

certain. Hope continues to stir among impoverished Haitians for Aristide's return to office, despite the economic stagnation which characterized his previous term. Hesitant that Aristide's 1990 platform was too radical and unstable, the Clinton Administration insisted that he be little more than a figurehead president. His opposition to the Preval/Smarth-supported austerity programs gives the public optimism for the future. But a legislature controlled by Aristide's party will likely have a negative impact on foreign investment and donations. In a country like Haiti, which lacks the basic infrastructure and natural resources needed to build upon, a drop in investment could have a devastating effect on the future of its economy.

SELF-DETERMINATION OVER MODERNIZATION?

The postponed legislative elections are a crucial element in helping to determine the country's future. Right now Congress is split between supporters of Preval's modernization plan and those who rally behind Aristide and his anti-austerity campaign. The pro-Preval OPL currently controls the Senate. By a narrow vote it succeeded in obtaining that body's approval to begin privatizing many of the state-run industries. There are nine of these privatization programs underway, including the electric and telephone companies.

In the first round of elections, voters demonstrated their abiding trust in former President Aristide. Aside from being huge, it is impossible to know exactly what percentage of the population rallies behind him today, due to the minute voter showing at the polls and the accusations of fraud. With the seven seats in the Senate, Aristide's Famni Lavalas, party almost certainly would have won most of the positions being contested, drowning the OPL. This scenario does not seem all that unlikely given the fact that Preval and other OPL leaders have had enormous difficulties gathering significant domestic support for their internationally-backed austerity plans. According to a speech Aristide gave shortly after Smarth's resignation, "It is a game of organizing their own business rules which are good for those that have more and bad for those who have less." Such sentiments are widely held by the Haitian population.

What makes for this extreme variation of opinion on the island? Once again it goes back to the haves and have-nots. The initial stages of the reforms inevitably will bring job cuts as private management seeks to achieve efficiency through heightened productivity. Most of these state-run industries are notorious for their inefficiency. But in a country experiencing astronomically high unemployment, such job cuts will eliminate the sole source of income for many families. It affords scarce solace to individuals who must live their lives worrying about their short-run needs (such as how they are going to get their next meal) to endure crushing hardships for the distant possibility of long-run benefits. They ask, what good are such prospects if people cannot survive the suffering that they are forced to presently endure?

If indeed Aristide does gain a majority in any future election he may contest—namely the presidential race of 2000—it is assumed that he will respond to mass public opinion by putting an end to or reform at least some of the privatization programs. However, the United States and other international donors have threatened to pull the plug on development funding if the austerity plan is abandoned, and without such funds Haiti is doomed to sink down to an even starker level of poverty.

U.S. ROLE IN HAITI

The majority of development funds received by Haiti come from the U.S. In practice, this should endow the U.S. government with a significant influence over Haitian

economic and political developments. The basic inconsistency of the Clinton Administration's policy towards Haiti lies in the fact that global democratization is a putative priority for the United States, yet leaders continue to press the island to structure its economy in accordance with Washington's neo-liberal prescriptions, thereby denying the Haitian public (when it comes to privatization) the right to self-determination, the most fundamental component of a fully functioning democracy.

Although Washington was the driving force behind Aristide's brief return to the presidency in 1994, his empowerment was not permitted. Due to U.S. involvement, what was happening in Port-au-Prince did little more than legitimize a process that would depoliticize the island, transforming it into a paragon of the market reforms Washington insists should guild that nation's economic development.

NASA LEWIS RESEARCH CENTER: PART 3

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1997

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add further comment to the status and future of Lewis Research Center [LEWIS]. The following represents the third installment of a special report conducted by the Congressional Research Service and deals with changes at Lewis during the 1990's.

NASA Lewis faces an optimistic future. The center has weathered some challenging times recently, and has emerged even stronger. Faced with limited budget allocations, Lewis has managed to achieve more with less and through careful budgeting have prospered in many areas. They have been designated as the No. 1 center for aeropropulsion and as center of excellence in turbomachinery. Lewis' other missions include aeronautics research, on-board space applications, and commercial communications.

In addition to this, Lewis is also a contributor to many NASA-wide programs. In the past they have conducted microgravity research for the U.S. space shuttle. Currently, they are developing further microgravity technology for the international space station. They have contributed to the Mission to Planet Earth Program whose focus includes such things as analyzing ozone depletion and detecting and understanding the consequences and causes of destructive natural phenomena. Lewis also had a hand in the Mars Pathfinder mission which landed on Mars on July 4, 1997, in order to conduct mobile geological studies.

Although Lewis has been affected by past NASA budget limitations, they are currently contributing to the most exciting and dynamic of NASA's missions. They have and are continuing to provide for the future, useful, accessible, and informative research material on a wide array of science-based activities. Their importance to NASA and to the Nation is evident from the fact that their funding for 1998 has been recommended as \$671 million, \$50 million higher than that received in 1997.

The third installment of a report by the Congressional Research Center outlines the challenges that NASA Lewis has met and conquered:

NASA LEWIS RESEARCH CENTER

THE 1990S—CHANGES AT LEWIS

Budget constraints as NASA have led to an examination of the agency's management

structure, facilities, and center roles and missions. NASA Administrator Dan Goldin has attempted to meet budget reductions through an agency-wide restructuring that is based on consolidating work at centers, closing of facilities, streamlining of management, privatization and outsourcing of some operational activities, and reducing employee levels. The goal has been to meet reductions without cutting programs. The major effort in this area is known as the Zero Base Review, which was undertaken in 1995.

Lewis (and other NASA centers) has experienced significant changes in its roles and missions as well as its workforce. Several of those changes, such as workforce reductions, are ongoing. Lewis' funding peaked in FY1993 at \$1,002.6 million, and its employee level also peaked in FY1993 at 2,823 full-time equivalents (FTEs). For FY1998, the request for Lewis is \$671.5 million with an FTE level of 2,085. A discussion of the major changes follows, focusing on the space station redesign in 1993 and the Zero Base Review.

SPACE STATION REDESIGN

In 1993, due to continued cost growth and schedule delays, President Clinton ordered NASA to redesign the space station, which was then known as *Freedom*. As part of the *Freedom* program, Lewis was responsible for managing one of the four main work contract packages—the design, development, and fabrication of the space station power systems.

As part of the redesign, Johnson Space Center (JSC) was given lead center responsibility for the space station. That resulted in a loss to Lewis of 260 FTEs and 400 contractor employees. However, Lewis did maintain an active part in the program. Its support to the space station program includes technical and management support in the areas of power and on-board propulsion components and systems, engineering and analysis, and testing for components and systems. That includes use of LeRC facilities and testbeds and construction of flight hardware as required.

ZERO BASE REVIEW

In 1995, as part of NASA's FY1996 request, the Administration directed NASA to facilities, and management practices. The goal of the review was to meet the future reductions without cutting programs. This review is known as the Zero Base Review (ZBR) and has resulted in a significant restructuring of the agency's management and centers.

The primary recommendations of the ZBR for Lewis follow: Designate Lewis the Lead Center for Aeropropulsion and a Center of Excellence for Turbomachinery; close the rocket engine test facility; retain the Plum Brook facility but only on a fully reimbursable basis; close facilities/structures with a saving of more than \$150 million by FY2000; plan to transfer/consolidate research aircraft at Dryden Flight Research Center (DFRC) as well as decommission aircraft whose research mission has ended; adopt performance-based contracting approaches to facilities maintenance reduce its outyear funding requirements by \$5 billion over five years. Administrator Goldin directed the agency to undertake an extensive review of all NASA center mission and roles, and operations and other institutional support and technical services contracts, yielding greater than \$100 million in savings by FY2000; obtain information resources system services from Ames research Center (ARC) and Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC), and reduce requirements; resulting in savings of \$50 million by

FY2000; transfer Atlas-class expendable launch vehicle (ELV) management to Kennedy Space Center (KSC); phase out large chemical propulsion technology development and transfer the responsibility to MSFC; explore creation of an institute(s) to conduct activities of microgravity research, onboard propulsion, and space power; and reduce FTE level to 2,027 by the end of FY2000.

Those recommendations are to be fully implemented by FY2000. Some have already been implemented and others are currently in progress. A brief description of the status of the above recommendations follows:

Lewis is NASA's Center of Excellence for Turbomachinery and the Lead Center for Aeropropulsion.

The rocket engine test facility has been closed and is currently being dismantled. The land that the facility occupied may be transferred to the City of Cleveland which has plans for expanding Hopkins International Airport. All rocket engine testing is being consolidated in Louisiana at Stennis Space Center (SSC) which has been designated the Center of Excellence and Lead Center for rocket propulsion testing.

All testing that is now done at Plum Brook facilities is undertaken on a fully reimbursable basis. All NASA programs, the Department of Defense (DOD), other government agencies, and companies that use Plum Brook reimburse Lewis fully for all testing. NASA plans to keep Plum Brook open unless there are no requirements for testing at its facilities, at which point the facility would be put in a "mothballed" status.

Lewis has closed several facilities/structures that were not required to undertake current or planned work. Current analysis shows that the closures will reach the goal of achieving at least \$150 million in savings through FY2000.

The consolidation of aircraft at DFRC is currently on hold. Consolidation of the aircraft became controversial in 1996. NASA's Inspector General's office questioned whether the consolidation would actually save the agency money and whether there would be a negative impact on researchers based at other centers who use the aircraft for their experiments. Congress took an interest in this issue and passed legislative language in the VA-HUD-IA FY1997 Appropriations Act that prohibited NASA from moving aircraft to Dryden if they were stationed east of the Mississippi River. Recently, NASA Headquarters directed Lewis not to renew the lease on its DC-9, which is used for microgravity research. Lewis microgravity researchers will have to use a KC-135 based at Johnson Space Center (JSC) for their airborne experiments.

Like all NASA centers, Lewis is adopting performance-based contracting approaches for its facility maintenance and operations, institutional support, and technical services contracts. Lewis still expects this effort to yield at least \$100 million in savings by FY2000.

Lewis is in the process of determining how it will obtain information system services from Ames and Marshall. This effort may not achieve the \$50 million in savings by FY2000 that was originally estimated.

Transferring Atlas-class expendable launch vehicle (ELV) management to KSC is planned, but will not occur until 1999. Under current NASA Policy, Lewis is still responsible for the overall management of launch services for intermediate and large ELV services for NASA. The agency decided that Lewis would maintain responsibility for management until all planned launches took place. Only two Lewis managed launches remain—the launch of the Cassini spacecraft aboard a Titan-IV/Centaur scheduled between October and November 1997 and the

Atlas launch of Earth Observing System's EOS AM-1 in 1998. At that point, management of Atlas-class launches is to be transferred to KSC, NASA has no future plans for the larger Titan-sized launches. Even if Lewis were to maintain responsibility for Atlas-class launches, there are no near-term plans for launches for such vehicles after EOS-AM-1. NASA is instead focusing on the development of "faster, cheaper, better" spacecraft that require launch vehicles smaller than the Atlas-class.

Major chemical propulsion technology development has been phased out at Lewis. MSFC is now the Center of Excellence for space propulsion. Lewis, however, will retain some expertise in chemical propulsion and undertake research and development in this area as directed by MSFC.

The original concept of institutes involved the conversion of some civil servants to employees of an institute. Because civil servant retirement portability and conflict of interest issues that required legislative changes, the original institute concept was dropped throughout the agency. However on March 13, 1997, NASA created the National Center for Microgravity Research on Fluids and Combustion, located at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland. The institute is a partnership between NASA Lewis, Case Western Reserve, and the Universities Space Research Association (USRA). Lewis scientists involved with the center will remain civil servants and stay at LeRC sites. There are no current plans to create institutes on space power or onboard propulsion.

After undergoing a FY1997 NASA-wide employee buyout, Lewis has reduced its FTE level as of March 29, 1997, to 2,152. This puts Lewis within 125 FTEs of reaching its FY 2000 target level of 2,027. Lewis expects to average 50 losses each year through normal attrition over the next 3 years. With normal attrition and currently assigned FTE targets, no additional buyouts or a reduction-in-force (RIF) are anticipated. If LeRC does not experience normal attrition or if its FTE target is lowered, then limited buyouts in targeted areas might be necessary. [See below for further discussion of Lewis' FTE reductions].

COMPARISON OF CENTER FTE AND BUDGET CHANGES

As of March 29, 1997, Lewis has reduced its FTE level by 671 since FY1993 (its peak level). This is a reduction of 18.96%. In addition, since FY1993, Lewis' budget has been reduced by 33%. Except for a few of NASA's smaller centers (Stennis and Dryden), all of NASA's centers have experienced a reduction in budget and FTE levels. That reduction has not been divided equally among the centers. Many employees at Lewis assert that the center has had to share a greater burden of the reductions than the other NASA centers. The following statistics show that Lewis has shared a greater burden of the reductions than most but not all, of NASA's other centers.

Through FY1997, Lewis, at 18.96%, has had the highest percentage FTE reduction of all centers except KSC which has had a 19.04% reduction. Although it is not a field center, NASA Headquarters has had a 36.14% reduction. The agency average over the same period was 13.29%.

Through FY 1997, Lewis, at 33%, has had the highest percentage reduction in its budget of all the centers. The closest center at Lewis was KSC with a 17.59% reduction. NASA Headquarters has had a 52.64% reduction. The agency average over the same period was 5.77%.

Taking into account planned FTE levels, Lewis is to have a 24.48% reduction in its FTE level from FY1993 through FY2000. KSC

with a 42.93% reduction and MSFC with a 29.86% reduction will have higher percentage FTE reduction. NASA Headquarters expects a 49.70% reduction. The total agency reduction over the same period is planned at 23.96%.

The impression that Lewis has incurred the greatest share of NASA's reductions is incorrect with respect to FTEs. While Lewis has had the highest percentage reduction in budget of all NASA centers, KSC has had the highest FTE percentage reduction, and KSC and MSFC have the highest total planned FTE percentage reduction through FY2000.

THE CASE FOR NATO ENLARGEMENT: THE VIEWS OF GEN. WILLIAM ODOM

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the debate over enlargement of NATO has now been engaged in earnest since NATO Summit in Madrid made the decision to extend invitations to Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to become full-fledged members of the alliance.

The Congress now faces important decisions regarding NATO enlargement. Probably next year, the Senate will consider under the Constitution's provision on the ratification of treaties, the admission of these three countries, and the House and Senate will consider legislation that will be necessary to implement this expansion, including matters relating to the cost of enlargement.

In the wake of the Madrid Summit, the debate has been engaged on the merits and wisdom of expanding NATO. My position on this issue, Mr. Speaker, has been clear and unequivocal. As soon as the Communist regimes in Central Europe began to collapse in 1989, I urged the expansion of NATO in order to bring strategic stability, democratic reform and the cultivation of a civil society, development of free market-oriented economies, fostering of respect for human rights, and the institution of civilian control of the military forces in these emerging democracies. I continue to support strongly the enlargement of NATO. When the current expansion was being considered, I urged the inclusion of the three countries which were invited to join, as well as the inclusion of Romania and Slovenia. I continue to support expansion to include Romania and Slovenia as well as other countries which are prepared to contribute to NATO in the future.

As the debate on NATO enlargement has been engaged, one of the best expositions of the rationale for expansion was presented by my good friend, Bill Odom, who has had a distinguished military career. The Washington Post published his view in a recent Sunday "Outlook" section. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to this excellent analysis, and I ask that it be placed in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, July 6, 1997]

A LOOK AT . . . EXPANDING NATO—HISTORY TELLS US THE ALLIANCE SHOULD GROW

(By William E. Odom)

Enlarging NATO is the last major strategic challenge confronting America in the 20th century. Previously in the century, this nation has failed to meet only one: keeping the