funding will exist with which to initiate the program. The prime problem now, I believe, remains simply to mount and move out.

As he pointed out in his budget message of just about a month ago, President Johnson indicated, and I quote here an excerpt from the message (slide 46):

> We have progressed far enough that we must look beyond our original objective and set our course for the more distant future. Indeed, we have no alternative unless we wish to abandon the manned spacecraft capability that we have created.

On the heels of this message came the news release and the press briefings that NASA had relative to the budget, which included an approximate $450 million request for the Apollo Applications program. And as Dr. Seamans from the NASA indicated:

> There are a number of unique contributions with practical application, operational capability, science and technology that we can make with this program. And, in addition, we can place the Nation in a position to assess on the basis of valid experimentation and experience the value and feasibility of future space flight.

That sets some of the background for what I am going to cover. We are often asked the question, "What is the Apollo Applications program?" (Slide 47). The inquiry is unlike that when someone asks the question "what is the Apollo program?" where we could bring forth the mental image of a particular spacecraft configuration and we think of that vehicle going to the Moon. By contrast, however, the Apollo Applications program is not a vehicle concept. It is, in fact, a low-cost program concept that is aimed at determining in a firm sense the character of the U.S. next-generation space activities—whether they be manned or unmanned, whether they be planetary, lunar, or earth orbital in nature—and at the same time, maintaining

"IN 1961, THIS NATION RESOLVED TO SEND A MANNED EXPEDITION TO THE MOON IN THIS DECADE. MUCH HARD WORK REMAINS AND MANY OBSTACLES MUST STILL BE OVERCOME BEFORE THAT GOAL IS MET. YET IN THE LAST FEW YEARS, **WE HAVE PROGRESSED FAR ENOUGH THAT WE MUST NOW LOOK BEYOND OUR ORIGINAL OBJECTIVE** AND SET OUR COURSE FOR THE MORE DISTANT FUTURE. INDEED, **WE HAVE NO ALTERNATIVE UNLESS WE WISH TO ABANDON THE MANNED SPACE CAPABILITY THAT WE HAVE CREATED.**"

JANUARY 1967 BUDGET MESSAGE
PRESIDENT L.B. JOHNSON

"...**THERE ARE UNIQUE CONTRIBUTIONS TO PRACTICAL APPLICATION, OPERATIONAL CAPABILITY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, THAT WE CAN MAKE WITH THIS PROGRAM** AND, IN ADDITION, THAT **WE CAN PLACE THE NATION IN A POSITION TO ASSESS ON THE BASIS OF VALID EXPERIMENTATION AND EXPERIENCE THE VALUE AND FEASIBILITY OF FUTURE SPACE FLIGHT AND THE INTERRELATED ROLES OF MANNED AND UNMANNED SYSTEMS** IN ORDER TO GET THE BEST COST TRADE-OFF IN THE FUTURE FOR ULTIMATE OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS."

DR. ROBERT C. SEAMANS, JR.
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, NASA
JANUARY 24, 1967
PRESS BRIEFING ON NASA FY 68 BUDGET

SLIDE 46. BUDGET MESSAGE AND PRESS BRIEFING QUOTATIONS