



THE ANTARCTICAN SOCIETY

905 North Jacksonville Street
Arlington, Virginia 22205

HONORARY PRESIDENT — AMBASSADOR PAUL C. DANIELS

Presidents:

Dr. Carl R. Eklund, 1959-61
Dr. Paul A. Siple, 1961-2
Mr. Gordon D. Cartwright, 1962-3
RADM David M. Tyree (Ret.), 1963-4
Mr. George R. Toney, 1964-5
Mr. Morton J. Rubin, 1965-6
Dr. Albert P. Crary, 1966-8
Dr. Henry M. Dater, 1968-70
Mr. George A. Doumani, 1970-1
Dr. William J. L. Sladen, 1971-3
Mr. Peter F. Bernel, 1973-5
Dr. Kenneth J. Bertrand, 1975-7
Mrs. Paul A. Siple, 1977-8
Dr. Paul C. Dalrymple, 1978-80
Dr. Meredith F. Burrill, 1980-82

Vol. 81-82

June

No. 7

SOCIETY BOOK AUCTION TO BE HELD ON JULY 10th (see p. 10)

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT TO NEWSLETTER ON CELEBRATING ANNIVERSARY OF POLAR
YEARS, WITH COMMENTS ON HOPED-FOR REUNIONS. READ IT! SEND COMMENTS! PLEASE!

OLD TIME FAVORITE

(at old time prices!)

\$8.50

ANNUAL MID-WINTER PICNIC EXTRAVAGANZA

at

STRONGHOLD

Comus, Maryland

Saturday, July 10th 2 p.m. to sundown

Honorary Members:

Ambassador Paul C. Daniels
Dr. Laurence McKinley Gould
Count Emilio Pucci
Sir Charles S. Wright
Mr. Hugh Blackwell Evans
Dr. Henry M. Dater
Mr. August Howard

Memorial Lecturers:

Dr. William J. L. Sladen, 1964
RADM David M. Tyree (Ret.), 1965
Dr. Roger Tory Peterson, 1966
Dr. J. Campbell Craddock, 1967
Mr. James Pranke, 1968
Dr. Henry M. Dater, 1970
Mr. Peter M. Scott, 1971
Dr. Frank T. Davies, 1972
Mr. Scott McVay, 1973
Mr. Joseph O. Fletcher, 1974
Mr. Herman R. Friis, 1975
Dr. Kenneth J. Bertrand, 1976
Dr. William J. L. Sladen, 1977
Dr. J. Murray Mitchell, Jr., 1978
Dr. Laurence McKinley Gould, 1979
Dr. Charles R. Bentley, 1980

Charlie Morrison and Mike Metzgar, tried and true "baristers," will once again set up shop under the oaks and provide cool, refreshing libations at most nominal prices for all thirsty penguins and friends of penguins. Bill Cooke, ancient and honorable bartender, will serve as official Society taster, making sure that all beverages meet his highest professional standards.

Comus Inn will once again cater. This year we have chosen the luncheon. For \$8.50 per plate (goes by plate used, not by head count) one gets baked ham, roast turkey, chicken salad, coleslaw, 3-bean salad, potatoes au gratin, hot rolls, beverage, and ice cream. Fantastic price!

And a movie (to be selected) on snow and ice. Bring your youngsters. Let them climb Sugar Loaf Mountain alone. Good possibility you might even lose one or two!

Stronghold is impossible to reach, but Antarcticans do the impossible. So get off the Beltway onto Route 270 North and head towards Frederick. After you go past the Clarksburg exit, slow down, as 4.3 miles farther down the road will be the exit for "Hyattstown-Comus." Circle under 1-270, follow Route 109 for 3.3 miles to Comus. Turn right on Route 95 and go 2.5 miles. When you come to intersection, cross over, and 1/4 of a mile farther you will find a road turning off to the right, going upslope. Go up this road, pass the first house, and turn into the parking lot below the next house - Stronghold. Take your lawn chairs out, and join the party.

Send your check to Ruth at the Society's address. THIS WILL BE YOUR RESERVATION!

DO IT NOW!

Talk given by Dr. Robert H. Rutford to the Antarctic Society, Washington, D. C.
April 1, 1982

ANTARCTICA: U. S. ACTIVITIES IN THE NATIONAL AND
INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

"Antarctica, the continent lying concentrically about the South Pole. The land mass, almost wholly obscured by a continental ice sheet, lacks an indigenous population and is without an economic base, but it is important as an area of large scale international cooperation in scientific research, conservation, and logistic operations."

Those words, from the Encyclopaedia Britannica, repeated as the introduction to the award winning film highlighting the science activities of the United States in Antarctica, describe a part of the world which, for most of us gathered here tonight, occupies a special place in our hearts and minds. It is a place of extremes. As the environment of that continent is extreme so are the attitudes of those who have been there; it is a place one either loves or hates. For me it is a part of the world that has held my interest for many years. It has provided an opportunity for me to meet people, to do research, to lead people, and most of all, it, Antarctica, and all of the people involved in the activities there, regardless of nationality, have been good to me, my family, and my professional career.

It is indeed a special honor for me to stand before you this evening to present the Memorial Lecture for 1982, to join the special few who have been invited by the Antarctic Society to deliver a message to this elite group in our nation's capitol. I am humbled by the shadow of those who have been here before me, especially my friends and colleagues Cam Craddock, Joe Fletcher, Bob Nichols, and the Dean of U. S. Antarctic scientists, Larry McKinley Gould.

As most of you are well aware, I have had a continuing involvement with the U. S. activities in Antarctica, one that to my knowledge is unique. My initial contact with the program began in Greenland in 1955-56 when, as a U.S. Army lieutenant, I first met the Seabees from the U. S. Navy, who later would make the trip from Little America to Byrd Station along with Phil Smith and others. (We had in Greenland the large LGP D-8's for testing and operation. Tractors like these went to Antarctica and still are in operation there.)

In 1959 I first went to Antarctica as a graduate student, worked with several different groups including a New Zealand party in Victoria Valley. In 1960 I returned as Deputy Leader of a Minnesota party headed for the Ellsworth Mountains, a trip that ended in the Jones Mountains where we became the first field party put into the field by LC-130 aircraft. I can still remember that we landed at least 15 miles from the closest rock! We then taxied in close and we explored this area in the tradition of the two Roberts-Scott and Nichols-by man-hauling! Fifty years of progress in Antarctic transportation!

In 1963 I returned to lead a helicopter supported geologic mapping party in the Ellsworth Mountains and had the fantastic experience of discovering the first Glossopteris in West Antarctica in the northern Sentinel Range. The work from that season became the basis of a Ph.D. dissertation completed some years later.

A second visit to the Jones Mountains in 1968 led to a decision to never return to Antarctica. This was then followed by trips in 1973-74, 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77, and 1979-80, the first two as Director of the Ross Ice Shelf Project, the next two as Director of the Division of Polar Programs at NSF. The most recent trip was as a field assistant to George Denton in the Ellsworth Mountains. My participation in Antarctic affairs continues through my activities as a member of the Polar Research Board, Convenor of the SCAR Group of Specialists on the Antarctic Environmental Implications of Mineral Exploration and Exploitation, and as a member of the U.S. delegation to the past two Treaty meetings.

Thus, it may be that my involvement with this program has allowed me to wear more hats than almost anyone else. My involvement now covers over 25 years, and it is with this background that I suggest to you this evening that we take a hard and critical look at the U.S. involvement in Antarctica from both a national and international point of view.

The U.S. program in Antarctica-USARP or USAP, is currently operated and funded through the Division of Polar Programs of the National Science Foundation. The Division of Polar Programs had its beginning during the IGY, when the U.S. National Committee for the IGY worked with NSF to fund Antarctic research.

Dr. Tom Jones was appointed Antarctic Program Director in 1958, and by 1960 the staff had grown to seven. Two members of that staff continue with DPP today.

In the early 1960's Dr. Jones reported to the Director's Office. The staff was growing. A ship, the *Eltanin*, was to become part of the operation, and by early 1963 the Office of Antarctic Programs (OAP) was made a part of the International Activities Division. As the Foundation underwent reorganization, the administrative home of OAP changed also to the Division of Mathematical Physical and Engineering Sciences, then the Division of Environmental Sciences, and by early 1970 it joined the National and International Programs Directorate. The addition of Arctic duties in 1970 saw a name change to Office of Polar Programs.

In 1976 following another reorganization, the Office became the Division of Polar Programs in the Directorate for Astronomical, Atmospheric, Earth, and Ocean Sciences, and it remains with that Directorate today.

In addition to these organizational changes, the role of the Division has undergone considerable change. From a very humble beginning in IGY, the Office grew in size but the role of operational leadership in Antarctica continued to be provided by the U. S. Navy as it had been during the IGY. During the 1960's this dual role continued with NSF responsible for Science, the Navy for operations, and while the system worked, it was my view that it often worked in spite of itself.

In 1970 an Antarctic Policy Group (really a three agency troika of Department of State, Department of Defense, and National Science Foundation) led to the recommendation that the funding for Antarctic programs be consolidated, and in 1971 OMB Circular A-51 (.Revised) was issued. This document spelled out quite specifically the responsibilities of NSF, the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Department of Transportation, for the Antarctic Program. The consolidation of the Antarctic budget into a single budget line,

and the transfer of budget elements from other agencies to NSF began, with the "culmination" of that effort reached in 1976. Thus, the budget for DPP grew during this period to reach about \$30 million in 1976, actually closer to \$50 million if we include funds for purchase of two LC-130s.

The management of NSF was never too comfortable with this growth, and it also found itself continually defending the budget for the Antarctic program both from without and within. The other divisions and many members of the National Science Board failed to comprehend that this growth was a result of the transfer of function as well as budget, and the DPP budget soon became the target for many suggestions that a reduction "here" could result in a budget boost "there".

During the early to mid "70's, the Antarctic Program was impacted by the buzz words "Environment" and "Resources", and the budget for DPP began to show these subdivisions in the request budget. It was during this time that the decision was made to tie up the Eltanin, and the Antarctic program budget became more difficult to maintain at a satisfactory level.

In 1975 a second Antarctic Policy Group review of the program management and budget was conducted. Involvement within the Federal Government was still largely limited to NSF, DOD, and DOS although others signed off on the final document. It was, however, the beginning of a significant change in the internal decision making process within the Executive Branch of the government, as the APG was now expanded by the Carter administration to include all agencies who might have some interest in the Antarctic. The Living Resource and Mineral Resource issues suddenly found people from other agencies becoming Antarctic "experts" overnight; some of those "experts" still cannot spell Antarctica, try as they may; others have and continue to provide excellent input into the APG process and the Treaty activities.

It was somewhat shocking for some to see these new kids on the block elbow their way to the table, and to get involved in determining national policy for the conduct of Antarctic affairs. The influence and leadership of NSF in consort with DOD and DOS was reduced at this time; the procedural changes combined with personnel changes resulted in a very different mix in the cast of characters dealing with both domestic and international U.S. Antarctic affairs.

All of this occurred at the same time that the final decisions regarding management of the U.S. program were being implemented; decisions which once and for all established NSF as the single point manager for planning, budgeting and managing the U.S. Antarctic Program.

It is my perception that the change in APG policy, the changes in key personnel, and the move to single point management, while potentially of great benefit to the program, all came at the same time and were a bit too much to handle. The opportunity to establish NSF as the leader was not fully realized by NSF leadership at that time. In my personal view this was the time for NSF to move into the driver's seat and to become the "Lead Agency" in a manner and style that it deserved.

NSF had been handed the management of a national program—one that had lots of appeal to the citizens of the U.S.—a program that was increasingly becoming part of the international scene.

While I am well aware that the lead agency for the Antarctic Policy Group is DOS, it is clear that the influence exercised by NSF on that group has been diluted, just by the fact that there are more players in the game.

The most recent review of the U.S. Antarctic Policy and Programs has only recently been completed and a presidential memorandum forwarded. This unclassified document reconfirms the level of activity and the single point of management previously discussed. It further provides for separate budgetary guidance from OMB for the Antarctic Program to ensure that it is not funded at the expense of other NSF Programs. Finally, it allows other agencies to fund and undertake directed short-term programs of scientific activity upon the recommendation of the Antarctic Policy Group and subject to the budgetary review process.

This latter clause allows, for the first time in more than a decade, other agencies to launch "private" programs in Antarctica. This is a victory for several special interest groups within agencies of the federal government who have sought this foothold in previous years, but who were unwilling to support the NSF request for funding in their special interest areas.

Many people aware of this last APG review, were extremely pleased with the presidential memorandum. In my view, however, it weakens NSF's leadership of the program. It is somewhat like allowing a federal agency other than DOD, to fight a private war after getting approval of the National Security Council. The logic of this all escapes me, I must admit. It cannot, to quote from the Presidential memo, "maximize cost effectiveness and return on investment."

One final comment on the single point management system that has developed. As a participant of the system, let me assure you that the efficiencies that have been achieved are many. I think I speak for all members of the user community when I commend the DPP for the fine tuning of a system that in my view is the best in Antarctica. The support of science in Antarctica has never been better.

Let me turn now to some of the international aspects of the U.S. activities in the Antarctic.

It is of great personal interest to me that the first leader of the university that I will soon join, Dr. Lloyd Berkner, was the man who is often given credit for suggesting the Third International Polar Year (1957-58), an event we know as the International Geophysical Year. Out of the planning for this activity grew an ad hoc committee that met in 1957 to look at the possibilities of doing additional research in Antarctica. A Special Committee on Antarctic Research was established by ICSU, the International Council for Scientific Unions, and met in 1958. In 1961 the SCAR acronym was retained when the group became the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research.

The names of Laclavere, Panzarini, Gould, Robin, Gjelsvik, and now Knox, recite a history of the growth of SCAR to meet the increasing demands placed upon the scientific community by those external to that group.

SCAR has been a leader and has been involved heavily in the support of international symposia, has provided input and recommendations to the Antarctic

Treaty group, has provided a forum where scientific activities have been discussed openly with no fear of political reprisal, and through the SCAR mechanism, the international aspects of scientific research in Antarctica have been continued since the IGY.

Personally, I remember especially a 1972 meeting in Canberra at an afternoon session of the SCAR Group of Specialists on Ice Shelf Drilling, in which all SCAR nations participated in the development of drill site selection criteria for a hole through the Ross Ice Shelf. This was my first real experience with a SCAR meeting, other than a symposia, and I came away with a feeling that RISP could at any time call upon the expertise of twelve nations to assist in its efforts. And, in fact, we did!

SCAR operates independent of the Treaty, although there is continual dialogue between SCAR and the treaty nations. Many of the recommendations adopted by the Treaty Consultative Meetings had their origin in SCAR, and SCAR has served well as a Scientific Committee.

This discussion of SCAR may seem somewhat out of place, but it should not. The U.S. has continually been a leader in the SCAR arena. If we are to look critically at U.S. activities in Antarctica we must also look critically at our involvement with SCAR.

It has been my experience that the forum provided by SCAR is invaluable for the exchange of both scientific and often informal political views in a low risk environment. I am aware that by definition SCAR is a scientific not political body, but the very fact it brings together representatives who later gather together as the scientific advisors to the Treaty Consultative Meetings is a useful exercise.

The evolution of SCAR during its 20 year plus existence is of some interest, and the changing role of SCAR has not been without problems. SCAR traditionally has suggested scientific needs, has provided scientific advice but has not attempted to operate programs.

The development of BIOMASS in the past six years has changed this somewhat, although there is a continuing debate as to just how the BIOMASS/SCAR relationship should be interpreted. It was interesting to me to hear today from a third party as to his view of BIOMASS history and intent, and it might be well for all of us who are currently engaged in the debate to review the history of how BIOMASS came to be.

As most of you are aware, the U.S. participation in SCAR occurs through a U.S. National Committee organized through the national organization adhering to the International Council of Scientific Committees. In the U.S. this is the Polar Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences.

The U.S. organization of the National Committee is somewhat unique in that there is total separation between the operating organization, DPP, and the National Committee. U.S. federal agencies are represented in the SCAR arena only in the areas of Logistics and Mapping.

It is my impression that during the early years of SCAR few problems arose as a result of this organization, and it was not until the era of large

multi-national programs, often proposed in the SCAR arena, that problems began to develop. The communication problems between SCAR, SCAR Working Groups and Groups of Specialists on the one hand and the operating organizations on the other have increased in recent years.

This apparent disconnect is good in many ways, but it requires a dialogue both before and after SCAR meetings between the individuals representing the National Committee of SCAR bodies and the operating unit, DPP in this case, that too often has not occurred. The result of this communication break-down has been the gradual development of what appears to be an adversary relationship that is not beneficial to either the National Committee or the operating organization.

The fact that the National Committee is dependent on funding for its activities from the operating organization can cause real problems if the relationship between these two groups becomes too polarized.

At times such as we face right now, with tight budgets and continuing inflation, it is natural to suggest that support of advisory groups such as the PRB be greatly reduced, and that, as the National Committee, its SCAR activities be reduced. This is not to suggest that the PRB should not be required to justify its activities or defend its budget. Rather, it is to caution against application of across the board cuts that may have serious long-range impacts.

It is my personal belief that the U.S. has a great deal more to lose than to gain through a decreased involvement in SCAR. The decade ahead is one in which international activity and involvement should and will increase, and it is disturbing to me to hear arguments for a reduction of U.S. activity at the international level through SCAR.

If the SCAR activity is worth doing at all, then I suggest that it is worth doing well. We must provide the support necessary to ensure a continued leadership role for the U.S. in SCAR. In my view it would not serve the scientific interests of this country well if we were to reduce our international involvement and become an inactive or passive member of SCAR.

We are entering a decade that will see great changes in the role of Antarctica on the international scene. Already another nation, India, has sent a party to the continent, and Brazil continues her attempt to field a group. The number of nations who have acceded to the treaty now numbers over 20.

The Living Resources Convention has been ratified by eight signators and that regime will soon hold its organizing meeting and the provision of the Convention will enter into force. This will bring a third international body into existence that will deal with Antarctic issues outside of the traditional two bodies (SCAR and the Treaty).

We heard today at the opening meeting of the Polar Research Board that comment that the Recommendation from the last Treaty Meeting concerning the Mineral Resources question is at about the same stage as the Living Resources question was following the IXth Consultative Meeting of the Treaty nations in London five years ago. I doubt that anyone would have speculated at

that time that a Convention would be coming into force in 1982. We also heard differences of opinion as to the pace that the development of a convention for Mineral Resources will take, but it almost certainly will occupy the attention of the Treaty Nations for a major part of this decade, and almost certainly SCAR will be called upon by the Consultative parties to provide some scientific and/or technological input into their deliberations. The U.S. has been an active participant in this SCAR input to date, and I would hope that it will continue to do so.

Another part of the total U.S. activity in Antarctica, although it takes place on other continents, is the participation in the Treaty process. As most of you know, the Treaty document itself is unique and it is not my intent to discuss it here.

Rather, I would simply say that as a participant in parts of the last three meetings of the Consultative parties to that treaty, I have come away with a feeling of pride in the role that the U.S. has played. It is not possible for me to detail much of what goes on at the Treaty Meetings because of the restrictions placed on those who do participate, but the work of the Antarctic Policy Group in providing meaningful position papers, in providing delegation members, and delegation leaders and spokespersons has been excellent.

This is not to say that mistakes have not been made, but I think it is fair to say that the U.S. has played a major role in the Living Resources agreements.

Currently within the APG there is a discussion of a position paper for use by the U.S. delegation to the Special Consultative Meeting on minerals that will be held in New Zealand in June. The Presidential memorandum referred to earlier calls for that paper to be forwarded from the APG by May 15. I would further note that through the Antarctic Advisory Group to the Department of State there has been the opportunity for input from non-governmental representatives including several of the people here tonight.

My review of the total U.S. activity as it relates to the Antarctic has only briefly touched on the participation of other Federal agencies. For the past decade this has been largely through the Antarctic Policy Group and through programs funded by NSF. There have been some other activities but these have apparently, and unfortunately, been quite independent of the DPP management. What will happen in the future as the result of the recent memorandum we can only guess at. I sincerely hope that some mechanism other than the APG is formed to coordinate these potential activities.

By now many of you are wondering what it is that this talk is all about. For sometime, as I have been involved with the Antarctic program I have worried about the ups and downs of the program. I have given serious thought to the management structure and have expressed my views in private correspondence and internal documents. I have watched with pride the development of a system that provides excellent support for the majority of science efforts.

A year ago I was to deliver this lecture but had to withdraw. In the ensuing twelve months much has happened, and what I had planned to say at that time has now been overcome by events.

Let me now make some comments for us all to consider.

I do-not quite know what the word I want to use here is, but for the sake of not finding a better one, let me use the word "excitement". I am concerned that the excitement of the Antarctic Program seems to be gone. Certainly there is excellent science being done, and the contribution to our understanding of the world around us continues to grow through Antarctic research. What I am talking about is the unusual, the idea that brings together scientists and logistics support in an effort that is synergistic for all involved.

Have we all become so bureaucratic that we worry more about form than substance? Has the U.S. activity reached such a stage in its evolution that the stagnation point has been reached?

It strikes me that the Division of Polar Programs may be buried so deep in the NSF bureaucracy that it is all but ignored if things go well. About the only time it surfaces is when the annual VIP visitors list must be put together or when there is a financial crisis.

The new Presidential Directive, through its statement concerning separate budgetary guidance, provides a rationale for establishing the Division of Polar Programs as a separate entity, reporting directly to the Director of the National Science Foundation. This realignment would focus more attention on the activities in the Antarctic, and would provide greater exposure for the program both within NSF and within the Executive Branch of government.

Should the whole structure of the Polar Research Board and the National Committee be re-examined? It is my perception that the Polar Research Board attempted to differentiate functions at one time through the establishment of the Committee on Polar International Relations. It is also clear to me that this effort was not clearly explained and was never fully understood by the Antarctic community.

Should there be a careful review of the philosophy and policy concerning scientific research in the Antarctic? The new policy statement nowhere mentions a "balanced program". What is a balanced program?

What about Bert Crary's recommendation in his article in the December, 1970, issue of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists? While one of his proposals would have eliminated many of us from our continued direct involvement in Antarctic field activities, I suggest to you all that the article is still well worth reading a dozen years after it was published. . Bert presented some thought-provoking ideas then and in most cases they remain valid today.

How should we react to the points about management of scientific programs and international cooperation so clearly stated by Phil Smith in that same issue of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists and re-emphasized in his paper contained in the Dry Valley Drilling Project volume of the AGU Antarctic Series. Again, I suggest that you all re-read those two contributions.

The recent initiative by the Division of Polar Programs to raise some of these questions with the Polar Research Board is to be commended. I urge my colleagues on the Board to take this task seriously. By the same token, I hope that the Division of Polar Programs and the National Science Foundation will take the resulting response from the Board seriously also!

It is my impression that a dialogue has begun in recent months that will, hopefully, address many of the issues that heretofore have only been discussed privately. We will not all agree and consensus will never be reached, but I sincerely hope that the differences of opinion can be aired openly, in a low stress environment, without fear of any retribution.

This group gathered here tonight represents a very special minority among the citizens of this country. Most of you have been involved in the United States activities in the Antarctic in one way or another. My charge to you tonight is to use your special expertise along with your strong interests to work to strengthen the U. S. Antarctic activities in whatever way you can.

All of us have unique skills, and the opportunity to utilize those skills to aid the U.S. Program will certainly be available to you in the months and years ahead. Let us all take advantage of those opportunities. Let us all work together to strengthen all aspects of the U.S. Antarctic activity, as we move into the challenging decade ahead. Thank you.

* * * * *

AUCTION. Commander Kelsey Goodman, USN (Ret), has graciously given the Society two of his historic polar books for auctioning off as a fund-raising effort at our Mid-Winter Picnic at Stronghold on July 10th. BUT you don't necessarily have to be there. You can send in your bids, which must be received by July 8th, to the Society at our Arlington address, marking the envelope "Book Bid." You will be duly represented at the auction by one of our most honorable non-bidding members who will act on your behalf, bidding up to the authorized amount specified in your submitted bid. The books to be auctioned are:

- 1). Dr. Frederick A. Cook: My Attainment of the Pole. N.Y. Polar Publishing Co., 1911 Cist Edition) 604 pages, Quarto, Original brown cloth, numerous illustrations and sketches, water stains. Signed "Dr. W. A. Applegate, Chief Surgeon, Southern RR, with regards from Frederick A. Cook." Minimum bid: \$25.
- 2) Lt. Adolphus W. Greely: The International Polar Expedition Report on The Proceedings of the U.S. Expedition to Lady Franklin Bay, Grinnell Land. One of 4500 copies. Two volumes, 545 pp plus 738 pp, Quarto, several foldout maps, numerous other maps, charts, photographs, and sketches. With 17 scientific appendices, including mammals, birds, botany, molluscs, tides. Both volumes have been repaired. Vol. 1 lacks backstrip. Minimum bid: \$55.

Remember, money is only monetary - you can't take it with you. Books are immortal, and classics are forever.

President Pete Burrill had a few words for you folks as he's about to step down after two highly successful building years for the Society, but we ran out of space. So Pete is being put "on hold" until the August Newsletter. ... Think Swithinbank! He will be our speaker on *August 51st* at NSF. How timely and clairvoyant we are in having a Brit at this time!

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT ON CELEBRATIONS/REUNIONS RELATIVE TO POLAR YEARS, SPRING '83

The time has come to see what enthusiasm exists in the hinterlands among Antarcticans for a Spring '83 reunion in Washington. There are all kinds of reasons for having a Gathering of The Clan, it being the 100th anniversary of the First Polar Year (only Larry Gould, Bud Waite, and a handful of others are still alive from that one), the 50th anniversary of the Second Polar Year, and the 25th anniversary of the IGY. If you are IGY or older, you presumably have made your pile and will never get any wealthier - just a bit more decrepit - so it behooves all of us in that category who want to break bread and drink wine with our peers to plan on Washington in May 1983. We want to know how you all feel about a reunion, so we have a few questions we would appreciate your answering (see reverse side). If we get a strong enough show of hands' to warrant celebrating, we will try to establish a program of interest for the majority.

The idea, as I see it, is to come up with something which will (1) make it worthwhile, (2) make it interesting, (3) make it provocative, (4) make it historic, and (5) make it memorable. The key to the future is presumably the past, and presumably the key to a successful polar reunion will be getting as many of the good old boys to Washington as is humanly possible. The Antarctic Society has shown in recent years that people like Larry Gould, Bud Waite, Dick Black, Bob Nichols, and Charlie Murphy are ageless, that they are good for all ages, that their recollections resemble a good wine, better with aging.

The IGY is represented by Bert Crary, Ned Ostenso, Dick Cameron, Ron Taylor, Rudi Honkala, Bob Benson, Johnny Dawson, George Toney, Joe Krank, John Mirabito and Mort Rubin, plus Ruth of the House of Siple. Most are members of our Society, some are not, and a few are workers. -I think the core is there to provide the spade work, and I am pretty sure there are enough recent vintage Antarcticans in the Washington area who would be willing to work on a reunion.

It appears to me that it might be best to have an all-purpose type reunion, one of interest to the majority, but with individual days designated for special programs. Some pipedream possibilities would include polar exhibits in some of the government/private buildings commemorating the various polar anniversaries, such as history of polar cartography (USGS), polar exploration (National Geographic Society), polar philately (anyone but the Postal Service), Antarctic Treaty (State Department), polar literature (Library of Congress), etc. Commemorative days could be set aside for talks pertinent to the various commemorative periods, presuming we could find some host who would be willing to provide us with a lecture hall. We could have one general all-purpose type dinner/banquet; we could have the Antarctic Society Annual Memorial Lecture; and we would have individual camp luncheons and evening donkeybrooks by expeditions/eras. Whatever we do will have to be built around the IGY, as BAE II will be holding their own special reunion later on in the year (October 22, 1982 in Washington). And, time is fleeting, as the list of members from the IGY (close to 150) has seen deep inroads from the Great Reaper. From the wintering-over folks in '57-'58, Carl Eklund, Gerald Fierle, Ben Harlin, Norbert Helfert, Herfried Hoinkes, Bob Johns, Finn Ronne, Paul Siple and Ed Thiel are gone.

There is no "best time" to please everyone. Washington is a delightful city in the spring, and from mid-April to mid-May it is beautiful - decked out in a profusion of lovely dogwoods, azaleas, tulips and magnolias. April is a big tourist month, with the DARs swarming over the city in late April. In mid-May someone

upstairs always pulls the switch marked "Washington-high humidity" which begins four miserable months when only the British are happy here in Washington. So tentatively, unless we hear a loud dissent, we are thinking about the window following the DARS and preceding the humidity. And for those who don't have a Washington connection, there are probably more rooms available in early May than in late April.

Please complete this questionnaire and return to: Paul C. Dalrymple
Antarctican Society c/o
R. J. Siple 905 N.
Jacksonville St.
Arlington, VA 22205

1. The idea of an Antarctic reunion:

- / / Sounds interesting; am undecided, keep me on mailing list
- / / Certainly am interested; probably would come
- / / Will come
- / / Not interested; please do not contact me again

2. If I come to the reunion, I would like a:

- / / One-day reunion
- / / Two-day reunion
- / / Three-day reunion
- / / Four-day reunion
- / / Five-day reunion

3. These are my ideas about what I would like to have for a reunion: