

Mr. TEAGUE. Well then specifically what were the agreeable disagreements of the Army to this directive?

Secretary STAHR. We haven't disagreed with the directive. In the course of discussing what might be in the directive before it was issued, in general, they are the points that I made in this statement.

One is that we don't think space is a function, or that it is a separable thing and we hoped they wouldn't overlook that. We conceive of space just like we conceive of the air and the ground, as one more medium for helping do a job for people on Earth, and specifically for the Army, in our case.

We also made the point that we have an interest and a very high competence in the field of communications and we wanted this protected and, as I read the directive, and indeed as Secretary Gilpatrick testified, that interest is protected under the directive.

We also made the point that we feel, as I said here in my statement, that space research is an area where you need lots of ideas. This is a field that is just opening up, and it would be a great pity indeed if we said that only certain people are going to be allowed to think about it.

The directive meets that point by permitting each of the Services to develop ideas. This is where the real creativity goes on and I am sure that that is the reason why the directive specifically says that "preliminary research" is not going to be centralized. We also made the point about the possible effect on our scientific personnel.

Mr. TEAGUE. Did Army suggest a defense space agency instead of turning it over to Air Force?

Secretary STAHR. No.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Questions?

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Weis.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Secretary, in the directive and in subsequent testimony the unusual circumstances seemed to come up as the reason why one of the Services should get the future development of an idea rather than the Air Force. Could you give me a precise, or "imprecise" definition of what "unusual circumstance" might be?

Secretary STAHR. I don't know whether I could or not. It is not within my prerogative to interpret this directive but I am going to take a crack at it anyway.

Zeus has already been mentioned. Zeus has at least the potential capability of being developed into an anti-satellite weapon. I would say that if it does so develop, that this would clearly be a circumstance in which the responsibility for that development should remain with the Army, which has developed Zeus to the extent it has already been developed. The mere fact that it was shooting down something out in space should not be considered a reason to change the developing agency. There isn't any place that I can identify where you can draw a line and say, "Here is not space and there is space."

This would be a logical "unusual circumstance" to justify assigning that responsibility to the Army in my judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the lady yield there?

Is there any difference, Mr. Secretary, in having a weapon that will shoot down an airplane, shoot down an ICBM, or shoot down a satellite?