

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

By D. James Baker

I AM PLEASED TO REPORT that the Council with its newly elected members has now met and that a number of new Society activities are underway. The Office of Naval Research has agreed to provide support for awards to the best student papers presented at our meetings and for the publication of a career booklet and a booklet about how to prepare good visual aids and to give a good scientific talk. We have submitted a proposal to NSF, NASA, and NOAA for start-up support of an Oceanography Newsletter, support of students to attend scientific meetings, and the publication of a directory of educational programs.

We are also in the process of appointing a public education committee. As you will see from Connie Sancetta's summary of the results from the member questionnaire (see the following article), one of the highest priorities for our members was to get our message out to the public. Several people have volunteered to serve, and we look forward to an active group.

Preparation of educational materials such as viewgraphs and wall charts is underway. We welcome ideas about what to include and volunteer help. We are looking into an electronic journal. As far as meetings are concerned, we have decided that our next scientific meeting will take place in Seattle, Washington, during April 13–16, 1993. An announcement will be mailed later this year.

As you can see from the masthead, the Society office has moved to a new address in Washington, DC. The new space is contiguous with the offices of the American Meteorological Society, who have provided invaluable help in many ways to TOS. We are very grateful for this help. The new arrangements allow more space at a lower cost. We hope you will drop by if you are in Washington.

In the last issue, I noted that the proposed US federal budget increases in ocean science funding looked good, but still faced a number of hurdles. The situation is mixed now, with growth rates

at different agencies being very uneven: NSF and DOE are doing relatively well, but NOAA, NASA, and ONR have problems. Your letters and other interaction with Congress continue to be needed so that ocean science can make its case for adequate support.

There are several reasons for the budget problems. First, the total amount of money available for government spending is not growing as rapidly as expected. As you know, the world is facing slowed economic growth. On the US side, Congress has had to find money to finance the Gulf War, to bail out the savings and loan associations, and now to aid failing banks and insurance companies. The need for federal dollars in these emergencies, coupled with slower economic growth than expected, decreases the amount of funds available for discretionary (which includes science) programs in the federal budget.

Internationally, the economic problems are the same, and we have the added excitement of a Soviet revolution, Eastern European independence, and increasing needs from developing countries (ranging from economic aid to environmental protection). A reunited Germany is finding that the cost of modernizing East Germany is greater than expected. The consequence of all this is another need for funds from the developed countries, all of which will have to cut back on their programs—including science programs.

What's more, the international events lead to a changing world order with direct influence on national events. In the US, the collapse of the Soviet Union has led directly to reduced growth for the Department of Defense, including ONR, one of the traditional supporters of US ocean science. Our infrastructure is decaying—shore-based laboratories and instrumentation need replacement, and ships need upgrading. Unless something new is done, all the necessary funds will come from the research budgets.

Bob Detrick, in his excellent analysis of the past years' budgets for the forthcoming Ocean Studies Board report, shows that the sum of ocean science funding has not differed much from inflation over the past 10 years. The US Global Change Research Program is one reason that we have seen budgets grow faster than that recently. Programs like TOGA, WOCE, JGOFS, and related activities have enjoyed rapidly increasing support. But we are now seeing what appears to be the beginning of a leveling off of the funds for that umbrella program. For example, this year's funds for the Climate and Global Change program in NOAA have been kept at last year's level, and NASA's Earth Science Program is being constrained to the point where we may see an effect on the near-term ocean-related missions. All this is happening at a time when the community needs increased support for the ongoing and proposed activities of both individual investigators and cooperative programs.

Until now, we have all recognized that there will have to be significant budget increases each year for several years to come if we are to carry out the ongoing and newly proposed programs and continue to maintain a healthy individual investigator program. But we may be at the end of that road. I suspect that such leveling is inevitable, since it is very hard to sustain rapid growth rates in any program for several years in a row (no matter how meritorious). I would be very happy to be proved wrong in this, but my view of the budget process makes me pessimistic.

I think that all the organizations that look after the health of the ocean sciences, such as the Oceanography Society, our sister societies, and the Ocean Studies Board, need to consider this problem carefully. We need to look at research, facilities, and education. By working together we may be able to come up with a plan that minimizes the pain. □

WHAT DO YOU WANT FROM US?

RESULTS OF THE OCEANOGRAPHY SOCIETY MEMBER SURVEY

By Constance A. Sancetta

IN EARLY 1991 we sent a mailing to all members asking your guidance on future directions for the society. About 25% responded (473 of roughly 2000 members), which is unusually high for this kind of survey. Out of 18 possible activities, the highest priorities given were to "Provide representation to governments and international bodies of consensus viewpoints" (267 votes), "Publish a monthly newsletter" (229), "Issue public statements on ocean science issues" (205), and "Maintain an international directory of professionals" (204). Many people suggested that the newsletter be combined with a calendar. There was some concern as to how one arrives at a consensus viewpoint. Strong runners-up were educational activities such as student attendance at meetings (185) and high school outreach (161).

Concerning meetings, a large majority (75%) liked the present meeting format, which consists of invited review talks in the morning and poster sessions in the afternoon. It is important that the invited speakers be interesting and that they neither consist of the same old faces nor emphasize large programs at the expense of small science. Several people noted the difficulty of justifying the time and money

for a meeting at which one cannot present an oral talk. Roughly half (47%) would like annual meetings, and 22% prefer biennial. Preferred meeting size was difficult to assess because the questionnaire did not indicate the attendance ranges. About half (48%) liked in-between-sized and 20% a large interdisciplinary meeting; 15% liked small focused meetings. We suspect that people had in mind conferences for the latter (20–50 people) and meetings along the lines of the AGU Ocean Sciences meeting (>1000) for the large multidisciplinary type. "In-between," then, would mean perhaps 200–700, which is within the range of the Monterey and St. Petersburg meetings. A popular request was for a mix of meetings—a large multidisciplinary one every 1–2 years and smaller focused ones more frequently. Numerous topics were suggested for future meetings, the most common being coastal oceanography and global change/paleoceanography; other winners were air-sea exchange, pollution/environmental management, remote sensing, and data assimilation/modeling/prediction.

Many suggestions were made for how TOS might serve the international community. Most of them were along the lines of "en-

courage communication through publications and international meetings," "represent ocean science issues to governments," and "educate the public." Some specific suggestions we found interesting were to support exchange programs for professionals and students; to provide information on resources and expertise that could be used by people in developing nations; to profile ocean-related activities of a non-US institution in *Oceanography* or at a meeting; to provide names of experts on different topics who are willing to answer questions from agencies; to sponsor the transfer of used books and journals to other nations; to provide translation services; and to address Law-of-the-Sea issues (especially access to study areas).

We are gratified by the large number of members who volunteered to help on various committees and to lecture at historically black colleges. We are now establishing several new committees, and some of you will certainly be hearing from us. More volunteers for specific activities are always welcome. Contact Judi Powell at the new address for headquarters: 1701 K Street NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20006-1509; (202) 331-7997. □

A REPORT ON THE SECOND MEETING OF THE OCEANOGRAPHY SOCIETY: ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA, MARCH 25–28, 1991

By Tom Dickey

THE SECOND MEETING of The Oceanography Society (TOS) was held in St. Petersburg this past spring. The invited talks were presented in the elegant Mahaffey Theater of the Bayfront Center and the posters and exhibits were located in the St. Petersburg Hilton. Evening receptions were hosted at the University of South Florida Marine Science Complex and the Columbia Restaurant, both on the waterfront. One of the unique features of the venue was the spring-training baseball games (St. Louis Cardinals) taking place adjacent to the meeting sites. Local support was strong and was responsible for much of the meeting's success.

The format of the meeting followed that of the successful inaugural TOS meeting held in Monterey in August 1989. Invited lectures were given during half-day plenary sessions. Posters and exhibits were viewed during the

remaining half-days. The themes for the meeting were selected by the meetings committee. One of the goals was to facilitate discussions of interdisciplinary problems of general concern. The themes for the first three days included Theme I, "The Ocean and Global Climate" (Chair: Lynne Talley); Theme II, "CO₂ Transport and Transformation in the Ocean" (Chair: Robbie Toggweiler); and Theme III, "The Influence of Mid-Ocean Ridge Processes on the Ocean" (Chair: John Lupton). Whereas the first three days focused on special topics, the final day was reserved for special lectures under Theme IV, "Perspectives and Future Directions in Oceanography" (Chair: Mike Bacon).

Theme-I lectures treated climate-related problems characterized by time scales ranging from the interannual to the last 150,000 years, with specialists from the areas of physical

oceanography and air-sea interaction (Benno Blumenthal, Carl Wunsch, and Bill Holland), geochemistry (Wally Broecker), and paleoclimatology (Laurent Labeyrie). Theme-II lectures also focused on climate, but with an emphasis on carbon dioxide and carbon fluxes. Biological (Dave Karl and Alice Alldredge) and geochemical (Jorge Sarmiento, Martin Heimann, and James Bauer) aspects were considered in detail during these lectures. The Theme-III session was also highly interdisciplinary and focused on recent work concerning the effects of mid-ocean ridges on the oceans. Geological (Mike Mottl, Gary Klinkhammer, and Ed Baker), biological (Holger Jannasch), and physical (Steve Riser) aspects were considered.

The fourth day was particularly enjoyable as the diverse speakers were given great latitude in presenting their own perspectives and

ideas. Vern Suomi, a pioneer in remote sensing of our planet, described his views of how technology can be developed and utilized. The fascinating new age of computing capabilities was graphically described by Larry Smarr, Director of the National Center for Computer Applications. Perspectives on operational oceanography and academic oceanography were given by Rear Admiral Dick Pittenger. An entertaining look at global environmental change from the viewpoint of the geochemist was given by Karl Turekian. Finally, Roger Revelle took us through technological advances and their impacts on the marine sciences. We mourn the recent loss of Roger, whose many accomplishments and honors are highlighted elsewhere in this issue.

There was an excellent representation of college students, both in terms of poster pre-

sentations and participation in dialogue. A special session, "Careers in Oceanography," was conceived by local organizing committee chairman Peter Betzer. High school students and teachers participated in this session. The program included presentations concerning various aspects of careers in oceanography from the perspectives of scientists in various disciplines (Alice Alldredge, biological; Tom Dickey, physical; Bob Duce, atmospheric and oceanic chemistry; Bill Landing, chemical; and Margaret Leinen, geological). The panel answered questions that followed their presentations.

The final registration for the meeting totaled 527 (with 139 abstracts); 109 students attended. In addition, an open business meeting of TOS was held and plans for the next meeting were addressed.

From my own perspective, I accepted the challenge as program chairman in part because of the great success of the inaugural meeting under the leadership of Rana Fine and the organizational groundwork put in place by the TOS staff. In addition, I view the chairmanship as both an honor and an opportunity to interact with many of the world's leading oceanographers. Finally, I thank TOS staff, especially Judi Powell and Jim Baker; the meetings and program committee, chaired by Stan Wilson; the local organizing committee, chaired by Peter Betzer; the session chairs, speakers, and poster presenters; and the staff of E.H. Pechan, especially Annette Najjar. Their efforts made the second TOS meeting a successful and enjoyable event. □

SUMMARY OF THE OCEANOGRAPHIC SOCIETY ST. PETERSBURG MEETING QUESTIONNAIRE

By Judi Powell

IN ORDER TO GET REACTIONS from those who attended, a questionnaire was distributed at the Society's second scientific meeting in St. Petersburg. The information will be used in planning future meetings—continuing and improving upon the favorable aspects and correcting the negative elements. The following is a brief summary of the highlights.

The Positives

The majority of respondents offered favorable remarks. The format of the meeting—a single daily plenary followed by a poster session, all focused on a daily theme—received high marks. Adequate time for social/scientific interaction was highly praised. Many feel this unique combination is the secret to the success of TOS meetings and urged us to maintain the format. The registration fee was seen as "reasonable" to "a bargain," considering that it included meals, functions, and a quality meeting. The hotel and theater facilities as well as the social functions were highly rated.

The Negatives

The majority of negative remarks concerned the audiovisual presentations. TOS needs to improve the level of audiovisual support for the speakers and to encourage speakers to improve the caliber of their visual aids. Some attendees also thought we needed to stress the importance of overview presen-

tations by the invited speakers in order to achieve our goal of an interdisciplinary forum.

Things to Think About and/or Work On

- Include more women in the program.
- Give TOS awards.
- Encourage international and minority participation.
- Allow more publicity and promotional lead time.
- Provide a written record of the meeting.
- Close meeting with plenary session on "hot topics."
- Provide a booth for listing employment opportunities and resume drop-off.

We thank each of you who took the time to give us your comments. Every comment has been noted and we will review the complete list when planning the next meeting. □

OBSERVATIONAL PHYSICAL OCEANOGRAPHER ROSENSTIEL SCHOOL OF MARINE AND ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

Candidates are sought to fill a physical oceanographer (Assistant to Full Professor, tenure track) position in the Division of Meteorology and Physical Oceanography. Interested scientists with appropriate academic credentials and a proven track record in initiating field programs in physical oceanography are encouraged to apply. Successful candidates are expected to augment the existing field capabilities in the school and to have an interest in the application of new technologies. Currently the school has one of the largest current meter groups in the U.S., a long standing expertise in ocean tracer work and a major satellite remote sensing capability. The holder of the position is also expected to contribute to the joint graduate program in meteorology and physical oceanography. Currently the Division consists of approximately 18 faculty and 25 graduate students.

Applicants should submit a letter expressing their interest in the position and their long-term research interests along with a vitae and the names of five references to the Chairman of the Search Committee, Dr. Donald B. Olson, RSMAS/MPO University of Miami, 4600 Rickenbacker Causeway, Miami, FL 33149, USA.

The University of Miami is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.