

over backward to meet the requirements of the Army and the Navy as prescribed by the directive.

Mr. MILLER. Some of us remember that during the thin days when missilery was not popular and the Air Force was more interested in developing fast planes to carry out its mission, it neglected this field.

And the Von Braun team, working on pennies, came through with the first breakthrough, but the breakthrough was hardly there, and the Air Force rather voraciously reached out and said, "This is ours. We are going to take it away from the Army."

I am not too certain that during the long period of the development of the Polaris, the Air Force was too happy.

Now is the Air Force under this directive going to find some way of saying, "Well now, Polaris is a strategic weapon. We will take it."

General WHITE. It is a very interesting theory, Mr. Miller. I don't happen to agree with you and it would take a long time to sort this one out, but I would like specifically to answer your last question: The Air Force has no designs whatsoever, on the Polaris weapon system. Polaris is carried by submarines. We don't have anything to do with combat ships at sea.

I have advocated that there be created a unified, single strategic command within the United States Armed Forces. I specifically stated that if such a command were formed, the Strategic Air Command would be a subordinate of it and I submit that no other chief of staff in history has ever offered to have its major command subordinated to any other command.

Moreover in the same paper I recommended, as would be normal in a situation such as that, that if a unified command were formed, the staff would be comprised of appropriate representatives from all the services that contributed forces and moreover that the commander of this force could be either a naval or an air force officer.

Mr. MILLER. General, knowing you and your record—I know your record, you hardly know me—when I was a junior member of the Armed Services Committee, I had the opportunity to follow yours and I have every confidence in you. I ask these questions because in this particular field, it is a field I feel belongs in another committee, but it was with respect to research and development of this weapon that I was concerned with extending its range, maybe new techniques of firing from under the sea—these are the things that we are concerned with and that in these, the Air Force was not going to be parochial is the thing that concerns me.

For instance, I have one more question. The only defensive system with which we have come up so far against air attack, or missile attack, is Nike-Zeus. Do you feel that the Army should be allowed to go ahead and continue Nike-Zeus?

General WHITE. I would answer that question in two ways: I in no way oppose the Army producing or manning a point defense system for the United States. When you get down to the Nike-Zeus, I have supported the Secretary of Defense's decisions in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. After all, though that is a matter of the internal operation of the Pentagon rather than the—

Mr. MILLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, it involves—

General WHITE. It is that, but I am sure the Congress has an interest and has a right to have an interest.

The CHAIRMAN. We are interested, yes.