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/palaeoceanography; 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 encouraging 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 Allredge) 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