

work out in practice, gives us adequate scope to fulfill the Army's assigned and logical missions in the defense of this country.

It is my view that space is an environment—not a function. The Army does not view space programs as ends in themselves; rather, we view space as a new and challenging medium which we will have to consider and investigate and utilize in carrying out our mission.

Let me see if I can give you an example. The Army's mission, in its broadest sense, is preparedness for land warfare. We all know that one of the important functions in land warfare is communications, and it is hardly necessary to say that this function is becoming more important every day. It is also obvious that, for the future, space will be a critical environment for communications and that there is an enormous amount of work to be done in this field.

Now it happens that the Army has had assigned responsibilities in this area since 1959 which, under Paragraph III of the space directive, will be continued. This simply illustrates what I mean when I say that the Army doesn't take the view that it has any business working on space problems just for the sake of working on them. Our effort will always be to view space programs strictly in relation to our assigned mission.

It is this concept which has been at the center of the Army's thinking. It is my view that it is vitally essential to our national defense that the Army, Navy, and Air Force be encouraged and supported in their respective fields of primary research. Exploitation of this relatively new and untouched environment is best accomplished by maintaining a broad attack upon it, an attack characterized by the highly diversified and differing requirements of the three Services to conduct operations on the land, on the sea, and in the air. I'm sure I don't need to remind this particular committee of the Army's past accomplishments and contributions in space technology. Nor need I remind you of the proved and widely recognized capabilities and wealth of talent which exist in the Army's scientific team, both civilian and military.

I was here on last Friday during the appearance of Secretaries Gilpatric and Hitch, and I want to comment on one subject which seemed to concern some members of the committee. That is the problem of morale amongst the Army's scientific team, and more particularly the military members of that team, both present and future. I have given a great deal of thought to this subject and would like to give you my conclusions.

Stated in its simplest terms, the real question involved is whether Army scientists will be willing to bend their best efforts on primary research projects in space with the foreknowledge that the results of their work may later have to be turned over for development to another Service. My answer to that question is that I believe they will, given the assumption that the projects on which they are working are projects which really bear a logical and useful relationship to the Army's primary mission.

Any other answer, it seems to me, would suggest that the Army's scientific team is simply bent on self-aggrandizement, and this I do not believe to be the fact. I believe that in this day and age the Army is faced with more than enough scientific frontiers within the fields of its assigned missions to challenge fully the great intellectual and professional talents of our scientists and research teams.