

Government has been a "dead hand" on the nuclear industry, Keyworth told the committee, and its role now is simply to get itself off the industry's back. This, of course, overturns the policy established by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. It is unlikely that Congress, which for four years voted funds for programs including the Clinch River Breeder Reactor over the objection of President Carter, will toss these R&D programs into the garbage bin.

Over the past year a fight has raged between the administration and the Congress over national policy in thermonuclear fusion. Less than six months after President Carter put his signature on the 1980 Magnetic Fusion Energy Engineering Act, mandating an aggressive fusion effort, Carter holdovers and anti-technology factions in the Reagan camp were trying to overturn the intent and goals of the law.

Bouquard asked Keyworth, "Are you going to appeal the OMB cuts in the DOE fusion program [more than \$50 million in real dollars]?" Keyworth would only say that he cannot comment on specific programs still under budgetary review. Bouquard was visibly angered by this posture.

On the space program, Flippo received an equally negative response. When he asked if Keyworth will support the Galileo Jupiter mission before the OMB, Keyworth replied: "It is a good mission. The question is whether we can afford to support it."

"In an article in the *Washington Post*," Flippo said, "you recommended against continuation of NASA's planetary programs." "Planetary exploration has dominated space science programs for the last decade," Keyworth replied, trying to deflect the question. "I strongly support all areas of space science. . ." Flippo cut Keyworth off in obvious disgust.

Research & Development

Cold welcome for a Heritage proposal

by Marsha Freeman

The Heritage Foundation's attempt to eliminate NASA aeronautics research and development in the name of "free enterprise" has touched off a major battle in Congress. Because it would gut American advanced military programs (and hamstringing the country's second largest export industry), the David Stockman-backed plan has

also prompted a second look at the special report issued by *EIR* earlier this year entitled "The KGB Moles and the Heritage Foundation."

The battle pits the socialist-founded but nominally conservative Heritage Foundation, along with the Office of Management and Budget, against Congress, the military, and the aerospace industry. Since the British Fabian Society operatives who set up Heritage as a control point over the administration, using the "right-wing" version of British liberalism, are interlinked with KGB personnel, the questions arises as to whether certain elements of Soviet intelligence are using Heritage to undermine vital U.S. capabilities.

Research in advanced aircraft has been federally supported since the birth of the industry in the second decade of this century. It is supposed to be turned over to private industry, according to Heritage's 1980 report to the Reagan administration. The author of this proposal, Richard Speier, asserted in October that the government should not pay for aeronautical research and development since it ends up as a "commercial" product for industry. Congress, industry, and the military took a distinctly opposite viewpoint during hearings held Dec. 8 by the subcommittee on Transportation, Aviation, and Materials of the House Committee on Science and Technology.

Dan Glickman (D-Kans.), the subcommittee chairman, said in his opening statement that "suggestions have ranged from turning aeronautics over to the military, to ending all propulsion work and closing the NASA Lewis Research Center in Cleveland, to zeroing to entire program." Glickman then presented for the hearing record three letters from high-level Defense Department administrators, to dispel the notion that the military would pick up aeronautics research if it were dropped by NASA.

The Pentagon's position

In a recent letter to OMB director David Stockman, Defense Secretary Casper Weinberger stated that the "major reductions proposed in the NASA aeronautics technology programs and the closing of the Lewis Research Center are not consistent with DOD needs. . . . Therefore, I request that, before any budget reductions and subsequent management actions are taken which impact the NASA aeronautics program, this department be given the opportunity to review these actions to ensure that they will not adversely affect important defense needs."

A letter to NASA Administrator James Beggs from the Undersecretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, Dr. Richard DeLauer, states: "The continued superiority of U.S. aeronautical technology, and the historic dependence of the Military Services on NASA facilities and technical specialists have been, and will

continue to be, crucial to the development of military aircraft. Successful development of the B-1B, Advanced Technology Bomber, Next Generation Air Force Fighter, and the Marine Corps transport assault aircraft are critically dependent on a vital and productive NASA aeronautics program."

Third, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research, Development, and Acquisition, J. R. Sculley stated on Dec. 1 in a letter to Dr. Beggs that "The Army's reliance on these programs means that substantial reductions . . . would necessitate the Army incurring major increases in our existing and proposed budget . . . in fact, some of these capabilities and facilities could not be replaced by the U.S. Army, at any cost."

Industry can't do it, either

In his opening statement to the subcommittee, full committee chairman Don Fuqua (D-Fla.) stated that if these cuts were made "we would become a second-rate power where aeronautics is concerned." Rep. Ronnie Flippo (D-Ala.) stated that "Parson Malthus would have been right [about limited growth] except for R&D. We're mortgaging our future if we cut these programs."

The first industry witness was former Apollo astronaut and aeronautics expert Neil Armstrong. Chairman Glickman asked his opinion "of the Heritage Foundation recommendation that NASA back out of aeronau-

tics research because private industry has sufficient incentives now to do it."

Armstrong said that such a proposal was "like asking the Congress to back out of passing legislation. NASA is in the business of doing research," he stated. "I couldn't accept that kind of recommendation." Fuqua asked directly if industry would pick up this research. Armstrong replied that there "is no evidence that would be the case." He explained that there has been a steady erosion of NASA resources for aeronautical research over the last dozen years; industry had plenty of opportunity to "pick up the slack, but industry R&D has declined in parallel with the decline in NASA funding."

"NASA has \$5 billion worth of facilities for the whole aeronautics industry," Armstrong explained, which no one could replace. In general, Armstrong could see no reason for changing a system which has worked magnificently. "If it ain't broke, don't fix it," he concluded.

Other industry representatives concurred. Congressional witnesses from the Ohio area whose constituents would be affected by the closure of the NASA Lewis Research Center pledged their cooperation with any coalition in Congress that will fight the overall NASA cuts. This will be a bipartisan effort against the Heritage approach.

Executive Intelligence Review

U.S., Canada and Mexico only	3 months	\$125
	6 months	\$225
	1 year	\$396

Foreign Rates

Central America, West Indies, Venezuela, and Colombia: 3 mo. \$135, 6 mo. \$245, 1 yr. \$450

Western Europe, South America, Mediterranean, and North Africa: 3 mo. \$140, 6 mo. \$225, 1 yr. \$470

All other countries: 3 mo. \$145, 6 mo. \$265, 1 yr. \$490

I would like to subscribed to the *Executive Intelligence Review* for

3 months 6 months 1 year

Please charge to my

Master Charge No. _____

Visa No. _____

Interbank No. _____

Signature _____

Expiration date _____

I enclose \$_____ check or money order

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Make checks payable to *Executive Intelligence Review* and mail to *EIR*, 304 W. 58th Street, 5th Floor, New York, NY 10019. For more information call (212) 247-8820.