

Ripley's Son-in-Law Given Smithsonian Aid for Work; Ripley's Son-in-Law Aided by Smithsonian

The Washington Post

March 15, 1977, Tuesday, Final Edition

Copyright 1977 The Washington Post

Section: First Section; A1

Length: 1336 words

Byline: By Charles A. Krause, Washington Post Staff Writer

Body

Smithsonian Secretary S. Dillon Ripley's son-in-law has received almost \$40,000 in federal and private money since 1974 from the Smithsonian Institution, the World Wildlife Fund and the International Council for Bird Preservation - All of which are directed by Ripley.

Robert S. Ridgely, an ornithologist married to Ripley's oldest daughter, Julie, also now has at his disposal in South America a camper purchased by the Smithsonian, apparently with World Wildlife Fund money.

Ripley is a director of both the International Wildlife Fund and its U.S. chapter, headquartered in Washington. The Smithsonian secretary is also president of the International Council for Bird Preservation.

In all, Ridgely has received \$21,400 (not including the cost of the camper) from the World Wildlife Fund to support research on macaw parrots in South America; \$10,000 from the International Council to subsidize publication of Ridgely's first book; and \$9,500 in federal Interior Department money given to the Smithsonian and later the World Wildlife Fund for a report on macaw parrots in Central America, a report that Ridgely recently completed.

Ridgely received the Interior Department grant money from the Smithsonian in May, 1974, just as he was receiving his master's degree in zoology from Duke University. In response to a written inquiry from The Washington Post, the Smithsonian said that "Secretary Ripley was neither aware of, nor did he participate in the negotiations which led to the award of the research contract to Mr. Ridgely."

One official at the World Wildlife Fund said Ridgely was an extremely competent ornithologist. Ridgely's book, "A Guide to the Birds of Panama," has also received a number of complimentary reviews.

In 1974, he was virtually unknown. It was impossible to determine how Ridgely came to the attention of the Smithsonian because, in response to an inquiry, the Smithsonian failed to

explain the exact procedures that led to Ridgely's selection three years ago.

Ripley at first agreed - and then refused - to be interviewed on this subject by The Post. Ridgely could not be reached for comment because he and his wife are said to be travelling in the camper in the jungles of Peru.

Whether or not Ridgely in fact received special treatment because of his relationship to Ripley, several Smithsonian employees interviewed in recent weeks have cited the Ridgely case as an extreme example of a general condition.

According to these employees, who asked that their names not be used for fear of retaliation, it is extremely difficult for persons wishing to work at the Smithsonian to be hired (or promoted) unless they are acquaintances of Ripley's or have the right social and academic backgrounds.

"We are an elitist. WASP-type organization," said one Smithsonian employee, describing the Institution's high level administrative staff rather than mid and lower level employees.

"For a long time, you had to have gone to Yale and breathe rarefied air to get a job here. Now, you just need to know someone who went to Yale."

This employee said she was once told that "we need someone with class" when she asked what qualifications were necessary to fill a particular job.

Other employees say the Smithsonian is run through an "old boy" network. In some departments, such as the Smithsonian's security division, the network runs to the military rather than to Yale, where Ripley did his undergraduate work and served as director of the Peabody natural history museum before Smithsonian secretary in 1964.

While relatively few Smithsonian employees are aware of the federal research grant and the camper provided to Ridgely by the Smithsonian, a book review written by Ripley about his son-in-law's book in the November issue of the Smithsonian Magazine is widely known and talked about.

Ripley, a well known ornithologist himself called Ridgely's book "definitive . . . a valuable volume that serious bird watchers concerned with neotropical birds can hardly do without.

"Here, for example, is a typically full account of the Blue-crowned Motmot's habits," Ripley wrote before quoting the following passage from the book:

"Unlike other Panama motmots, not a true forest bird, and especially in the west often found in thickets and bedgrowns in pastures . . . Canal Zone birds give a rather dovelike single hoo-oo (sometimes doubled), somewhat hoarser or more tremulous than the usually tripled hoot of the Rufous Motmot; also has a very tremulous *hoorr* or *hrrroo* , softer than the corresponding call of Rufous Motmot."

Despite the praise and quotes from Ridgely's book, Ripley failed to mention that the author is his son-in-law, a fact which Bennett Schiff, book review editor of the Smithsonian Magazine, said he too was unaware of before the review was published.

Ripley did mention in the review that "A Guide to the Birds of Panama" was "sponsored" by the International Council for Bird Preservation (ICBP) but the smithsonian secretary failed to

mention that he was president of the organization, which provided \$10,000 to subsidize publication of the book by Princeton University Press, according to Tom Lovejoy, a World Wildlife official and close friend of Ridgely's.

The ICBP, which is supported by private gifts and donations, is in fact run out of Ripely's private bird laboratory in the National Museum of Natural History building. The **Smithsonian** provides banking and other administrative services for the private ICBP, which has its main office in London, the **Smithsonian** acknowledged after an inquiry from The Washington Post.

These arrangements appear to be of the kind that prompted the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior and Related Agencies to asks the General Accounting Office to audit the **Smithsonian**'s books last summer.

Senators on the subcommittee became concerned about financial practices at the **Smithsonian** after they learned of a secret, \$1 million contingency fund maintained for years by Ripley. The fund was abolished after the subcommittee found out about it.

The subcommittee also asked the GAO to look into the **Smithsonian**'s use of the American Security & Trust Co. bank as a depository for **Smithsonian** money. Ripley served for many years as a director of the bank before resigning last December. Sources have told The Post that the **Smithsonian** is now in the process of closing its accounts at AS&T and moving the money to the Riggs National Bank.

Since the request for the GAO audit first became public last fall, the **Smithsonian** has been extremely reluctant to discuss its financial procedures. The following chronology of Ridgely's financial supports since 1974 was pieced together from Interior Department records and an interview with Lovejoy, the World Wildlife official in Washington who is a close friend of Ridgely's and a former student of Ripely's at Yale.

The Interior Department's Fish and Wildlife Service decided in 1973 that it needed a study of macaw parrots in Central and South America to determine whether they should be placed on the government's endangered species list. The **Smithsonian** was selected to undertake the study and was give \$9,500. Dr. Helmut Sick, a noted Brazilian ornithologist, was selected to do the work.

In mid-winter of 1974, Sick notified the **Smithsonian** that he could not do the study because of an illness in his family. On May 1, 1974, Ridgely, at the **Smithsonian**'s suggestion, was designated by the Interior Department as Sick's replacement.

Ridgely spent about \$1,850 of the money in 1974 before the grant was switched "by mutual consent" from the **Smithsonian** to the World Wildlife Fund, which added \$21,400 - and money for the camper - to the \$7,650 remaining in federal money so that Ridgely could complete his study of macaws in both Central and South America.

The initial report on Central American parrots was completed last November. Ridgely is still working on the South American segment of the study, according to Lovejoy.

Graphic

Picture, S. DILLON RIPLEY . . . involvement denied

End of Document

Yates Declines Smithsonian Position

The Washington Post

March 1, 1977, Tuesday, Final Edition

Copyright 1977 The Washington Post

Section: Metro; C3

Length: 476 words

Byline: By Charles A. Krause, Washington Post Staff Writer

Body

Rep. Sidney R. Yates (D-Ill.), chairman of the House appropriations subcommittee that oversees the budget of the Smithsonian Institution, quietly declined last month to be reappointed as a Smithsonian regent. He said he had difficulties "reconciling" the two positions.

The Illinois congressman, first appointed a Smithsonian regent in 1975, said yesterday that he found it "awkward" to serve as a director of the museum and research complex, while at the same time serving as chairman of the House Appropriations Interior Subcommittee. This unit plays a key role in determining how much the Smithsonian receives from the U.S. Treasury each year.

Much like directors of a corporation, the 17 congressmen, senators and private citizens and the Vice President and Chief Justice of the United States ultimately are responsible for day-to-day operations and policy decisions affecting the semipublic, semi-private Smithsonian.

Yates said his decision not to seek another two year appointment as a regent had nothing to do with a General Accounting Office audit of the Smithsonian's books currently under way or recent articles in The Washington Post and other publications raising questions about the Smithsonian's financial practices.

The GAO audit was ordered last summer by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior and Related Agencies after that committee discovered a \$1 million contingency fund maintained by Smithsonian Secretary S. Dillon Ripley.

Since the audit began, Ripley has resigned as a director of the American Security and Trust Co., where the Smithsonian maintains bank accounts. The Post has pointed out other Smithsonian financial arrangements, including the purchase of almost 1,300 acres of farmland in Maryland for a land preservation and research facility called the Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies.

As part of those purchases, the Smithsonian has agreed to let former owners live free in their manor houses and farm center property without fee.

Yates said he was learning "things I didn't know" about the **Smithsonian** in various news accounts. But the congressmen said he thought regents generally were well informed about **Smithsonian** activities.

Contributing to his decision not to seek another term as a regent, Yates said, was his inability to attend all the regents meetings because they sometimes conflicted with sessions of the House. This, Yates said, sometimes made it difficult for him to obtain information made available at the regents meetings.

A spokesman for Speaker Thomas P. (Tip) O'Neill, who appoints the three congressmen who served by statute as **Smithsonian** regents, said yesterday that O'Neill has not yet decided who will be appointed in Yates' place. The spokesman said there was a possibility that another House regent also may ask not to be reappointed.

End of Document

Residents of Md. Bay Area Subsidized by Smithsonian; Smithsonian Subsidizes Residents of Bay Area; Institution Buys Land, Lets Seller Stay, Free

The Washington Post

February 28, 1977, Monday, Final Edition

Copyright 1977 The Washington Post

Section: First Section; A1

Length: 1474 words

Byline: By Charles A. Krause, Washington Post Staff Writer

Dateline: ANNAPOLIS

Body

In the name of land conservation, science and the environment, the Smithsonian Institution has in effect created a vast subsidized housing and farming preserve here along the shores of the Chesapeake Bay.

The Smithsonian has spend over \$1.7 million since 1965 buying up hundreds of acres of land along the Rhode River, land that in some cases the Smithsonian allows former owners to farm for free. In two cases, the Smithsonian has agreed to let former owners live free of charge in their former manor houses until their deaths.

In one instance, that of Ernest N. Cory Jr. - an attorney indicted along with Maryland Gov. marvin Mandel on charges of political corruption - the Smithsonian agreed to buy a 100-foot yacht that Cory no longer wanted as well as take over the monthly mortgage payments on his mansion and pay the property taxes on his 17-acre estate until Cory and his wife die in exchange for the Cory property.

In addition, Cory said in a recent interview, he was able to take substantial tax deductions as a result of the transaction. That was because he had his land appraised for over \$11,000 an acre in 1965 and the Smithsonian paid him substantially less than that, resulting in a tax loss for Cory.

The prime farmland, shorefront property, wooded areas and pasture land that comprised the historic farms and estates the Smithsonian purchased are now part of a land preservation and research facility here called the Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies, a part of the Smithsonian.

The Smithsonian is so sensitive about its land purchases and other activities here that Chesapeake Bay Center employees were warned last week not to talk to any reporters. All inquiries about the Center were referred to Smithsonian officials in Washington, who demanded

that all questions be submitted in writing.

However, it was possible to piece together - using Anne Arundel County land records and other sources before submitting written questions - a history of the financial agreements that led to creation of the Center, which now receives \$500,000 in federal operating support.

The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior and Related Agencies has ordered a General Accounting Office audit of the **Smithsonian**'s books, reflecting the subcommittee feeling that the **Smithsonian** has been less than forthcoming about its spending of \$100 million a year in federal money and approximately \$11 million a year in private funds.

The story of the Chesapeake Bay Center provides a textbook example of the way the **Smithsonian** has gotten a large project going with private donations and then gone to Congress for federal money to operate it. That method of operation is a primary concern among the senators who asked for the audit.

Last year, the Center used part of its money to hire Michael Singer, an artist, to "construct a series of marsh grass pieces," in marshland on the **Smithsonian** property.

Center employees were then transported by boat to see the marsh grass sculptures before they were blown away this winter. Singer, according to the **Smithsonian**, received \$1,500 for his work.

For the most part, however, the Center does scientific research on pollution and the environment, and Center scientists have published any number of papers in scientific journals.

The history of the **Smithsonian**'s involvement in and around the Chesapeake Bay began in 1962, when Robert Lee Forrest, an eccentric millionaire, left his estate, Java Farm, and \$1.7 million in cash and securities to the Smithsonians.

During the mid-1960s, the **Smithsonian** got large sums from the Ford Foundation as well as other groups to buy land adjacent to Java Farm. The stated object was to save the whole area from development and to keep it in its state of pastoral beauty.

Income from Forrest's \$1.7 million bequest was not - and has not ever, according to the **Smithsonian** - been used to purchase property along the Bay or to directly offset operating costs of the Center. The Forrest money was put into the **Smithsonian**'s unrestricted trust fund, which is used for whatever the **Smithsonian** wants the money to be used for. Some of the money, the **Smithsonian** said, has "been used for various purposes at the Center.

After additional land was acquired, a research facility, eventually named the Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies, was established on the 1,700 **Smithsonian** property. Its purpose was environmental education and research designed to compare the ecological properties of mature forests, oil fields, agricultural lands and residential areas to determine how these land uses effect the amount and composition of runoff into marshes and estuarine waters."

In pursuing that goal, the **Smithsonian** has made arrangements with the local gentry - some of them well connected members of families whose forebears have lived in this part of Maryland since the 18th Century - that allows them to continue to live a life many of them could no longer otherwise afford.

Cory, for example, has been forced to ask the U.S. District Court in Baltimore to appoint a public defender to represent him at his second trial along with Mandel. Cory said his legal troubles have ruined him financially and, were it not for the deal he consummated 12 years ago with the Smithsonian, he and his family probably could no longer afford their Corn Island estate.

"Life tenancy" agreements of this kind usually involve gifts of property to charitable institutions - not sales of property. Charles R. Rinaldi, chief of the land acquisition division of the National Park Service, said his agency is prohibited from engaging in agreement (such as assumption of mortgage and tax payments, free use of farm or pasture land) like those entered into by the Smithsonian.

The Washington Post submitted the following question last week: "Why is the Smithsonian permitting individuals to farm land on (Center property) free of charge?"

The Smithsonian's full, unedited response: "The acreage being farmed is part of a major study on the effects of land use on biota and part of an overall effort to establish a mosaic of various land uses at CBCES (the Center). Abandoned farms are not natural in a changing rural/urban area, thus they form something of a control situation.

"Thus, it is crucial to the study that a significant portion of the land be in farming and, if the individuals now farming this acreage were not doing so, the CBCES would have to undertake that task.

"In addition, the farmers involved also provide some security and patrolling services on the acreage they farm, by virtue of their presence. All of this makes it worthwhile to the SI to permit these farmers to farm the CBCES acreage they do without change to them."

As for the Corys, the Smithsonian was asked why it finds it advantageous to allow them to live at Corn Island free of charge. The Smithsonian responded that:

"It is not a question of 'permitting' the Corys to live where they do. The Corys live there as life tenants. Under the terms of the transaction, the SI has no rights to occupy the otherwise control who occupies the house until the death of both Mr. and Mrs. Cory, or a period of 20 years from the date of the transaction, whichever is later."

Rinaldi said the Park Service would, in a case such as this, deduct 1 per cent a year from the agreed upon sales price for a piece of residential property for every year the former owners are expected continued to occupy it."

The Smithsonian says that it paid Cory a total of \$125,000 for his Cora Island property, including the assumption of a \$68,000 mortgage on his house and the assumption of a \$30,000 mortgage on his boat, the "Elida."

It is not entirely clear why the Smithsonian agreed to take the boat, which was reportedly 65 years old at the time and is said to have sunk at its moorings shortly after the Smithsonian took possession of it. (The Smithsonian was asked these questions but did not answer them.)

In any case, the Smithsonian acknowledged in writing that the boat a yawl, was "partially refurbished" while in the Smithsonian's possession and sold two years after the Smithsonian bought it for \$3,750 - a loss of approximately \$26,000.

In answer to another written question, the **Smithsonian** said it actually purchased 1,297 of the over 1,700 acres that make up the Chesapeake Bay Center. The cost of these purchases was \$1,771,300 - or almost \$1,400 an acre.

According to the **Smithsonian** it raised a total of \$1,520,000 largely from the Ford Foundation and various Mellon family foundations, to purchase the land. It obtained Mortgages to cover the remaining \$250,000 worth of land.

Two of these mortgages remain outstanding. The **Smithsonian** was asked in writing, but failed to answer, where the funds come from to pay off these mortgages.

Graphic

Picture, View of Corn Island estate south of Annapolis, which **Smithsonian** purchased, allowing owners Ernest N. Cory Jr. and his wife to occupy for their lifetimes. By Bob Burchette - The Washington Post

End of Document

GAO Criticizes Smithsonian's Mixing of Funds; GAO Study Says Smithsonian Converts U.S. Cash to Own Use

The Washington Post
April 1, 1977, Friday, Final Edition

Copyright 1977 The Washington Post

Section: First Section; A1

Length: 1307 words

Byline: By Charles A. Krause, Washington Post Staff Writer

Body

The Smithsonian Institution has created two private corporations to convert millions of dollars of U.S. funds into "private money," which it then spends without regard to federal restrictions, according to a General Accounting Office audit report released yesterday.

The GAO report recommends that the two corporations be disbanded and that the money and programs they administer be integrated into the Smithsonian's overall structure.

The audit of the Smithsonian's finances was requested last summer by a Senate subcommittee after several senators voiced suspicions that the Smithsonian has been pooling public and private money and otherwise circumventing restrictions that normally would apply to federal agencies.

The Smithsonian, which was given an opportunity to comment on the report before its release, vigorously disagreed with the GAO's conclusions and recommendations concerning the two private corporations.

The Smithsonian also disagreed with another GAO finding pertaining to one of the corporations, the Smithsonian Research Foundation. The GAO documented that Smithsonian officials had failed to mention the foundation at congressional budget hearings after the foundation at congressional budget hearings after the foundation was incorporated in 1966.

In its comments, the Smithsonian said that because three senators and three representatives sit as regents (directors) of the institution and approved setting up the foundation, the Smithsonian felt Congress had been notified about the foundation.

"While this is true, we do not equate approval by the board of regents with approval by Congress," the GAO report said.

"The Smithsonian never adequately informed Congress of the creation of the foundation or of its intent to operate independent of fiscal year and civil service requirements, although it (the

Smithsonian) had the opportunity to do so during appropriation hearings," the GAO said.

According to GAO auditors, the **Smithsonian** incorporated both the **Smithsonian** aResearch Foundation and the **Smithsonian** Science Information Exchange (SSIE) to avoid having to return u.S. funds not spent - as required - during a given fiscal year and to avoid civil service hiring and firing regulations.

The **Smithsonian** converted more than \$9.9 million in federal funds into "private money" in fiscal year 1976 through the corporations, according to the GAO. The auditors said they found no evidence that the money was used for anything other than purposes for which it was appropriated by Congress.

While the GAO report makes no general statements about overall financial management of the **Smithsonian**, the report does draw a picture of inadequate oversight by Congress of the **Smithsonian**'s finances and a reluctance by **Smithsonian** officials to inform Congress of the institutions decisions and plans.

"The committees of the Congress have never requested and are not furnished with information on the planned used of **Smithsonian** private funds when considering appropriations requests," the report said.

"The **Smithsonian** has a long tradition of private financing and independence," the GAO report said. "The Congress has not reviewed the private funds budget in the past.

"In our view, the mixture of federal and private funding in so many **Smithsonian** activities makes a review of the **Smithsonian**'s federal budget of and by itself inadequate.

"Simply stated, there can be no assurance under the present set up that congressional budget actions will have the intended effect," the report said.

In this regard, and at the request of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior and Related Agencies, which requested the audit, the GAO examined how the **Smithsonian** has used its endowment funds and other legitimate sources of private income to begin projects that then require federal funds to maintain.

The auditors found that the **Smithsonian** had committer itself to both the Cooper-Hewitt Museum of Decorative Arts and Design in New York City and the Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies near Annapolis without telling Congress until years after making the original commitments.

Hundreds of thousands of dollars in federal funds are required annually to maintain the Cooper-Hewitt and the bay center.

According to the GAO report, **Smithsonian** Secretary S. Dillon Ripley said he is fully agreeable to developing guidelines for determining how the **Smithsonian** should spend its private money.

Ripley also is agreeable to providing Congress with complete information on how the **Smithsonian** plans to spend its private money in advance of congressional hearings on the **Smithsonian**'s yearly federal appropriation, the report said.

The GAO auditors said they did not have enough time to examine the Smithsonians use of

private banks to deposit both its legitimately private money and federal money hanneled through the two private foundations.

The auditors were asked to look into this aspect of the Smithsonian's finances after Senate subcommittee staff members were told that the Smithsonian was depositing large sums of money in the American Security & trust Co., of which Ripley was a director until his resignation last December.

The auditors also reported that Ripley has spent from one-third to two-thirds of each of the last three years traveling outside Washington.

In fiscal year 1976 and the transition quarter of August through October, 1976, for example, Ripley spent 90 full working days out of Washington on official business as well as 130 days at his litchfield, Conn., estate. That translated into 44 weeks outside Washington during a period of approximately 64 weeks.

Ripley explained to the auditors that his duties as secretary of the Smithsonian require his attendance at a wide variety of meetings and conferences throughout the world, thus accounting for his official travel.

The Smithsonian also told the auditors that Ripley considers Litchfield "a regular place of duty . . . as arranged with the board of regents, where he maintains a rsidence, office, library and waterfowl preserve. While there, he conducts research, writes official reports, reveives and sends official correspondence, receives official vistors and maintains daily contact with the Washington office by telephone and exchange of correspondence."

Most of Riley's travel - as well as his salary - is paid for with private smithsonian funds, according to the audit report.

The Smithsonian's budget for the 1976 fiscal year and the three-month transition quarter totaled \$153.6 million. Of this, \$121 million came from direct federal appropriations, \$15.5 million from federal research grants and other federal contracts and \$17 million from private endowment funds, donors and fund-raising activities, the audit said.

The audit report says part of the controversy about the Smithsonian's use of its public and private money stems from its unusual constitution. It is neither a U.S. agency nor a fully private museum and research complex.

Instead, the Smithsonian Institution was created by congress in 1836 after an Englishman, James Smithson, left his fortune to the United States for the purpose of creating "an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men."

The Smithsonian is separate from, but under the care of the U.S. government. Its board of regents is comment. its board of regents is composed of members of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of the government and private citizens.

Under Ripley's tenure, the Smithsonian has grown from a somewhat sleepy collection of museums into what generally is viewed as an exciting and innovative research and museum complex. At the same time, Ripley's personal style - aloof and sometimes arrogant - has won him a number of influential enemies as well as friends in Washington.

Graphic

Picture, S. DILLON RIPLEY . . . agreeable to setting guidelines

End of Document

Smithsonian Chief's Link To Bank Is Investigated; Smithsonian Secretary's Link to Bank Is Investigated - Correction Appended

The Washington Post

Correction Appended

Copyright 1977 The Washington Post

Section: First Section; A1

Length: 1382 words

Byline: By Charles A. Krause, Washington Post Staff Writer

Body

The General Accounting Office has been asked to determine whether it was proper for Smithsonian Secretary S. Dillon Ripley to sit as a director of the American Security and Trust Co. at the same time the Smithsonian was depositing hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in noninterest-bearing accounts at the bank.

As a result of the arrangement, the Smithsonian appears to have lost thousands of dollars in interest by leaving its money in the checking accounts, rather than investing the funds in short-term securities. AS&-T did provide free checking and other services in return for the more than \$500,000 in average month-end balances the Smithsonian kept at the bank.

Dwight Dyer, chief of staff for the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior and related agencies, said that he learned of Ripley's membership on the AS&-T board and the Smithsonian's deposits late last summer. He said he sent a memo to the GAO to include this as part of an audit of the Smithsonian's books requested by the subcommittee last June.

Ripley quietly resigned from the bank board in December, just as the GAO was completing its audit. The GAO is supposed to have a report ready for the Senate subcommittee later this month.

In an interview in his office last Thursday, Ripley said he resigned from the AS&-T board after 10 years because "I'm tired. I just have less and less time (for outside activities) as the Smithsonian grows larger."

He said his resignation was unrelated to the GAO inquiry. Furthermore, he said, "the fact that I was a director of this bank was not a conflict of interest." There was "no favoritism" and "no partiality" shown toward AS&-T, Ripley said. He acknowledged that the Riggs National Bank handled most of the Smithsonian's accounts prior to his going on the AS&-T board in 1967.

He said the **Smithsonian** opened its first private bank account in 1847 and opened in 1927 its first account at a bank that became part of AS&-T.

According to the **Smithsonian**'s financial records, approximately three-quarters of the \$799,000 that the quasipublic Institution keeps in private banks was deposited in checking accounts at AS&-T during the last 13 months Ripley served on the bank's board.

At prevailing 5 per cent short-term interest rates over that period, the **Smithsonian** could have earned about \$25,000 a year in interest on the money. However, it was impossible to learn how much AS&-T free checking and other banking services were worth because the **Smithsonian** refused to explain exactly what services AS&-T provided.

Ripley received at least \$2,400 a year in director's fees, according to a source at AS&-T. He owns 150 shares of AS&-T stock, which is close to the minimum that a director is required by law to own. Ripley said he knew nothing about where the **Smithsonian** was keeping its money during the period he served on the AS&-T board - or that the money was being kept in noninterest-bearing checking accounts.

"The treasurer (of the **Smithsonian**) has to organize these things," Ripley said. "I see what's in our financial report. And that's about all."

T. Ames Wheeler, the **Smithsonian**'s treasurer, said he, too, knows little about where the Institution deposits its money. Those decisions are made by Betty Morgan, an assistant treasurer, Wheeler said.

It was Morgan, Wheeler said, who decided to close one of the **Smithsonian**'s AS&-T checking accounts last month. She will decide what to do about a second, much larger, account at AS&-T, Wheeler said. "She's very knowledgeable about the banking business," the treasurer said.

Despite his noninvolvement in the decision to close the one AS&-T account, which had average daily balances of \$65,000 over the past 18 months, Wheeler said Morgan's decision was prompted in part by the GAO audit.

The auditors "certainly caused us to peer over in that direction. We looked at it (the account at AS&-T) and decided to put the money in the Treasury," Wheeler said.

The **Smithsonian** still maintains a second checking account at AS&-T, which had month-end balances over the past 18 months of about \$450,000, Wheeler said. This account is one described by bankers as "non zero based," which means in effect that the **Smithsonian** had been using the account primarily for savings without receiving any interest.

Wheeler acknowledged that keeping large balances in noninterest-bearing checking accounts, whether at AS&-T or at the 24 other private banks where the **Smithsonian** has accounts, may not be the most efficient way for the Institution to be handling its money. "It pays to look at these things," Wheeler said. "Yes, it does."

Dyer indicated that the Senate subcommittee, which has grown increasingly concerned about the **Smithsonian**'s handling of its federal and private funds, is certain to have questions about the use of private bank accounts at budget hearings next month. Dyer said it is not clear to him why the **Smithsonian** does not keep its unspent funds in the Treasury like other government agencies.

Another series of questions is likely to revolve around the Smithsonian Research Foundation, a private, non-profit corporation set up by the Smithsonian in 1966. The Foundation is never mentioned in any Smithsonian literature or its budget document, even though the Foundation is clearly related to the Smithsonian. Ripley, Wheeler, Morgan and two other Smithsonian officials serve as directors of the Foundation.

It was the Foundation's account at AS&-T that was closed last month.

According to an explanation of the Foundation's purpose and activities prepared at the Smithsonian at the request of The Washington Post, the Research Foundation was created in 1968 to handle search money appropriated by Congress to the Smithsonian.

By transferring the federal money from the Smithsonian's account at the Treasury to the Foundation, the Smithsonian was able to fund multi-year search projects and to hire scientists and other personnel for "flexible assignments outside of normal civil service requirements."

The Research Foundation will receive about \$1.7 million during the current fiscal year from a variety of sources, according to the Smithsonian. Funding of this magnitude was kept the Foundation's account at AS&-T at about \$65,000 a day over the past 18 months, ending last Sept. 30. The Smithsonian estimated that about 300 checks a month were written on this one account over that period.

Ripley said that Congress was told about the creation of the Smithsonian Research Foundation in 1965 or 1966.

The secretary said the absence of any reference to the Foundation in subsequent Smithsonian literature must have been "inadvertent."

Dyer said he could not say for sure that Ripley did not mention the Foundation sometime over the past 10 years. But he said he and members of the Senate subcommittee were unaware of its existence last summer when he learned about it from a source outside the Smithsonian hierarchy.

The subcommittee ordered the GAO audit in the first place after it found out about a \$1 million contingency fund maintained for several years by Ripley. The secretary was getting the money from federal appropriations to various Smithsonian museums and departments, funds which were then partially turned over to Ripley for emergencies - without Congress' knowledge.

The contingency fund has now been discontinued.

The Smithsonian depends on federal appropriations for about 90 per cent of its \$100 million annual budget. The remaining 10 per cent comes from private trust funds and donations.

Because of the way it was chartered by Congress, the Smithsonian is neither a fully public nor fully private institution. Ripley is paid out of the private funds, as are more than 1,000 of the Smithsonian's employees, and answers only to a board of regents composed of the Vice President, the Chief Justice of the United States, senators, representatives and private citizens.

Ripley said the Regents approved both the creation of the Research Foundation and his joining the AS&-T board of directors in 1967.

Sources within the **Smithsonian** say that the GAO audit and the resulting publicity have been painful both for Ripley and the Institution, which is accustomed to being described only in the most favorable light.

Correction

Due to a typographical error, a story in yesterday's editions of The Post stated that the **Smithsonian** Institution keeps \$799,000 in private banks. The correct figure is \$700,000.

Correction-Date: February 8, 1977, Tuesday, Final Edition

Graphic

Picture, S. DILLON RIPLEY . . . "no favoritism" shown to AS&T

End of Document

Regents' Committee to Probe Smithsonian's Finance Policy; Regents' Panel to Review Smithsonian Fund Practices

The Washington Post

April 29, 1977, Friday, Final Edition

Copyright 1977 The Washington Post

Section: First Section; A1

Length: 1165 words

Byline: By Charles A. Krause, Washington Post Staff Writer

Body

A committee of Smithsonian Institution regents has been created to review the institution's financial practices following recent criticism of the Smithsonian by the General Accounting Office, members of Congress and the press.

The regents' committee, headed by Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.), also plans to hire an outside firm to examine the institution's organization, management practices, effectiveness and its present relationship to Congress.

Creation of the high-level committee is the first sign that the Smithsonian, a sprawling museum and research complex that depends on federal appropriations for almost 90 per cent of its budget, is concerned about the public criticism leveled against it in recent months.

Until now, Smithsonian officials have tended to dismiss the criticism as uninformed.

Among other things, the GAO found that the Smithsonian has created two private corporations to convert millions of dollars of federal money into "private money" each year that the institutions then spends without regard to federal restrictions.

The GAO auditors also found that the Smithsonian has committed itself over the years to major projects, such as the Cooper-Hewitt Museum of Decorative Arts and Design in New York City and the Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies near Annapolis, without informing Congress or seeking its approval.

The GAO is inquiring about the reasons why the Smithsonian has about 25 accounts in private banks around the world. They are also still looking into questions concerning the propriety of Smithsonian Secretary S. Dillon Ripley's years of service as a director of the American Security & Trust Co. at the same time millions of dollars of Smithsonian funds were deposited in AS&T checking accounts.

The committee to study the Smithsonian's financial practices and its accountability to Congress

was created by Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, who heads the institution's board of regents. Burger apparently created the committee following a **Smithsonian** budget hearing April 18 before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior and Related Agencies.

At that hearing, Sen. Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) indicated the subcommittee's extreme displeasure with the **Smithsonian**'s handling of its \$100 million a year in federal money. Stevens then called for a complete set of congressional hearings to review the institution's relationship to the federal government.

The **Smithsonian** is a semipublic corporation created by Congress in 1846. Because of its unique status, the **Smithsonian** receives large amounts of federal money but is run as if it were independent of the federal government.

Smithsonian officials clearly want to preserve the present arrangement, which could be threatened if Congress decided to act on Stevens' call for hearings to review the current relationship.

In a letter to Rep. Sidney R. Yates (D-Ill.), chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee that passes on the **Smithsonian**'s yearly federal budget request, Jackson told Yates of the new regents' committee and outlined its mission in general terms.

Jackson asked Yates "to maintain the status quo" with respect to the **Smithsonian**'s 1978 budget until the regents committee has time to review the Institution's overall financial structure and its use of both federal and private monies.

Yates made the Jackson letter public yesterday during hearings on the **Smithsonian**'s request for \$106.5 million in federal money for the next fiscal year. Yates, who was himself a **Smithsonian** regent until he declined renomination last January, said he was inclined not to force the institution to revamp its financial practices in a drastic way before the regents committee has a change to act.

Rep. Jamie L. Whitten (D-Miss.), another member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, said, however, that he thought the full House Appropriations Committee should begin an investigation of the **Smithsonian**'s financial practices regardless of what the regents plan to do.

Whitten, who had the full House hearing room convulsed in laughter several times during his questioning of **Smithsonian** officials, said he thought "the GOA is right. I think we (the Congress) ought to have control over an institution that gets so much federal money."

Whitten was piqued at the **Smithsonian**, he said, because of an article in last December's issue of **Smithsonian** Magazine in which Whitten said his remarks on the Tennessee-Tombigbee barge canal project in Tennessee were taken out of context.

After getting Ripley to admit that he hadn't read the article, Whitten dead panned: "You mean you have a wonderful magazine like that and you don't even read it?"

"The point I make is not that this (article) is so damaging," Whitten continued, "but I'm trying to find out whether you folks are sitting on top of your own operation. It's apparent to

Apart from Whitten's criticism, there was far less harsh criticism of Ripley and his subordinates at

yesterday's house hearing than at the April 18 Senate hearing. The Senate hearing continues next Tuesday. Yates questioned Ripley about the **Smithsonian**'s relationship to Congress and the institution's financial practices but his tone was less critical than was Stevens' two weeks ago.

Yates did, however, criticize the GAO report for not answering all of the questions asked of the auditors by the Senate subcommittee, which ordered the GAO to audit the **Smithsonian** last year after discovering a secret. \$1 million contingency fund maintained for years by Ripley.

Yates also expressed his concern about clarifying the institution's relationship to Congress and strengthening its accountability for the public and private funds that make up the institution's budget, which this year totals about \$115 million.

"I suppose this is an historic meeting," Yates said shortly after the hearings began yesterday morning. "We need to find out what the relationship is between the **Smithsonian** and the federal government. This has troubled me for a long time."

According to Jackson's letter to Yates and a letter from Ripley to Jackson, also made public yesterday, the regents committee and the consulting firm will undertake "a thorough review of the entire situation" the **Smithsonian** now finds itself in.

"The GAO report and the concerns expressed during the Senate hearing have been discussed with Secretary Ripley and his staff, all of whom are committed to working with your subcommittee, the (regents') audit review committee and the (full) board of regents to resolve these matters," Jackson told Yates.

In addition to Jackson, the regents committee has three other members: Rep. Elford A. Cederberg (R-Mich.), John Paul Austin, president of the Coca-Cola Co., and Murray Gell-Mann, a professor at the California Institute of Technology.

The House hearings on the **Smithsonian**'s 1978 budget will continue this morning.

End of Document

New Probe Asked In Smithsonian, U.S. Relationship; Restudy of Museum Role Asked

The Washington Post

April 19, 1977, Tuesday, Final Edition

Copyright 1977 The Washington Post

Section: Metro; C1

Length: 1000 words

Byline: By Charles A. Krause, Washington Post Staff Writer

Body

Sen. Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) called for a full-scale re-examination of the Smithsonian Institution's relationship to the federal government yesterday after hearing Smithsonian officials declare that they could sell off the National Air and Space Museum or the Museum of Natural History without Congressional approval.

Stevens said the Smithsonian's present unilateral freedom to acquire and dispose of property and buildings bought or maintained with U.S. money illustrates a need for greater control by Congress over the semipublic, semiprivate institution, which is requesting \$106.5 million in federal funds for the 1978 fiscal year.

Stevens is the ranking minority member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior and Related Agencies, which ordered the General Accounting Office to audit the Smithsonian's books last year after the subcommittee discovered a secret, \$1 million contingency fund maintained by Smithsonian Secretary S. Dillon Ripley, Stevens said several times during budget hearings yesterday that the Smithsonian's financial practices are unsatisfactory.

"There has been no allegation of impropriety on the part of you or your colleagues," Stevens told Ripley. "But we (members of the subcommittee) seriously question the fiscal policies of the Smithsonian as far as federal funds are concerned."

Among other things, the GAO audit found that the Smithsonian has created two private corporations to convert millions of dollars of federal money into "private money" each year, which the Smithsonian then spends without regard to federal restrictions.

The GAO auditors also found that the Smithsonian has committed itself over the years to major projects, such as the Cooper-Hewitt Museum of Decorative Arts and Design in New York City and the Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies near Annapolis, without informing Congress or seeking its approval.

These two additions to the Smithsonian's activities now require hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in U.S. support.

Yet Peter G. Powers, the Smithsonian's general counsel, said yesterday that virtually all Smithsonian properties, including the museums on the Mall in Washington, legally belong to the Institution and not to the federal government - despite the fact that hundreds of millions of dollars in federal money has been spent over the years to build, improve and maintain them.

Asked by Stevens whether it is the Smithsonian's position that it could sell off these properties without Congressional approval. Powers responded unequivocally: "Yes . . . although I can't believe we'd do it" without informing Congress first.

Stevens told Powers that, in his view, Congress could no longer tolerate the present situation, under which the Smithsonian has great independence from the federal government while receiving approximately 90 per cent of its budget from the federal treasury each year.

"These must become federal properties if we are to continue to fund them with federal taxpayers' dollars," said Stevens, who was the only member of the subcommittee at the hearing. "There seems to be a growing feeling in the Congress that we ought to be more involved in the acquisition and disposition of properties belonging to the Smithsonian."

After the hearing, Stevens said in an interview that he thinks the time has come for Congress to conduct a complete set of hearings to determine whether The Smithsonian's relationship to the federal government, little changed since the Institution was created by Congress in 1846, still is appropriate.

At present, The Smithsonian is governed by a board of regents composed of the vice president of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, six members of Congress and private citizens. The composition of the regents reflects The Smithsonian's semipublic, semiprivate status.

The Institution receives private money from various endowments, other donations and fund-raising activities such as its museum shops and The Smithsonian Magazine. In addition, it receives millions of dollars in research grants each year from federal agencies for scientific research. The Smithsonian considers the money to be private. It also receives \$100 million a year in direct federal appropriations.

In its early years, the Smithsonian received about 10 per cent of its money from the federal government and 10 per cent from private sources. In recent years, the ratio has been reversed.

Committee source have said Stevens and other members of the appropriations subcommittee have begun to feel that Congress should have greater control over how the Smithsonian spends its federal money. This feeling has grown stronger, according to these sources, since the discovery of Ripley's contingency fund and the recent GAO report, which found that the Smithsonian has used its private spending and civil service requirements.

For its part, the Smithsonian has contended that Congress has not paid as much attention to the Smithsonian as it should have and has not provided it with the kind of flexibility it needs to accomplish its cultural and research missions.

For example, Ripley and Powers argued yesterday that the private corporations are necessary to

get around federal requirements on hiring and expenditures so the **Smithsonian** can hire scientists outside the civil service rolls and also fund multiyear research projects.

Stevens said the **Smithsonian** should have asked for legislative authority to spend its money in the most efficient way rather than set up the corporations without informing Congress about them.

"I don't think we have any disagreement with the goals of the **Smithsonian** but we are supposed to be the committee that watches over the taxpayers' money," Stevens said near the end of the hearing, which will be continued at a date not yet set. "The problem is that you have a tradition of comingling public and private money in a way that the subcommittee finds difficult to accept, Stevens said.

Graphic

Picture, no caption

End of Document

Smithsonian to Study Its Federal Relationship

The Washington Post

May 14, 1977, Saturday, Final Edition

Copyright 1977 The Washington Post

Section: Metro; C3

Length: 324 words

Byline: By Charles A. Krause, Washington Post Staff Writer

Body

The regents of the Smithsonian institution are negotiation with Phillip Samuel Hughes, a retired assistant comptroller general of the United States, to conduct "a scholarly, constitutional study" of the Smithsonian's relationship to the federal government.

Charles Blitzer, assistant secretary for history and art for the Smithsonian, who briefed reporters yesterday after a regents meeting, said Hughes was selected to carry out the study by Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.), who heads a regents committee recently recreated to review criticisms of the Smithsonian's financial practices by the General Accounting Office, members of Congress and the press.

Blitzer said the regents generally approved Jackson's selection of Hughes and authorized the senator to proceed with negotiations aimed at outlining the scope of the study and Hughes' direction of it. Blitzer said Hughes met with the regents at their meeting yesterday and indicated that he could begin his work in July if he is formally commissioned.

Blitzer said the regents' study will attempt not to duplicate a recent GAO audit of the Smithsonian's finances - an audit that has been roundly criticized as inadequate by members of Congress - or a possible upcoming investigation of the Smithsonian's finances by House Appropriations Committee investigators.

The appropriations committee investigation was requested this week by the House Appropriations Subcommittee of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, which handles the Smithsonian's budget. Appropriations Committee Chairman George H. Mahon (D-Tex.), himself a Smithsonian regent, must approve the request before the investigation can begin.

At their meeting yesterday the regents put off a decision on whether future meetings should be open to the public and deferred another decision on whether the Museum of African Art on Capitol Hill should become a part of the Smithsonian, Blitzer said.

End of Document

GAO's Tour of the Smithsonian

The Washington Post

February 12, 1977, Saturday, Final Edition

Copyright 1977 The Washington Post

Section: First Section; Editorial; A14

Length: 621 words

Body

WHEN YOU SAY "Smithsonian," millions of Americans think of Washington's wonderful collection of museums. But the Smithsonian Institution, established by Congress in 1846 in accordance with the terms of a will left by James Smithson of England in 1826, has grown into a giant, worldwide research and museum conglomerate. The organization spends about \$100 million in public funds every year, in addition to about \$11 million in private donations and grants. In the District telephone directory alone, the Smithsonian listings take up a column; activities elsewhere - such as research operations in the Canal Zone, India, Pakistan, Egypt or the Cooper-Hewitt museum of design and decorative arts in New York.

There is also a subsidiary organization, the Smithsonian Research Foundation, which has received federal money transferred from the Smithsonian's account at the Treasury. Until Congress found out about it two years ago, there was a \$1-million contingency fund maintained by S. Dillion Ripley, secretary of the Smithsonian.

It is this complex of activities - together with some financial arrangements involving Mr. Ripley's connection with the American Security and Trust Co. here - that are now attracting investigatory attention. Last fall, Sens. Robert C. Byrd (D-W.Va.) and Ted Stevens (R-Alaska), chairman and ranking minority member respectively of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee with responsibility for federal payments to the Smithsonian, requested a General Accounting Office audit of the organization's books. While noting that the request "in no way should be construed to imply any suspicion of wrongdoing or deliberate impropriety," the request pointed out that the Smithsonian had not "undergone the usual federal reviews and examinations accorded most government agencies."

This week, staff writer Charles A. Krause of this newspaper reported that the GAO also has been asked to determine whether it was proper for Mr. Ripley to sit as a director of American Security at the same time the Smithsonian was depositing hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in non-interest-bearing accounts at the bank. As a result of this arrangement, the Smithsonian appears to have lost thousands of dollars in interest by leaving its money in checking accounts instead of investing the funds in short-term securities.

Smithsonian officials defend the system as an efficient cash management arrangement. Mr.

ripley, who resigned from the American Security board in December after 10 years, sees no conflict of interest. The **Smithsonian** secretary, who reportedly received at least \$2,400 a year in directors fees from the bank and who owns 150 shares of its stock, said he knew nothing about where the **Smithsonian** was keeping its money during the period he served on the American Security board.

This kind of link between private and public funds and bank directorships is nothing new. As some readers may recall, four years ago staff writer Ronald Kessler detailed a similar dual role involving the treasurer of the Washington Hospital Center who also happened to be a vice president of American Security. A year later, there were reports by staff writer Douglas Watson on the then-Maryland state treasurer who had placed millions of public dollars in non-interest accounts in various private banks - including one he headed.

In each case, the arrangements may have been merely convenient, friendly - and entirely legal. But when they involve taxpayers' money, questions having to do with conflicts of interest and public confidence cannot be lightly dismissed. For the sake of everybody involved, the GAO should pursue an exhaustive review of the **Smithsonian's** financial practices.

End of Document

Smithsonian Congressional Hearing Backed

The Washington Post

May 4, 1977, Wednesday, Final Edition

Copyright 1977 The Washington Post

Section: Metro; B4

Length: 537 words

Byline: By Charles A. Krause, Washington Post Staff Writer

Body

More in sorrow than in anger, Sen. Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) said yesterday he still believes Congress should conduct legislative hearings to clarify the Smithsonian Institution's relationship to the federal government.

Steven's statements came in response to reporters' questions about the recent creation of a committee of Smithsonian regents that will review a recent General Accounting Office report critical of the Smithsonian's financial practices.

Stevens said he knows the Smithsonian does not want to go through another set of oversight hearings, and the senator said he does not especially enjoy calling for them. Smithsonian officials "think I'm antagonistic," he said, "but I'm really supportive. I'm trying to give them a base to operate for another 100 years."

The regents' committee, headed by Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.), also plans to hire an independent consulting firm to study "the Smithsonian's organization, management and . . . the institution's present accountability to the Congress."

The regents' committee was created last month after Stevens, who is ranking minority member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior and Related Agencies, which handles the Smithsonian's yearly budget request, said he was extremely dissatisfied with the way the Smithsonian administers its 100 million a year in federal money.

At that time, Stevens called for a new round of hearings to determine whether Congress should bring the Smithsonian under greater U.S. control. At present the institution, which was chartered by Congress in 1946, is run by an independent board of regents composed of the Vice President of the United States, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, members of Congress and prominent private citizens.

Yesterday, after concluding a hearing on the Smithsonian's request for \$106.5 million in federal funds for the next fiscal years. Stevens said that creation of the regents' committee to evaluate the institution was admirable but he said he thought Congress "should get started too."

Legislative hearings on the **Smithsonian** would be conducted by either the Senate Rules Committee or the Government Operations Committee. Stevens said he did not know whether members of those committees are interested in holding the hearings, which Stevens said he thinks are necessary "to fit the **Smithsonian** into the federal fabric in a consistent way."

Recent congressional hearings on the **Smithsonian's** budget and its financial practices have revealed a number of ambiguities and problems confronting the institution as it attempts to maintain the flexibility it thinks necessary to run its museums and research programs while adhering to laws governing the use and spending of U.S. funds.

Jackson has asked the appropriations committee of both houses of Congress to "maintain the status quo" with respect to the **Smithsonian's** budget requests for next year while the regents' committee reviews "the entire situation."

Stevens said yesterday he is not inclined to go along with Jackson's request although Stevens said he wants to confer with Sen. Robert C. Byrd (D.W.Va.), chairman of the Interior appropriations subcommittee, before making a final decision.

End of Document

Smithsonian Considers Public Regents' Meetings

The Washington Post

April 30, 1977, Saturday, Final Edition

Copyright 1977 The Washington Post

Section: First Section; A3

Length: 358 words

Byline: By Charles A. Krause, Washington Post Staff Writer

Body

Smithsonian Secretary S. Dillon Ripley disclosed to a House Appropriations subcommittee yesterday that the institution's board of regents, headed by Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, will decide next month whether future regents' meetings should be open to the public.

Ripley's disclosure came after Rep. Sidney R. Yates (D-Ill.), chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Interior and Related Agencies, and Rep. Ralph S. Regula (R-Ohio), a subcommittee member, suggested that the regents ought to open their meetings because they regularly make decisions involving federal money.

The Smithsonian has recently been criticized by the General Accounting Office, members of Congress and the press for its lack of accountability to Congress and the public for the more than \$100 million a year it receives in federal appropriations.

The regents, who govern the Smithsonian, include the Chief Justice, the Vice President, six members of Congress and prominent private citizens from around the country. Their meetings, held three times a year, are traditionally closed to all but a few high-level Smithsonian officials.

The House Appropriations subcommittee concluded two days of hearings yesterday on the Smithsonian's request for \$106.5 million in federal funds for the 1978 fiscal year.

Among other topics, Yates questioned Ripley about a recent story in The Federal Times that said that Ripley, a noted ornithologist, has birds belonging to the National Zoological Park at his private waterfowl preserve in Litchfield, Conn.

Ripley acknowledged that he does regularly trade birds and other animals with the zoo for breeding purposes. Dr. Theodore Reed, director of the zoo, and Ripley defended the practice but Yates said he thought this subjects Ripley to criticism and told the Smithsonian secretary that his activities should be above reproach.

"I think there's a question of Caesar's wife," Yates told Ripley. Addressing himself to Reed, Yates said: "My reaction would be that if you're going to have outside breeders, then you ought to send

them (the National Zoo's birds) to zoos other than Dr. Ripley's."

Graphic

Picture, S. DILLON RIPLEY . . . questioned on the Hill

End of Document

Electronics Security Guards Ripley's Office; Elaborate Security Net Guards Ripley's Office

The Washington Post

March 16, 1977, Wednesday, Final Edition

Copyright 1977 The Washington Post

Section: Metro; C1

Length: 846 words

Byline: By Charles A. Krause, Washington Post Staff Writer

Body

Smithsonian Secretary S. Dillon Ripley has had an elaborate security system installed in his office to protect himself against violence and to guard against leaks to the news media and the General Accounting Office, which is now auditing the Smithsonian at the request of Congress, according to well placed sources.

Last fall, according to sources within the Smithsonian's Office of Protection Services, Ripley ordered approximately \$8,000 worth of security devices for his office in the Castle Building on the Mall. Other security devices were ordered for the offices of T. Ames Wheeler, treasurer of the Smithsonian, these sources said.

The new security system was installed in two stages, part last July and part last January. Among the devices now in place to protect Ripley's second floor office are:

A closed circuit television system that is hooked up each evening when Ripley leaves his office. A camera is placed on an antique chair outside Ripley's door and a reception set is placed on a guard's desk at the east entrance to the Castle Building. A security guard is supposed to watch the monitor through the night to guard against break ins.

Hidden sensors were placed in molding around the door inside Ripley's large office suite. The sensors are activated at the end of the day and are apparently connected to an alarm in the Office of Protection Services, located in the nearby Arts and Industries Building.

A "kick-bar" under Ripley's desk. This device allows Ripley to call secretly for help should someone threaten him while he is at work.

Carl W. Larsen, director of the Smithsonian's public information office, was asked yesterday to explain why Ripley felt it necessary to have this new security system installed. Larsen was also asked whether the new devices cost \$8,000, as sources told The Washington Post.

"The Smithsonian Institution does not discuss any aspect of its security system," Larsen replied

in writing. "To do so would weaken the ability of such systems to provide the intended security.

Although the new security devices were installed only three months ago, Ripley has in recent weeks ordered additional cameras for his office, according to sources. These cameras and related equipment will cost about \$4,000, the sources said.

Ripley also reportedly tried to change the combination on his office safe recently. He asked for instructions on how to do it himself so that no one else would know the combination, according to one source.

But the **Smithsonian** secretary botched the job and the Mosler Safe Co. had to be called in to repair the broken combination lock, the source said.

Sources said there are a number of reasons for Ripley's heightened concern for his personal safety and security within his office.

The kick bar was installed last summer under Ripley's desk following an incident at the **Smithsonian**'s Silver Hill storage facility, according to these sources. A supervisor there was allegedly bludgeoned to death by one of his employees. More recently, On Feb. 20, a guard at the Air and Space Museum was shot and killed, allegedly by another guard while both were on duty.

Sources said the hidden sensors and closed circuit television system were installed last January because Ripley became concerned about employees providing embarrassing information to GAO auditors and to reporters for both The Washington Post and The Federal Times concerning the **Smithsonian**.

The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior and Related Agencies, which handles the **Smithsonian**'s \$100 million a year federal appropriation, ordered the GAO audit last summer after senators on the subcommittee became concerned about the **Smithsonian**'s financial practices.

The audit report from the GAO is expected to be ready this week, according to the subcommittee staff. Senate hearings on the **Smithsonian**'s 1978 budget request are scheduled for March 24.

Smithsonian employees have been covertly providing embarrassing information to the GAO, the subcommittee (which then transmits information to the GAO to be looked into) and the news media. Top **Smithsonian** officials have attempted to figure out where the leaks are coming from, according to several sources. The closed circuit television system and the sensors were put into Ripley's office to guard against papers being taken from his files and then leaked, one source said.

After each article in The Washington Post about some aspect of the **Smithsonian**'s activities, top officials meet to try to determine how The Post received its initial information.

Yesterday, for example, Ripley met with top officials in the Office of Protection Services because an article in Tuesday's editions of The Post mentioned Protection Services because an article in fact was often carried out through an "old boy" network of retired military officials who hired their friends for top positions.

At yesterday's meeting, which sources said became quite heated, one security official was

overhead saying "we can justify that," meaning the hiring practices.

End of Document

Page PAGE 2 of NUMPAGES 29
Ripley's Son-in-Law Given Smithsonian Aid for Work; Ripley's Son-in-Law Aided by Smithsonian

--	--	--

Page PAGE 5 of NUMPAGES 29
Yates Declines Smithsonian Position

--	--	--

Residents of Md. Bay Area Subsidized by Smithsonian; Smithsonian Subsidizes Residents of Bay Area; Institution Buys Land, Lets Seller Stay, Free

--	--	--

GAO Criticizes Smithsonian's Mixing of Funds; GAO Study Says Smithsonian Converts U.S. Cash to Own Use

--	--	--

Smithsonian Chief's Link To Bank Is Investigated; Smithsonian Secretary's Link to Bank Is Investigated - Correction Appended

--	--	--

Regents' Committee to Probe Smithsonian's Finance Policy; Regents' Panel to Review
Smithsonian Fund Practices

--	--	--

New Probe Asked In Smithsonian, U.S. Relationship; Restudy of Museum Role Asked

--	--	--

Smithsonian to Study Its Federal Relationship

--	--	--

	Page PAGE 23 of NUMPAGES 29
GAO's Tour of the Smithsonian	

--	--	--

	Page PAGE 25 of NUMPAGES 29
Smithsonian Congressional Hearing Backed	

--	--	--

	Page PAGE 27 of NUMPAGES 29
Smithsonian Considers Public Regents' Meetings	

--	--	--

Electronics Security Guards Ripley's Office;Elaborate Security Net Guards Ripley's Office

--	--	--