

and tell them the true story, about your medical history."

"No dad, I don't want you to do that. I've got to go," were his last words.

About six months later, Pfc. Hatton, while serving with the 25th Infantry Division in combat operations, was killed in action.

The blow to the family is one which will never be overcome. Questions are repeated over and over. There are no answers. Perhaps Pfc. Hatton knew but never let on. In his letters to his family from Vietnam, he always closed with "am in good health and have no problems." Not once was there ever a complaint about his physical condition, his parents recalled. "Bobby never told us anything because he didn't want to worry us."

LETTERS ARRIVED

When his death was reported, letters came from all over. A total of 103 Masses was said for him at St. Mary Church. Friends from all faiths attended the services.

Three of those letters tell the story of Pfc. Hatton. From Sister Theresa Ann, SND, Dayton, Ohio, former teacher at St. Mary School, where he attended elementary school, came these words. "I am not a bit surprised that he died this way. It was like him to give his life in the service of others."

His commanding officer in Vietnam, Capt. Ora L. Boss, wrote: "The feelings of myself and all the men of 'A' Company must be expressed. While on operation 'Paul Revere IV,' the platoon to which your son was assigned, came under heavy enemy fire. Bob was one of the platoon machinegunners and provided cover fire so that the wounded could receive medical attention. In doing so, your son was killed by fragments from a hostile grenade on Nov. 13, 1966. Bob died instantly, suffering no pain, and because of his dedication many of his friends were able to receive medical aid. Your son was a fine man and a dedicated soldier."

A CLOSE FRIEND

Officer Candidate David W. Moreno of the Bronx, N.Y., a close friend of Pfc. Hatton at Fort Polk, La., and presently at Fort Lee, Va., where the two were to attend officer school together, had this to say.

"Bob Hatton was the greatest human being I have ever met or probably will meet. He stood head and shoulders above myself and the other men in our company. He was always willing to help one with a problem as well as the men in his squad. His brilliant smile made me feel a lot better when I was depressed.

"Bob's friendship made the days go faster and the sun shine brighter. The last time I saw Bob, I knew I could never be the same person again. I had become a better man because of him. Bob showed an overabundance of good sense, integrity and moral strength. He tried to do his best at all times and won the respect of all the men in Company D.

MOST PRECIOUS

"Bob paid the most precious price for freedom and it is up to all of us to see it was not done in vain."

Pfc. Hatton's decorations came to light to his family at his death. He was the holder of the National Service Medal; the Vietnam Service Medal awarded by the U.S.; Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal by the Vietnamese government; Combat Infantryman's Badge; Machinegunner's Medal; and Sharpshooter's Medal.

Pfc. Hatton rests now in St. Stephen Cemetery. His patriotism to his country since a child can only be summed up in the words of his father. "I guess Bobby had the Stars and Stripes in his eyes forever."

Our Space Program—What Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, while the United States is going forward with its project to put a man on the moon, there is increasing debate on the question of what our future goals should be in space exploration and research. Decisions will have to be made, and soon.

Two recent editorials which appeared in the Chicago Daily News and the Washington Post discuss this problem in a constructive manner. The editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Daily News]

AFTER THE MOON, WHAT?

Project Apollo is expected to place Americans on the moon in two or three years. Then what? Should there be projects such as the establishment of semi-permanent lunar stations, with costs rising as high as the rockets? Or should there be a cutback in the manned space expenditures that would permit the achievement of other objectives?

In a recent New Republic, American physicist Ralph E. Lapp gives his answer: "I believe that the NASA manned space program must be cut back . . . Manned spectaculars must give way to instrumented programs, and we must relate space spending to national science policy."

Spokesmen for the space program give other answers, of course. Lapp quotes an editorial in the trade press urging a big followup to Apollo: "We feel space exploration is . . . as significant to mankind as any scientific, social or political program on Earth. In the long run, it may be even more important than slum clearance, pollution control, mass transportation, universal higher education, medicare and other vital programs."

This extreme statement helps state the issue, because the space program could be so expensive that the choice would have to be between it and some, or even all, of the other objectives mentioned. Project Mercury cost \$500,000,000; Gemini cost \$1.35 billion; the cost of Apollo is currently reckoned at \$23 billion.

Lapp points to a "multitude of problems right here on Earth which science can help solve." There are social problems such as slums and congested traffic. There are health problems such as cancer, mental diseases and defective human organs. "The biological scientists," says Lapp, "bear a heavy responsibility to chart the future."

In urging that the U.S. space program be cut back to a steady \$1 billion or \$2 billion a year after Apollo, Lapp is not advocating that space exploration be abandoned. But manned exploration is what skyrockets the costs, and ". . . there is very little use for man in space if one considers the comparative cost of manned and instrumented space missions. . . . The single greatest discovery of the Space Age—the Van Allen radiation belt—was made with only a 30-pound payload."

If, as we believe, logic is on the side of disinterested scientists, powerful forces are nevertheless pushing for bigger manned space programs. NASA's annual budget is \$5 billion a year. Because of the long lead-time in NASA operations, some of the Apollo con-

tractors have nearly finished their jobs. Of the estimated 400,000 people employed in space work, 100,000 may well be out of jobs within a year if a post-Apollo project isn't launched soon.

So the time to decide what comes after Apollo is now. And the American people, advised by the entire community of expert knowledge, should participate in giving the answer, weighing value against competing value and one priority against others.

Fortunately, the climate is favorable for rational discussion. No convincing case has been made that there are military advantages in manned stations on the moon. Mao Tse-tung isn't likely to put the Red Guard on Mars or Venus. The prestige race to put the first men on the moon will be lost or won with Apollo. And the astronomical costs of space exploration recommend co-operative international ventures in the future, rather than the blind, national competitions of the past.

[From the Washington Post]

SPACE: THE CRISIS OF DECISION

(By Joshua Lederberg)

Decisions are being made now on the executive budget for the coming year. The public knows almost nothing of the personalities and political philosophy of the men in the middle echelons of the Bureau of the Budget. Yet they play a decisive role in the hard choices that must be made among competing values. The President has the choice of which programs will be implemented, which deferred.

Among the crises of decision, the national space program must be the source of some of Mr. Johnson's and his budgeteers' most painful dilemmas. Besides the committed Apollo program for "a manned landing on the moon within this decade," we have to consider the funding of the next steps in space, a policy that will have important consequences for our overall technical progress.

Three years ago, Sen. Clinton P. Anderson took testimony from a number of scientists concerning the merits of the Apollo program. My position at that time was in support of the program, which put me in the minority among scientists and educators. If my judgment were operative, other categories of work in space or on science might have higher priority, but tearing Apollo down could have no constructive result.

The expected scientific payoff from Apollo was incidental: unmanned scientific missions like Surveyor and Lunar Orbiter have been spectacular successes at a fraction of Apollo's cost. Some combination of possible military utility, anticipated impact on the rest of the world and our spectator-sport interest in astronautics may have been behind the choice of the manned landing among possible programs.

The choice has proven itself pragmatically. Would Congress have sustained its support for space merely for science? It has been cogently pointed out that the nominal goal of Apollo, the lunar landing, is merely the means to create our fundamental technological capacity to operate in space. We cannot readily assess how much more economically this could be achieved if it were attacked directly as the actual goal; if we could afford to dispense with the psychological focus of the living man in space.

Three years have seen enormous advances in political conscience and action. We now have plans and authorizations for education, health and social programs that were only dreams then. We are also told we cannot afford guns and schools and space—we must decide against some programs in order to match a limited supply of dollars.