

systems and operations for planetary missions. The studies of launch vehicles are directed toward a single set of vehicles that will accommodate requirements for the earth orbital, lunar, and planetary missions.

FISCAL YEAR 1968

Based on the results of the FY 66 and some of the FY 67 studies, planned FY 68 studies will continue the earlier studies emphasizing selected areas such as identifying common systems in the various spacecraft modules and with a view to reducing the number of distinct modules required for earth orbital, lunar, and planetary missions.

A better definition of the long duration earth orbital space station will continue to investigate the implications of artificial gravity requirements as well as to determine the feasibility of adaptation to planetary modules. Similarly, the designs of the experiment modules will be investigated for their applicability for planetary missions.

Planetary studies will continue to identify design requirements for the reconnaissance flights to assure maximum carry over to later manned planetary landings.

Studies in the lunar area include the preliminary definition and predesign of a direct flight lunar logistic vehicle identified in a FY 66 study. Additional studies will continue the investigation of lunar experiments for both fixed stations and long distance lunar traverses.

The vehicle studies will continue to determine in more detail the characteristics of the most desirable systems to support the areas of earth orbital, lunar, and planetary missions.

Mr. RUMSFELD. This category of advanced missions was cut down to less than a third of what you requested. Was there any other category that was cut down to less than a third?

Dr. MUELLER. Well, the space station was cut—

Mr. RUMSFELD. One hundred percent?

Dr. MUELLER. Yes; 100 percent and to some extent these tie together. We are delaying the work that could be done on a space program for at least a year. The advanced mission studies lay the foundation for the future course of our activities. When we cut those back, we essentially cut back our ability to determine the course of action that would be most economical and most effective in the future.

Mr. RUMSFELD. That is what my view is. It seems to me that it is rather foolish to pare down advanced missions to less than a third of what NASA thought would be reasonable when this does, in fact, lay the groundwork for making intelligent decisions as we proceed through the future months and years.

Let me put it this way. Why did NASA accept this?

Dr. MUELLER. Well, again, it goes back to the need to balance the total program. I think that what this represents is a decision on the part of the President and the Bureau of the Budget to go forward with an aggressive space program, but by no means to go forward with the most aggressive space program that we could undertake.

It represents a conscious decision to—

Mr. RUMSFELD. Isn't it true that these studies help you decide what should be undertaken?

Dr. MUELLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUMSFELD. By revising that to less than a third, aren't you cutting off your options for the coming months and years? Aren't you reducing the input that is going to be available to make intelligent decisions next year and the year after?