively rare. Constructive criticism is healthy and we take it very seriously. We are particularly attentive to criticism from the scientific community which renders such invaluable service to the program, and which, in turn, is served."

As to the identity of the scientist who "failed to apply the scientific method," a NSA spokesman said that Cortright prefers not to name him. Inquiry among space critics who have recently "made the front pages" failed to turn up anyone who wasn't willing to stand by his criticism as originally stated.

Another question to which Cortright addressed himself was: "Have we compromised our scientific integrity in 'selling' our programs to Congress?"

His reply, in part, was: "There are certainly many pressures which could lead to such compromises. The answer, however, is a loud 'No!' Integrity is insured by placing leadership in the hands of trustworthy men. It is important to recognize, however, that the leaders of our space program are expected to make decisions. They go to Congress with the best programs they can devise after hearing from all sides and weighing all the arguments. They do not present a shopping list with all the pros and cons and ask Congress to make the decisions for them. Where their judgement is subject to doubt, I have never found Congress reluctant to ask for more information."—D.S.G.

Announcements

The **Puerto Rican Nuclear Center** has begun a 3-month period of irradiation of a plot of lower montane rain forest at El Verde, P.R., with gamma irradiation from 10,000 curies of cesium. The PRNC is studying ecological and cytological effects, under the auspices of the AEC's division of biology and medicine. Scientists who wish to make specific measurements in the post-irradiation period should contact H. T. Odum, PRNC, Bio-Medical Building, Caparra Heights Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00935.

Meeting Notes

The third international symposium on **natural mammalian hibernation** will be held at the University of Toronto 13–16 September. Attendance is by invitation, extended to persons active in the field. Scientists who wish to attend the meeting may contact the Hibernation Information Exchange, c/o A. R. Dawe, Office of Naval Research, Branch Office, 219 South Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill. 60604.

A limited number of papers discussing recent results in the area will be accepted for presentation during the symposium. Abstracts of up to 300 words are required. Deadline: *1 April.* (F. E. South, Jr., Dept. of Physiology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins)

Grants, Fellowships, and Awards

The Pacific Science Center Foundation, Seattle, recently created the **Arches of Science** award to honor persons in all professions who have made "notable contributions to the better understanding of the meaning of science to contemporary man." The award, consisting of $25,000 and a gold medal, will be presented for the first time in October. It is being underwritten by the Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Company. The Center welcomes letters of nomination from organizations; individuals may not recommend themselves. The recipient of the award will be selected by a 12-member committee headed by Dael Wolfle, executive officer of AAAS. Other members include George C. Martin, the Boeing Company, Seattle, Washington; Allen Astin, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C.; Frank Capra, Fallbrook, California; Norton Clapp, Weyerhaeuser Company, Tacoma, Washington; John Gardner, Carnegie Corporation, New York City; Robert Hansberger, Boise Cascade Corporation, Boise, Idaho; James H. Jensen, Oregon State University, Corvallis; Robert Loeb, Medical College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York; Abbott Mills, Federal Reserve System, Portland, Oregon; Charles Odegaard, University of Washington, Seattle; and Gerard Piel, *Scientific American,* New York City. Nominations must be received by *1 June.* (Pacific Science Center Foundation, 200 Second Avenue, North, Seattle, Washington)

Scientists in the News

The winner of the 1964 AAAS Socio-Psychological prize is **Stanley Milgram**, assistant professor in the department of social relations at Harvard University. His paper was entitled "Some Conditions of Obedience and Disobedience to Authority."