




# The Definition of ESA's Scientific Programme for the 1980's

by  
*Arturo Russo*





**The Definition of ESA's  
Scientific Programme for the 1980's**

*by*  
*Arturo Russo*

Istituto di Fisica  
Università degli Studi di Palermo  
Italy

The ESA History Study Reports are preliminary reports of studies carried out within the framework of an ESA Contract. As such, they will form the basis of a comprehensive study of European space activities covering the period 1958-1987. The authors would welcome comments and criticism, which should be sent to them at the appropriate address below.

The opinions and comments expressed and the conclusions reached are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or policy of the Agency.

The ESA History Team comprises:

Dr. John Krige,  
Director, CRHST, CNRS and Cité des sciences et de l'industrie,  
30, Ave. Corentin Cariou, 75930 Paris, France.

Prof. Arturo Russo,  
Istituto de Fisica, Università di Palermo,  
Via Archirafi 36, I-90123 Palermo, Italy.

Dr. Lorenza Sebesta,  
Università degli Studi di Bologna,  
Via Giacomo della Torre 5, Forli Italy.

*Published by:* ESA Publications Division,  
ESTEC, P.O. Box 29,  
2200 AG Noordwijk,  
The Netherlands.  
*Editor:* R.A.Harris  
*Price:* 35 Dutch Guilders  
*ISBN No:* 92-9092-526-4  
*Copyright:* © 1997 The European Space Agency  
*Printed in:* The Netherlands

## Contents

Introduction .....	1
Discussing a long-term strategy for ESA's scientific activities.....	2
<i>"Classical" and "new" space science disciplines</i> .....	4
The SAC's vision of European space science in the 1980s .....	7
<i>"Has ESA been good for science?"</i> .....	8
<i>The content and dimension of ESA's scientific programme</i> .....	9
The role of Spacelab (and Ariane) .....	10
More money for science? .....	13
<i>The Council's answer is no</i> .....	15
Studying future scientific projects .....	17
<i>The comets and the Moon</i> .....	20
The selection of ESA's next scientific mission .....	23
<i>The comet and the stars: telex lobbying</i> .....	24
<i>The SPC decision</i> .....	28
<i>Giotto and Hipparcos adopted</i> .....	29
Epilogue .....	30
Bibliography .....	33
Appendix 1: Tables .....	35
Appendix 2: Figures .....	45

**This page deliberately left blank**

# The definition of ESA's scientific programme for the 1980s<sup>1</sup>

*Arturo Russo*

## Introduction

Introducing the European Space Agency's Annual Report for 1975, the Chairman of the ESA Council, Wolfgang Finke, did not hide the difficulties that the newly created Agency had to face up to in the future: "If the eleven-year marriage of Europe and space under ESRO was occasionally stormy, the lusty cry of its progeny ESA after a long-anticipated and difficult birth did not signify the end of the problems". One of ESA's biggest problems, Finke wrote, was its very size - more precisely, the size of its programme and the budgetary consequences:

*Deciding what to put into the greatly enlarged programme of space activities to be undertaken by the new Agency had itself been difficult, given the different priorities of the ten Member States. Working out how these activities were to be financed in the mid-1970s - a period of peak expenditure for several of the biggest programmes which had been started virtually simultaneously - was bound to be intractable.*<sup>2</sup>

The dramatic increase of the volume of financial resources to be managed was the first aspect of the budgetary problems the new Agency had to cope with. The funds managed by ESA in 1975 amounted to 342.4 MAU, with an increase of 73.6 % and 180 % over ESRO's funds in 1974 (197.2 MAU) and 1973 (122.1 MAU), respectively.<sup>3</sup> A second aspect derived from the complexity of the optional programme structure of ESA's activities. The Agency, in fact, had to manage several independent budgets, each corresponding to a different programme, supported by a specific set of Member States, with a specific contribution scale. Only two budgets were mandatory, i.e. supported by all Member States according to a gross national product (GNP) contribution scale. These were the General Budget, covering the basic and support activities, and the Science Budget, covering all scientific satellite projects and the research activities of ESTEC's Space Science Department (SSD). The other budgets covered the various optional programmes approved by the ESA Council, each of them being financed by the participating Member States according to a contribution scale mutually agreed upon. In the first phase of its life, the Agency ran six optional programmes: Telecommunications, Spacelab, Ariane, Marots, Aerosat and Meteosat.

Besides the contribution scales, another important difference existed between the science programme, on the one hand, and the optional programmes, on the other. The former consisted of a succession of individual projects within an overall financial envelope, the various projects being selected by a competitive procedure, mainly based on scientific merit. Each optional programme, on the contrary, comprised one clearly specified project, mainly defined on political grounds and to be completed within an agreed fixed cost. The management of this complex budgetary structure was made more

---

<sup>1</sup> Most of the primary documents referred to in this paper can be found in the ESA collection at the Historical Archives of the European Communities, European University Institute, Florence, Italy. Other material related to the history of the science programme is in the archives of the Science Directorate at ESA Headquarters in Paris (hereafter *D/Sci archives*). The author wishes to thank Director R. Bonnet for making this material available to him and for his useful comments on the first draft of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> W. Finke's "Foreword" to *ESA Annual Report 1975*, p. 4. The new Agency began to function "de facto" on 31 May 1975 but, pending formal ratification and entry into force of its Convention, the ESRO Convention remained the legal basis of its activities and programmes. ESA's first Member States were the same as ESRO's, namely Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. By the end of 1975 Ireland also signed the ESA Convention, but it formally became a member state in 1980, when the Convention came into force. Meanwhile, that country was associated in the Agency's activities under the terms of a special Agreement of Co-operation and Association.

<sup>3</sup> *ESA, Annual Report 1975*, p. 137; *ESRO, Annual Report 1974*, p. 197; *ESRO, General Report 1973*, p. 169. A further increase of 35.8 % was realised in 1976, when the funds managed by ESA amounted to 465 MAU: *ESA, Annual Report 1976*, p. 164.

difficult by the need to comply with the so-called "just return" principle, requiring that, for each programme, the participating Member States should receive a share of industrial contracts, as far as possible equal to their financial contribution.

A complicating factor in the administration of ESA's various budgets was the peculiar economic climate in Europe in the 1970s, characterised by a high rate of inflation and large monetary fluctuations. The weighted average price increase within the Member States, over the period from mid-1974 to mid-1975, was 14.6 %, but the inflation rates were very different in the various countries, ranging from 7.1 % in Germany to 24.8 % in the United Kingdom.<sup>4</sup> The different inflation rates and the large fluctuations in the exchange rates between national currencies and ESA's Accounting Unit called for a serious revision of the Agency's financial regulations, in particular regarding the procedures for calculating financial contributions and industrial return. Failing to reach a general agreement on this matter, in December 1977 the Council called on the International Monetary Fund (IMF) for an expert analysis of the economic and monetary situation, and asked it to provide recommendations on how to change ESA's financial system accordingly. The IMF duly prepared its report by June 1978, but the diverging interests of those Member States with strong currencies and low inflation rates and those with weak currencies and high inflation rates made any substantive agreement impossible. As a consequence, the triennial level of resources for 1978-1980 could not be approved, and the mandatory budgets for 1978 and 1979 were not adopted because the required unanimous agreement was not reached. Mandatory activities, including the scientific programme, were subsequently developed by the recurrent application of the system of *provisional twelfths*, approved by the Council on a provisional basis.

Return to normality was realised in 1980, when the Council decided to maintain unchanged the existing financial system but to provide for some ad hoc compensation to take into account the most negative effects of inflation and exchange-rate variations. This compromise eased the way for the formal entry into force of the ESA Convention, which occurred after the French Government deposited its instrument of ratification on 30<sup>th</sup> October that year. In February 1984, after ten years of discussions, the Council finally approved the new Financial Regulations, thus replacing a financial system whose substance went back to the first ESRO Financial Rules of November 1964.

It is against this historical background that we will discuss the evolution of ESA's scientific programme in the late 1970s and early 1980s, dealing in particular with two main topics:

- 1 the definition of a general strategy for European space science in the 1980s;
- 2 the decision-making process which led to the selection of the Agency's next scientific projects: the cometary mission Giotto and the astrometry satellite Hipparcos.

### **Discussing a long-term strategy for ESA's scientific activities**

In early 1977, the ESA Director of Planning and Future Programmes, André Lebeau, asked the Science Advisory Committee (SAC) to undertake a discussion on a long-range strategy for ESA's scientific activities.<sup>5</sup> At that time, the Agency's first scientific satellite, the gamma-ray observatory COS-B, was in the second year of its orbital life, providing a continuous flux of valuable data; two other satellites, GEOS and ISEE-2, both devoted to magnetospheric studies, were scheduled for launch later that year and a third one, the X-ray satellite EXOSAT, was under development; finally, a new run of the decision making process had just been concluded with the decision to undertake two new projects in collaboration with NASA, the Hubble Space Telescope and the International Solar Polar Mission (ISPM).<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> ESA, Annual Report 1975, p. 138.

<sup>5</sup> "Medium-term orientation of the activities of the European Space Agency (1977-1983)", ESA/EXEC(76)1; SAC, 6th meeting (28/1/77), SAC(77)3, 22/3/77.

<sup>6</sup> Russo (1995). In the event, the launch of GEOS in April 1977 failed because of malfunctioning of the Delta launcher. The second GEOS flight model was successfully launched in July 1978. The ISEE-2 satellite, launched in October 1977, was the European contribution to the ESRO/NASA International Sun-Earth Explorers mission.



The main reason for the SAC to undertake the new long-term planning exercise, which followed that made in 1970 by SAC's forerunner of the ESRO period, the Launching Programme Advisory Committee (LPAC), was to make a case for a substantial increase in the level of resources for the Science Programme, established with the 1971 "first package deal".<sup>7</sup> That agreement had fixed the target annual level of the mandatory science budget at 28 MAU (including 1 MAU for contingency) at mid-1971 prices, corresponding to 69 MAU at mid-1976 prices.<sup>8</sup> The available funds for scientific activities were lower in ESA than in NASA by a factor of ten, the SAC noted, while the number of active research groups at European universities and research institutions had kept growing steadily since the beginning of the space age. Moreover, the technical complexity and financial cost of scientific space projects had significantly increased in this period, evolving from small multidisciplinary spacecraft with an exploratory character to large dedicated missions, and new research fields had added to the traditional space sciences, in particular those related to Earth observation from space platforms.

Finally, important developments had occurred since 1971, notably the decision of ESRO/ESA Member States to build the Spacelab facility within the framework of the US Space Shuttle programme, and to undertake the construction of the heavy satellite launcher Ariane. The advent of Spacelab, on the one hand, opened up the "microgravity" space environment to experimental activity in the fields of materials science (crystal growth, tribology, fluid dynamics, surface phenomena, materials processing, etc.) and life sciences (human physiology, cellular biology, plant growth, vaccine research, etc.). On the other hand, the availability of Ariane would have the consequence that European space missions would preferably be put into space by this launcher, and therefore "the ESA scientific programme would require a higher level of funding in order to satisfy the potential claims that would be made for its use".<sup>9</sup>

After some preliminary discussions, the SAC decided to hold an extraordinary meeting exclusively devoted to long-range planning of ESA's scientific programme. This meeting was to be carefully prepared by the SAC members, the Working Groups and the ESA Executive, in consultation with national delegations in the Science Programme Committee (SPC) and the scientific community at large.<sup>10</sup> The chairman of the SAC, the British astronomer Martin J. Rees, set the agenda for the discussions in an informal document he circulated in early October, following a meeting of the Committee on Space Science of the European Science Foundation (ESF) in which he had been invited to participate.<sup>11</sup>

Rees identified two broad classes of issues. The first included topics of specific interest to the SAC, such as the question of scientific priorities, the role of free flyers vs Spacelabs, the equilibrium between "classical" and "new" space science disciplines, the relationship between scientific and application programmes, the ways to reduce the costs of spacecraft and launches. The second regarded areas "where the ESF could usefully take the lead", i.e. the optimum feasible level of activity in European space science and the relation between the ESA programme and the national programmes. The problem, according to Rees, was to define a scientific policy tailored to Europe's needs and resources:

*There is little point in discussing scientific priorities in a completely "abstract" way [...] We ought instead to focus on what Europe should do, taking full cognisance of what has*

<sup>7</sup> Krige & Russo (1994), pp. 103-108. The LPAC policy statement of June 1970 is discussed in Russo (1993).

<sup>8</sup> ESA/C(76)33, rev. 3, 17/11/76, Annex. Besides the effects of inflation, the new figure also took into account the changes in the budget structure introduced after the second package deal and the setting up of ESA. Eventually, the science budget for 1977 was approved by the Science Programme Committee (SPC) at the level of 67.3 MAU: SPC, 9th meeting (14/12/76), ESA/SPC/MIN/9, 24/1/77, pp. 11-12.

<sup>9</sup> SAC(77)3, cit., p. 8.

<sup>10</sup> SAC, 7th meeting (2/5/77), SAC(77)8, 7/7/77.

<sup>11</sup> M.J. Rees, "Long range planning studies. Some preliminary ideas on what the SAC might do", SAC(77)12 [10 October 1977]. The following quotation is from p. 2. The ESA Space Science Committee was chaired by H. Massey, a pioneer of space research in Europe, and included other eminent space scientists (and ESRO founding fathers), such as R. Boyd, H. Elliot, H. van de Hulst, C. de Jager, R. Lüst, B. Peters. The ESA Director General, R. Gibson, and A. Lebeau were also members of the Committee. The meeting attended by Rees was held on 5 October 1977, and a copy of the minutes is available in *D/Sci archives*.

*already been achieved, the existing expertise (and limitations), and the wishes and plans of the major established European institutes. In the light of such considerations, we can maybe suggest some hypothetical launching programmes for major projects in the 1980s which, taken as a whole, could [...] provide a balanced scientific return, and give each member country a fair share of the action. This cannot be done without making a careful choice of sub-fields within each discipline, and accepting that some fields must be left entirely to NASA and the USSR.*

Rees also suggested a procedure to proceed with a thorough study of the European space policy for the 1980s. An extraordinary meeting of the SAC should be organised in early 1978, to be attended by incoming and outgoing SAC members, the chairmen of the Working Groups, top ESA officials and some invited experts and ESF members, "to discuss priorities in general and to decide what individual scientists or institutions might be invited to contribute opinions, papers on scientific topics, or information about plans and preferences". A further extended meeting would be held some months later "to digest the material and prepare a report".<sup>12</sup>

The extraordinary SAC meeting was duly held on 25 February 1978, chaired by the newly elected SAC chairman Roger Bonnet (Table 1).<sup>13</sup> The key question discussed at the meeting was the definition of a proper framework for ESA's scientific programme, i.e. the content of the activities to be supported by the Agency's mandatory science budget. This essentially meant a distinction between those disciplines, research fields and technologies that could be accommodated within the programme and those that could not, for either financial reasons or lack of relevant interest and experience in Europe. The LPAC's policy statement of 1970 had excluded from the ESRO programme such important fields as optical astronomy, solar physics and planetary exploration; at the same time, it had given priority to high energy astrophysics and magnetospheric studies. It was likely that a similar list of "negative and positive priorities" would be necessary in the new phase too.

This exercise involved two different aspects. The first was a careful appreciation of the long-term scientific potential of the various research fields, and the role Europe could play *vis-à-vis* the parallel efforts in the USA and the Soviet Union. In fact, as was pointed out at the meeting, "[one] should be cautious about giving priorities for missions to be carried out ten years hence" and "it would be a mistake to close off areas of science at this stage".<sup>14</sup> The second involved the question of the kind and size of projects to be done by ESA. On the one hand, large, observatory-type missions seemed most appropriate for co-operative undertakings, but, owing to the necessarily limited number of such projects, there would have been large fluctuations in the activity of any individual research group, with young scientists having a chance to carry out experiments only every six to eight years and being otherwise left with routine work. On the other hand, small projects and multi-experiment satellites, could more easily cater for the scientific community at large and facilitate a balance among disciplines, but many felt that confining ESA to small-size projects would betray the ambitions of European space scientists and the very meaning of their collaborative effort.

### ***"Classical" and "new" space science disciplines***

The balance between the various disciplines and between large and small projects was only part of the problem, however. The SAC also had to establish what criteria would allow a "new" discipline to be included in ESA's scientific programme. Since the early ESRO period, this had traditionally included two broad research areas, covered by the Solar System Working Group (SSWG) and the Astronomy Working Group (AWG), respectively. The former included solar physics, planetary science, solar-terrestrial relations, ionospheric and magnetospheric studies; the latter included astronomy and astrophysics, and cosmic-ray physics. All these fields had been covered to some extent by ESRO's first satellites, while in the late 1960s and early 1970s priority had been given to magnetospheric research (ISEE-2 and GEOS) and high-energy astrophysics (COS-B and EXOSAT). In the new decade, Spacelab would open up interesting opportunities for "science in space" in a variety of disciplines

<sup>12</sup> SAC, 8th meeting (18/11/77), SAC(77)15, 15/12/77, p. 10. This procedure as well as the agenda for discussions were eventually detailed by the Executive in SAC(78)1, 8/2/78, and SAC(78)4, 17/2/78.

<sup>13</sup> SAC, "Extraordinary meeting on long-term planning" (25/2/78), SAC(78)6, 11/4/78.

<sup>14</sup> SAC(78)6, cit., p. 6.

outside the traditional domain of "space science". Microgravity research in life and material sciences was only possible on Spacelab missions, and could extend the European space expertise in a domain of great importance in view of future manned space stations. In fact, two new working groups had been set up by ESA in order to deal with the new scientific prospects, the Life Science Working Group (LSWG) and the Material Sciences Working Group (MSWG).

Should biomedical research on Spacelab be considered as space science in the ESA framework, and then supported by the mandatory science budget? The answer tended to be positive, and in fact the SAC had recommended (and the SPC approved) the funding of a Sled facility for vestibular studies in the payload of the first Spacelab flight out of the science programme budget.<sup>15</sup> If, however, this programme should cater for the further development of life sciences in space, a revision of the "package deal" level of resources could hardly be avoided.

The situation was different in the case of materials science, also represented in the first Spacelab payload by a general experimental facility under development with national funding. There was an evident potential economic interest in this research field on the borderline between science and applications, and it was expected that governments and industry would support its development in the framework of an envisaged optional programme on Spacelab utilisation. The problem remained, however, about the role of the SAC and the SPC in the definition of a scientific policy for this field. In the words of the chairman of the MSWG, H. Weiss:

*The distinction between science and applications was academic. All our techniques were derived from scientific studies. In the field of material sciences, the physical and chemical behaviour of fluids and gases in space was still a mystery to a large extent and many years of exploration of materials in space would be required before the setting up of a space factory would be feasible. This field was indeed a scientific one and belonged to the science programme.*<sup>16</sup>

If there was a scientific content as well as an economic interest in materials science, and if this field was to share Spacelab facilities with "traditional" space science disciplines, how could the European scientific community represented in ESA's advisory and decision making bodies be involved in the selection of experiments? How could the principle of scientific merit, adopted within the framework of the mandatory science programme, be safeguarded within the framework of an optional programme funded according to national economic interests? If, on the contrary, material sciences were included in the science programme and the budget increased accordingly, how could one prevent the new application-oriented disciplines from being unduly privileged relative to "classical" research fields?

Alongside the new Spacelab sciences, a similar problem arose regarding Earth-oriented research, a field which was coming to the forefront of space research in the wave of the new interest for environmental sciences in the 1970s, but was not covered by ESA activities. Earth sciences included a wide spectrum of disciplines on the borderline between science and applications, from oceanography to climatology, from geodynamics to atmospheric physics, from geodesy to remote sensing. Lebeau, was a convinced advocate of the Agency's involvement in this field:

*This complex of disciplines forms a single whole, with a unity of its own, and one must not seek to divide it up artificially. It is founded on a set of homogeneous space techniques and means. It relates to a clearly identified, homogeneous scientific community and one which, moreover, as things stand at present is virtually excluded from the European programme.*<sup>17</sup>

According to the Director of Planning and Future Programmes, an optional science programme should be set up for the study of the Earth and its atmosphere. Such a programme, he said, "would constitute, alongside the mandatory scientific programme and the [optional] application programmes, a new category of activities".

---

<sup>15</sup> Russo (1997).

<sup>16</sup> SAC(78)6, cit., p. 4.

<sup>17</sup> SAC(78)3, 16/2/78, p. 4. The following quotation is from p. 1.

The proposal was not well received by the spokesmen of the European space science community. All recognised that a way was needed of including new branches of science in the ESA programme, either by enlarging the mandatory programme or establishing optional scientific programmes, but they did not like that any area of science should be granted a preferential position on the basis of its potential value for applications. The founding fathers of European space science were particularly resolute in this respect. "The study of the Earth and its atmosphere [is] also of a scientific nature", Reimar Lüst argued: "While a programme such as proposed might be more applications oriented than others and therefore more easily accepted politically, this would be at the expense of recognising the significance of the science to be done by ESA." Supporting Lüst's arguments, Hendrik van de Hulst, Martin Rees and Johannes Geiss recalled that the field of atmospheric research was covered by the SSWG and had not been neglected either in the past or in future planning. The latter added: "While new programmes might understandably be introduced into the Agency's structure, if these were imposed there might be criticism from other disciplines. Therefore care should be taken to select only first rate scientific objectives."<sup>18</sup>

Behind principles there were, of course, financial considerations and disciplinary allegiances. As the total funds that national governments allocated to space would presumably not increase in the future, all money going to application-oriented scientific projects would be lost for pure-science projects, both within the ESA framework and in national space programmes. Facing the pressure of new disciplines and new research fields which claimed access to space, Lüst and his peers wanted to protect the "traditional" fields by preserving the original character of ESRO's scientific programme, i.e. one driven by the established European space science community. They advocated more resources for space science, either by increasing the mandatory budget or in the form of optional programmes, but insisted that all research fields should be dealt with on equal footing, and that ESA's scientific policy should be defined on purely scientific grounds.

The discussion about the role of the new disciplines in the ESA programmes was complicated by two factors. Firstly, the SAC was split on this issue, with one of its members, Giuseppe Colombo, strongly arguing that priorities should also be based on "possible economic return", and that ESA should preferably undertake projects aimed at geophysical problems.<sup>19</sup> Secondly, a dramatic difference of opinion existed within the ESA Directorate, setting Lebeau, on the one hand, in opposition to the Director of Scientific Programmes, Ernst Trendelenburg, on the other. The former advocated an important European effort in Spacelab scientific utilisation and Earth-oriented research within the framework of ESA's activities. The latter shared his fellow space scientists' distrust of Spacelab and was resolutely against the inclusion of application-oriented disciplines in the mandatory scientific programme. The present level of the scientific budget was highly unsatisfactory, he argued, and one could hardly expect that it could be significantly raised in the near future: "In this situation, the inclusion in the scientific programme of 'new' disciplines [...] would be inadvisable, in that it would no doubt alienate our traditional customers without necessarily generating any 'new' friends".<sup>20</sup> The contrast between the two men led in this period to an important modification in ESA's directorate structure, essentially complying with Trendelenburg's vision: responsibility for studies of future scientific projects, with the significant exception of studies related to life sciences and material sciences, was transferred from Lebeau's Directorate of Planning and Future Programmes to Trendelenburg's Directorate of Scientific Programmes. Moreover, the latter ceased to be responsible for the meteorological programmes, which were placed under the responsibility of the newly created Directorate of Applications Programmes (an enlargement of the former Directorate of Communications Satellites Programme). This change enabled Trendelenburg more efficiently to guide ESA's scientific policy according to his own orientations.

Coming back to the extraordinary SAC meeting, two other important questions discussed by the participants were the role of the Ariane launcher and the aims of technological research within ESA.

---

<sup>18</sup> SAC(78)6, cit., pp. 3-4.

<sup>19</sup> SAC(78)6, add. 1, 20/4/78. Colombo's strong criticism of SAC's scientific policy is discussed in Russo (1995), pp. 60-64. Cf. also Bonnet (1985).

<sup>20</sup> SAC(78)4, 17/2/78. Cf. also A. Lebeau's "Souvenirs du programme Spacelab", annex to the Proceedings of the workshop on the history of Spacelab held in ESTEC on 22-23 April 1997 (to be published).

Ariane was much too big and expensive for the launch requirements of most scientific missions. Therefore, either scientific satellites had to go into orbit on shared launches, which would imply technical and schedule restrictions for the scientific programme, or a reduced version of Ariane had to be studied in order to meet the launch requirements of the programme itself. The issue of ESA's technological research touched a recurring controversial theme, i.e. the diverging interests of larger countries with important national space programmes and technological capability, on the one hand, and smaller countries which were dependent on ESA for supporting their research groups and training their engineers, on the other. The former, notably France and Germany, argued that the technological research programme in ESTEC should be kept at a minimum and mainly developed in relation to specific projects. This position was spelled out at the meeting by Klaus Pinkau and supported by Lüst. The interests of smaller Member States, which obviously converged with ESA's, were defended by Lebeau who insisted that "the technological research programme [should be] oriented towards basic space technology rather than specific projects".<sup>21</sup>

Concluding the meeting, a list of activities and task assignments was identified, and a Steering and Editorial Board (STEB) was set up, comprising Bonnet, Pinkau, H. Wolff and A. Wiin-Nielsen, with the task of preparing the final report. The on-going work was discussed at the ordinary SAC meeting of 9-10 May and a draft report was then discussed on 26-27 September at a new extraordinary meeting with essentially the same attendance as the previous one (Table 1).<sup>22</sup> The final version of the report was eventually approved by the SAC on 19 December and then printed and circulated by ESA.<sup>23</sup> We will review its content in the following section.

### **The SAC's vision of European space science in the 1980s**

"In the SAC's view, a case can - and should be made - to recover the support for space science which was lost in 1972": this sentence we find in the introduction of the report.<sup>24</sup> That year, we should recall, the provisions of the first package deal started to be implemented, rapidly transforming the former "space research organisation" into an organisation mainly devoted to application satellites (Figure 1). The budget for scientific projects was dramatically reduced from about 60 MAU to the target figure of 27 MAU plus 1 MAU contingency per year (at 1971 price levels).<sup>25</sup> At that time, this was meant to be a minimal funding level required for maintaining a viable scientific programme; in fact, it became a maximum level as Member States refused to increase their mandatory contributions to the science budget above the required minimum. After price level adjustments and new budgetary procedures, the annual level for science amounted to 76 MAU in 1978, to which one could add a pro-rata share of the general budget and a small amount for the scientific part of the first Spacelab mission, thus bringing the total to approximately 85 MAU. This figure, the SAC commented, "is about three times smaller than CERN's 1978 budget (approximately 260 MAU) [and] very low compared to the space-science effort in the USA".<sup>26</sup>

The second package deal (1973) and the ensuing creation of ESA (1975) had brought an important new element into the framework of the European space effort, i.e. the decision to build the Ariane launcher and Spacelab. This had two particular consequences: firstly, that future European space missions were preferably to rely on Ariane and the Shuttle/Spacelab system for launch, at a cost

---

<sup>21</sup> SAC(78)6, cit., p. 10.

<sup>22</sup> SAC, 11th meeting (9-10/5/78), SAC(78)11, 9/6/78; SAC, Extraordinary meeting on long-term planning (26-27/9/78), SAC(78)20, 20/11/78.

<sup>23</sup> SAC, *Recommendations on the development of space science in the 1980s*, ESA SP-1015, December 1978. The report was also referenced as SAC(78)17 and circulated under cover ESA/SPC(79)12, 3/1/79.

<sup>24</sup> ESA SP-1015, cit., p. 11.

<sup>25</sup> Krige & Russo (1994), pp. 103-108. It is worth recalling that in 1971 the LPAC had estimated that "the minimum level of funding required for a truly viable scientific satellite programme lies between 45 and 47 MAU": LPAC, 36th meeting (28-29/4/71), LPAC/110, p. 3 (restricted session). A recommendation for an increase of the science budget had been made by the LPAC in its 1974 guidelines for new mission studies: LPAC(74)4, January 1974. Cf. Russo (1993), pp. 35-37, and Russo (1995), pp. 15-20.

<sup>26</sup> ESA SP-1015, cit., p. 9. The comparison between space science and high energy physics was suggested by Trendelenburg on the basis of the CERN report *Resources given to high energy physics in 1976 in the CERN Member States*, prepared by C. Roche, DIR/CPO/153/Rev., January 1978. Cf. Trendelenburg's letter to STEB members, 27/7/78, in *D/Sci archives*.

presumably higher than "traditional" launch vehicles; secondly, that new scientific disciplines wished to be included into ESA's science programme in addition to the "classical" space sciences.

This situation justified the SAC's claim for a significant increase in the science budget in the coming decade, and a quick analysis of the graph reported in Figure 1 showed that this was indeed possible and even necessary. It indicated in fact that, owing to the completion of the Ariane and Spacelab programmes, the ESA funding requirements were undergoing a dramatic reduction in the near future. Supplementary support for space activities was then required, in order to "avoid Europe falling further behind the United States in terms of level of effort, and to enable European scientists to play a role compatible with Europe's historical and political importance in the World".<sup>27</sup> An increasing support to space research, in other words, was to be considered as a key element of a sound space policy for Europe *vis-à-vis* the United States, and also Japan, whose space effort was already comparable to that of ESA Member States as a whole. It was the SAC's task to show that the new resources made available for space activities in Europe could profitably be spent within the framework of ESA's scientific programme.

### ***"Has ESA been good for science?"***

This was the first question, or rather, as the authors of the report, with some rhetorical lengthiness, put it:

*Has ESA been good for science and is it necessary for Europeans to co-operate within the framework of a European organisation or agency rather than undertake projects as bilateral or multilateral co-operative ventures, in particular with the USA where, due to the volume of NASA's activities, the cost efficiency of space science could more easily be improved? Furthermore, to what extent should we rely on US generosity and goodwill? In other words, should we have our own kitchen and cook our own dinners, or should we await possible invitations to dinner from outside?*<sup>28</sup>

After a review of past scientific achievements, and a complex cost-effectiveness analysis of ESRO's and ESA's scientific satellites in comparison with national projects, the SAC concluded that "ESRO/ESA appears to have been less expensive than several national agencies". The Committee recognised that one important element mitigating against the desire to lower costs was the industrial policy that forced ESA to place contracts according to the "just return" principle, and it strongly recommended that "the fair geographical distribution of contracts should be averaged over more than one project at a time, and over periods longer than those necessary for the completion of a project". As an example of such a relaxed policy, the SAC presented the case of hardware experiments contributed by national scientific groups to the various ESRO/ESA satellites, where a fair geographical distribution had been achieved over a ten-year period, "without the imposition of a forced policy towards this end".<sup>29</sup>

In conclusion, answering the foregoing question, the spokesmen of the European space science community, insisted that Europe should keep a co-operative effort "on a European scale", in addition to any possible bilateral or multilateral undertakings. Three main reasons were given. Firstly, in a context in which the increasing complexity of spacecraft and experiments reduced the number of flight opportunities, and made the competition between scientists fiercer, the European programme increased the possibilities for the space science community to fly experiments, and offered more "security, stability and continuity" than co-operative ventures with a "one-off character". Secondly, the spectrum of scientific interests in Europe differed in many areas from that of American scientists, "and the European community at large feels the need for an independent programme in which its particular interests can be safeguarded and represented". In this respect, a clear guideline for future European programmes could be identified, i.e. "to exploit those fields of science of which the originality is well recognised, and which can be undertaken earlier in Europe than in the USA or USSR". Finally, the concept of free co-operation between European nations was an ideal that

---

<sup>27</sup> ESA SP-1015, cit., p. 15.

<sup>28</sup> ESA SP-1015, cit., p. 26.

<sup>29</sup> ESA SP-1015, cit., pp. 24-25.

extended beyond the scope of space research alone: "The furtherance of this ideal may in itself be worth some small cost penalty", the SAC argued.<sup>30</sup>

### ***The content and dimension of ESA's scientific programme***

The next step was to discuss an overall programme for the development of space sciences within ESA in the 1980s, including both the "classical" disciplines (astronomy and solar system science), and the new fields of microgravity research and Earth sciences. In Table 2, we present the plans elaborated between 1976 and 1978 by ESA's four Working Groups, which the SAC laid at the foundation of its analysis.<sup>31</sup> Two aspects were to be discussed: firstly, the size and content of the ESA scientific programme; secondly, the institutional framework in which the programme itself could be implemented. The first aspect was related to the place of the new disciplines *vis-à-vis* the classical ones and to the financial resources required to develop a viable programme in the various research fields. The second was related to the various mechanisms that the ESA Convention provided for the implementation of the scientific programme, namely the Mandatory Programme, the optional programmes and the internationalisation of national programmes (either within the Mandatory Programme framework or as an optional programme).

As regards the first aspect, the SAC refrained from establishing negative priorities, and recommended that "Europe [should] follow a policy in which all the fields of European scientific excellence in space are developed and supported, and in which the space science budget is not so small that entire fields must vanish". Three considerations supported this statement: firstly, the potential of the various research fields in Europe, as resulted from the Working Groups' discussions with the scientific community at large; secondly, the need to have a fair balance between the various (old and new) disciplines; thirdly, the role of space science in the political environment within which Europe would develop its overall space effort. As the SAC put it:

*In space science, Europe should accept and be equal to the position that it has economically and politically in the World. Europe should move into the next decade attempting to meet the challenge deriving from its scientific and cultural heritage.*<sup>32</sup>

This ecumenical space policy implied the achievement of an event rate of about one satellite launch per year and about half a Spacelab every two years, so that existing groups be granted a minimum level of continuity in hardware-building activity and an evenly spaced event rate of experiments in microgravity research. The obvious implication was a strong plea for a significant increase in the resources devoted to science in the ESA budget: "If such an increase is not achieved, it will not be possible to continue supporting the different branches of science in a reasonable way and it will be necessary to kill entire fields. [...] The reductions occurring in the 1970 to 1972 time frame have cut too deeply into the possibilities of space science, and [...] an upward correction must now occur".<sup>33</sup>

As regards the institutional framework, the SAC agreed to take "a pragmatic approach", recognising that in order to meet the demands of the classical and new disciplines, a combination of all three funding mechanisms should be used, "while at the same time maintaining the scientific standard irrespective of the way in which a particular programme is funded".<sup>34</sup> The case of Earth sciences was typical in this respect. Earth-oriented space projects were justified both for their purely scientific value (e.g., the understanding of the relations between the atmosphere, the oceans and the polar ices, or the study of the global motion of the Earth's crust) and because of their potential for easily identified applications (e.g., the description and prediction of the climatic system, or the possibility of earthquake predictions). After a discussion in a restricted meeting which is not reported in the

---

<sup>30</sup> ESA SP-1015, cit., p. 26.

<sup>31</sup> AWG, *Report on long-term planning, 1980-1990*, ASTRO(76)13, August 1976; *Summary and conclusions of astronomy long-term planning*, ASTRO(78)12, August 1978. SSG, *An approach to long range planning 1980-1990*, vol. I, SOL(76)9, September 1976, and vol. II, SOL(78)12, June 1978. SSWG, *Report of the Ad Hoc Panel on Earth Sciences*, SOL(78)16, August 1978. MSWG, *Long-term planning in material science*, MAT(78)10, March 1979. LSWG, *Long-term planning in life sciences*, LIFE(79)1, 1979.

<sup>32</sup> ESA SP-1015, cit., p. 33.

<sup>33</sup> ESA SP-1015, cit., p. 38.

<sup>34</sup> ESA SP-1015, cit., p. 39.

minutes, the SAC "unanimously agreed that Earth Sciences should be recognised as a discipline within ESA and be treated on an equal footing with the other scientific disciplines".<sup>35</sup> It, however, recommended that Earth-oriented missions should be supported within the framework of an optional programme, and that an Earth-Oriented Research Working Group be established "within the ESA's advisory structure, in order to guarantee a competitive selection procedure similar in every respect to that used in the field of 'classical' space disciplines".<sup>36</sup>

According to the SAC, the Mandatory Programme should continue to provide the backbone of ESA's scientific activity, but it was too small to support the long-term plans in the classical disciplines, and certainly it had no margin to provide for the new microgravity sciences. The Committee noted that, as a result of the tight financial constraints, both the AWG and the SSWG had undertaken a frustrating procedure of killing mission proposals and reducing the programme to the minimum level required to maintain the scientific community in the disciplines within their purview. Despite this exercise, the long-term programmes elaborated by the working groups required expenditures in the range of 120 MAU per year in the 1980s, i.e. about 30 per cent of ESA's total expenditure, "assuming a constant annual expenditure of 400 MAU" (Figure 1). The SAC, however, agreed to refrain from identifying particular fields for which support should be stopped in the future should the level of the science budget not be increased. On the contrary, it recalled that ESRO/ESA had never undertaken a pure solar physics or planetary mission, and considered that this situation had to be rectified.<sup>37</sup>

A cautious attitude was adopted with regards life and material sciences:

*The basic question is whether the microgravity research [...] will prove important or not. The SAC believes that there is need for a cautious but adequate investment here, much of which will have to be used to fund an exploration phase [...] This phase may last until the middle of the next decade, when it will be possible to review the situation and decide which of the investigations are ripe for in-depth study and scientific evaluation.*<sup>38</sup>

The Committee recommended that the exploration phase be supported by "a modest but continuous supply of Spacelab flight facilities", but insisted that additional funding had to be found and that the missions had to be "of high scientific value". The level of resources required during the exploration phase was estimated at 120 MAU for ten years, which could be accommodated within the framework of the mandatory scientific programme, "if its present very low level were increased".

### **The role of Spacelab (and Ariane)**

Two considerations can be made regarding the role of microgravity sciences in the SAC's report. Firstly, it reflects the long-standing distrust of space scientists towards man-in-space programmes. Since the glamorous times of the Apollo programme, they knew that scientific objectives were hardly the main motivation for sending human beings into orbit, political, military and ideological considerations being the real driving force for manned space missions. As the former NASA director for the space science programme put it:

*Underlying the prevailing discontent in the scientific community regarding the [manned spaceflight] program was a rather general conviction that virtually everything that men could do in the investigation of space, including the moon and planets, automated spacecraft could also do and at a much lower cost.*<sup>39</sup>

European space scientists, for their part, did not like being obliged to follow their American colleagues in the trap of manned spaceflight: i.e. being obliged to search for a scientific rationale for an essentially political decision such as the "second package deal" decision to build Spacelab in

<sup>35</sup> SAC, 14th meeting (28/9/78), SAC(78)21, 20/11/78, p. 2.

<sup>36</sup> ESA SP-1015, cit., p. 34.

<sup>37</sup> ESA SP-1015, cit., p. 32.

<sup>38</sup> ESA SP-1015, cit., p. 35.

<sup>39</sup> Newell (1980), p. 290. Cf. also pp. 389-392, about the negative attitude of American space scientists towards the Space Shuttle programme. Logsdon (1970), Lord (1987) and McCurdy (1990) devote several pages to the lukewarm (say often negative) attitude of American scientists to the Apollo, Spacelab and Space Station programmes, respectively.



Europe.<sup>40</sup> The SAC then insisted that the new disciplines should be developed within ESA "according to the same scientific principles" as the classical ones; that a competitive selection procedure should be introduced, "making use also of advice that is not *a priori* space-oriented"; and that the new Working Groups for life, material and earth-oriented sciences "should include scientists of high repute not committed to space investigations".<sup>41</sup>

The second consideration regards the actual prospects of Spacelab utilisation. When the SAC was preparing its report, the Spacelab programme was suffering a dramatic crisis, with development costs estimated at about 50 per cent higher than the approved budget; the first mission delayed from spring 1980 to mid-1981, and then again to spring 1982; the cost of the European contribution to the first Spacelab payload estimated at about twice the level approved two years earlier; and the two envisaged ESA demonstration missions almost definitely jeopardised. It was more and more clear that it was not only scientists who did not like Spacelab, but ESA Member State governments as well were reluctant to commit resources for the future utilisation of Spacelab, with the obvious exception of Germany.<sup>42</sup>

Within this framework, the SAC felt it should make clear its opinion about the role of the scientific programme in the future exploitation of Spacelab, being aware that a strong pressure would be exerted on the European space science community in the future to design ESA scientific missions in such a way as to make fullest possible use of these made-in-Europe space transportation systems. This could not be accepted. Spacelab was not competitive with conventional satellites for classical sciences on a cost/observation-day basis, and the high cost of the launch would gravely endanger the development of microgravity sciences for which Spacelab was the only opportunity for experiments. Here is the SAC's conclusion,

*The scientific community should consider itself as a potential user of this means of transportation, and not a promoter of it. In no way should the community and the Working Groups themselves undertake the task of programming the utilisation of Spacelab.*

A similar argument was made for Ariane. This rocket had been conceived and developed mainly for launching heavy telecommunications satellites into geostationary orbit, and it was over-scaled for most scientific missions. Double launches could not offer a general solution because of the constraints in terms of interface, orbits and launch windows. In conclusion:

*The SAC wishes to express clearly its concern that neither Spacelab nor Ariane is adapted to the financial state of the scientific programme and to the majority of its needs. If ESA wishes to promote the use of Ariane or Spacelab for science, then the mandatory programme must be put in a position to buy the launches by an increase in the funds available to the programme; alternatively, "free" launches could be provided in the form of an optional programme (which would allow the participating Member States to choose their respective contributions).<sup>43</sup>*

In a later statement, the SAC clarified that, in its recommendation to increase the mandatory budget to the level of 120 MAU/year, it was not intended that this should cover increased launch costs: "If the Member States agreed to grant 120 MAU/year as recommended, but stipulated that exaggerated launch costs (Ariane and Spacelab) should be charged to the mandatory programme, this would not improve the current situation for science".<sup>44</sup>

A new occasion for the SAC to express its opinion about the issue of Spacelab utilisation occurred in May 1979, when the rising costs of the programme and the diverging interests between Member States made the prospects of European use of this facility appear more and more uncertain. No firm commitment had been made from members states, apart from Germany, for supporting the proposed

<sup>40</sup> Krige, Russo (1994), pp. 109-112; Sebesta (1995). Cf. also Schwarz (1979); Russo (1997).

<sup>41</sup> ESA SP-1015, cit., p. 47.

<sup>42</sup> Russo (1997); Sebesta (1997).

<sup>43</sup> ESA SP-1015, cit., pp. 48-49. The possibility of optional programmes for launching scientific missions on Ariane or Spacelab referred to the obvious interest of France and Germany to support their utilisation after the development phase.

<sup>44</sup> SAC, 17th meeting (16/3/79), SAC(79)10, 3/5/79, p. 4.

experiments in the two demonstration missions planned by ESA; no long-term plan had been worked out for Spacelab use in the microgravity field; and all the important Spacelab instruments studied in depth within the science programme (the infrared telescope LIRTS, the X-ray solar telescope GRIST and the laser instrument for atmospheric studies LIDAR) had had to be abandoned because of their poor scientific profitability.<sup>45</sup> In this situation, the SAC was called on to put the question of Spacelab utilisation and the plans for its follow-on development on its agenda. "The SAC is well aware that the future of space programmes depends to a large extent on the results of these discussions [...], as Spacelab is one the major components of the Agency's transportation systems development programme", Bonnet wrote to the Director General.<sup>46</sup>

In view of the SAC meeting, the Executive (i.e. Lebeau's Directorate in this case) prepared a report on the costs of the utilisation of Spacelab for scientific investigations, whose aim it was to answer the criticism which had often been made with respect to the high costs of Spacelab missions and the high cost of developing Spacelab experiments and equipment. The key argument was the comparison of launch costs per kg of experiment for Shuttle/Spacelab and conventional launchers/spacecraft, respectively (Tables 3 and 5). These cost figures, the Executive argued, were "strongly favourable for Spacelab when compared to conventional satellite payloads". While recognising that Spacelab was not a vehicle tailored for traditional space disciplines, in particular those fields of astronomy and space physics requiring long-term observations or measurements, the document insisted that "the large mass and volume capabilities of Spacelab offer better possibilities for some areas of traditional space sciences like infrared astronomy (cryogenic cooling) and multi-spectral solar observations, large instruments for astrophysical observations, etc."<sup>47</sup>

The SAC definitely disagreed with these arguments. The comparison of launch costs per kg of experiment for the Shuttle/Spacelab system and conventional launchers was not the most significant way of reviewing the matter, as the total cost of Spacelab experiments was as high as those of comparable experiments in unmanned satellites. Given the present situation of the scientific programme, they argued, there is no way of planning Spacelab utilisation, let alone endorsing any follow-on development, until the costs of Spacelab missions are significantly reduced. The first priority was to increase the funding of European space science rather than to make further expenditure on transportation systems.<sup>48</sup> The latter argument was made more explicit by K. Pinkau in a letter to Bonnet just after the meeting:

*If you look at the German expenditures [...] you see that the expenditure between 1971 and 1976 rose by only 10 % (which is less than the inflation) although they accepted the entire Spacelab plus applications programme plus Ariane and Kourou into their funding. [...] They achieved this by killing the national scientific space programme. In my view it is entirely fair to say that the Spacelab development in the past has been paid essentially from within the scientific programme in Germany.*<sup>49</sup>

The SAC could not endorse any follow-on programme, Pinkau continued, without having previously received a firm assurance that the mandatory scientific programme would be increased, and that it would not be charged for the launch costs of Spacelab and Ariane. In a following letter, Pinkau, who was to succeed Bonnet to SAC chairmanship, directly challenged the Executive's argument with an irreverent metaphor:

*The considerations on the cost of any approach cannot be restricted to comparison, [...] an absolute yardstick exists. It is the size of the financial envelope available for that part of the activity which is to be served by this system. In our case, it is the size of the mandatory programme. [...] Systems have to come in practical sizes to be used. It may be much cheaper for me, per roll of toilet paper, to buy it by the truck-load, but I may not be able to afford investing so much money in this venture and it may be not practical. Thus I*

<sup>45</sup> Russo (1997).

<sup>46</sup> R. Bonnet, letter to R. Gibson, 30 Mars 1979, *D/Sci archives*.

<sup>47</sup> SAC(79)12, 26/4/79, p. 9.

<sup>48</sup> SAC, 18th meeting (9-10/5/79), SAC(79)16, 25/6/79. The SAC's views were supported by the ESF Space Science Committee, represented at the meeting by its chairman J. Geiss. See also 19th meeting (26/9/79), SAC(79)25, 8/11/79.

<sup>49</sup> Pinkau, letter to Bonnet, 19/6/79, *D/Sci archives*.

*may still decide to buy single rolls (Thor Deltas, for example) although they may be more expensive per roll, since this is compatible with my income and with a practical solution.*<sup>50</sup>

Pinkau made a similar argument regarding Ariane. "Scientists are led to believe that their proposals are doomed to failure from the outset if they do not propose Ariane missions", he wrote Bonnet, and then continued:

*It thus appears that we are victims of a feedback cycle which from the outset is reducing the scientific usefulness of our limited mandatory budget, because we are being presented with mammoth missions only. The mortality rate of these mammoth missions must be very high due to the financial situation, [...] and the time and enthusiasm of the proposing scientists, and much money is being wasted.*<sup>51</sup>

More money is needed for science, was again the general conclusion, not only for the sake of space science, but for making the rate of usage of Ariane and Spacelab proportionate to the level of resources Europe had invested in these new space transportation systems. The SAC, for its part, made it clear that it "would assess proposals on their scientific interest and associated costs, irrespective of the launching and space transportation systems that might be used".<sup>52</sup>

### **More money for science?**

The report on the development of space science in Europe in the 1980s was officially approved by the SAC at its meeting of 19 December 1978, and eventually published by ESA. It was also agreed that a summary of the report should be prepared for the Council, listing the SAC's main recommendations and the actions required for their implementation.<sup>53</sup> The first and most urgent set of recommendations, on which all other arguments about the future development of space science in Europe depended, regarded of course the increase in the level of resources. These recommendations can be summarised in the following three statements:

- 1 The support for space science which was lost at the time of the 1971 first package deal should be recovered as soon as possible through an increase in the level of the mandatory programme and the creation of optional programmes (in particular for Earth sciences);
- 2 The level of the mandatory programme should be increased up to 120 MAU/year for astronomy and solar-system sciences, plus 12 MAU/year for microgravity sciences, i.e. about 33 per cent of an assumed 400 MAU total level of resources for ESA in the 1980s;
- 3 The launch costs with Ariane and Spacelab (or part of them) should not be charged to the mandatory budget.

There was nothing the SPC could do regarding the problem of funding, but to discuss the SAC's report and advise the Council, the only body entitled to decide on this crucial question, to give "its urgent attention" to the fact that

*The present level of the mandatory programme, if not increased or complemented by optional programmes or otherwise, leads to a serious situation for European space science, in which groups that have gained world renown by their present work may face*

---

<sup>50</sup> Pinkau, letter to Bonnet, 28/9/79, *D/Sci archives*. Lebeau's comments, attached to a letter to Bonnet of 17/10/79, are *ibid*.

<sup>51</sup> Pinkau, letter to Bonnet, 18/10/79, *D/Sci archives*. Cf. also Trendelenburg to Bonnet, 25/10/79, and Bonnet to Trendelenburg, 6/11/79.

<sup>52</sup> SAC, 20th meeting (5-6/12/79), SAC(79)35, p. 2. It must be noted that this meeting was held after a SAC mission to the USA, on 23-25 October, where they visited the NASA Johnson and Kennedy Space Centers. Following this visit, concern about the lack of any firm plan for Spacelab utilisation in Europe was expressed by Bonnet in a letter to Gibson, 26/10/79, *D/Sci archives*.

<sup>53</sup> SAC, 15th meeting (19/12/78, SAC(78)23, 8/1/79; 16th meeting (22-23/1/79), SAC(79)4, 9/3/79. The summary report for the Council is ESA/C(79)14, 11/6/79. Preliminary versions of this document, for discussion in the SPC, are attached to ESA/SPC(79)7, rev. 1, 8/5/79, and ESA/SPC(79)7, rev. 1, corr. 1, 15/5/79.

*the problem of survival and where work in the new fields of space science may not get a fair chance of development.*<sup>54</sup>

A few aspects of the SPC discussions, however, are worth mentioning as they provide evidence about the attitudes of Member States towards the main questions. Most delegations were in favour of a general increase in the funds devoted to space sciences, but opinions diverged about how this could be achieved. The French delegation opposed the idea of increasing the mandatory budget, and stated that their authorities would anyway not approve participation in new optional programmes in the near future. Additional French money, in other words, would eventually go to the national programme. Moreover, the delegation could not agree with the SAC's arguments regarding the launcher question. As France was the main sponsor of Ariane, its position is easily understood:

*It was up to scientists to adapt their missions to the launchers which existed. [...] The primordial [political] question was whether ESA considered its scientific programme as a separate entity, in which case there would be no need for it to accept the imposed launcher, or whether it represented an essential part of a coherent whole. In the latter case, every attempt should be made to make the maximum use of the investments already made, and the use of Ariane was not a constraint but an objective.*<sup>55</sup>

Contrary to France, Germany was in favour of increasing the Science Programme budget, in consideration of its political importance as ESA's only mandatory programme. The German delegation argued that, "in order to avoid a decomposition of the fundamental activity of the Agency", the scientific Mandatory Programme should be restored to the level it enjoyed before the 1971 package deal, and insisted that the transfer of individual scientific projects to optional programmes should be resisted. Only the new Earth-oriented sciences and material sciences could be regrouped as optional programmes, each with their own budgets.<sup>56</sup> The delegation also believed that the scientific programme should use as far as possible the Shuttle/Spacelab system and Ariane, but the Council should find ways to subsidising their use.

Similar concern about the high costs of the new space transportation system was also expressed by the Swiss, Swedish and British delegations. The latter, however, was adamantly against any increase in the mandatory budget which, in its opinion, should anyway provide for the classical disciplines only. Equally against any increase in the mandatory budget was Spain, which, however, argued that new disciplines should be considered within the scientific programme. Italy and the smaller Member States were in general favourable to a global increase of expenditures on space sciences but they could not give any firm information about the rate of increase (if any) their authorities would eventually agree to, or their financial participation (if any) in new optional programmes.

In view of the important Council discussion on the SAC report and the future of the scientific programme, the Executive prepared a document to present its own case for an increase in the level of the Mandatory Budget and a proposal for the practical implementation of the SAC's recommendations.<sup>57</sup> The starting point was again the crucial divide of the 1971 package deal. In the period between 1967 and 1971, the ESRO annual budget showed an overall increase of about 20 % for satellites and sounding rockets and of about 50 % for satellites alone, the Executive recalled, while in the following period, the envelope for space science in ESRO/ESA was dramatically reduced and strictly maintained at the level established with the first package deal. As a consequence, the Executive concluded, "there has been no evolution in the European scientific activity in space, but, at best, stagnation". Four main arguments were then given for an increase of the scientific budget. Firstly, the intellectual challenge presented by advanced space missions which required international collaborations: "a simple return to purely national programmes would represent scientifically a step backwards". Secondly, the high scientific interest of the European space science community in ESA's

<sup>54</sup> SPC, 19th meeting (22-23/3/79), ESA/SPC/MIN/19, 26/4/79. The quotation is from the attached resolution ESA/SPC/XIX/Res. 1, 23/3/79.

<sup>55</sup> SPC, 18th meeting (23-24/1/79), ESA/SPC/MIN/18, 22/2/79, p. 4.

<sup>56</sup> The quotation is from a draft resolution presented by the German delegation which, however, was not put to the vote: ESA/SPC(79)15, 26/4/79. Cf. ESA/SPC/MIN/19, cit., p. 7, and SPC, 20th meeting (22-23/5/79), ESA/SPC/MIN/20, 25/6/79, p. 6.

<sup>57</sup> ESA/C/Bur.(79) 3, 29/5/79, attached to ESA/SPC(79)27, 12/9/79. Following quotations from pp. 4 - 6.

programme, as demonstrated by the number and quality of proposals addressed to the Agency: "ideas and proposals abound, only money is scarce". Thirdly, the low level of the ESA science budget in comparison with other international scientific activities, in particular particle physics at CERN. Finally, the non-competitive position of the ESA science programme in relation to NASA: "the NASA science budget is about 9 times as high as that of ESA [while] the GNP of the USA is about equal to that of the ESA Member States". In conclusion, the Executive fully endorsed the SAC's main recommendation that from 1982 onwards, "the pure science programme of ESA should receive a substantial boost and recover the momentum that was severely reduced in 1971".

The Executive (i.e. Trendelenburg's Directorate in this case) went even further, however, presenting its own estimate of the financial requirements for space science within ESA, and suggesting a possible scenario to implement the proposed new budget level. In fact, the 120 MAU/year level recommended by the SAC for astronomy and solar system sciences could only be assumed as a baseline for the science budget, as it allowed the launch of a medium-size satellite per year.<sup>58</sup> These disciplines had now evolved from an exploratory phase to a phase which required larger systems of higher performance and higher costs. In the astronomy field, projects such as a large infrared telescope or an X-ray facility fell into the 250-300 MAU class. In the solar system area, where single spacecraft were cheaper, the new scientific objectives required groups of spacecraft simultaneously operating in different sites, therefore "the global costs of such programmes again falls into the above brackets". Finally, if the European scientific community wanted ESA to get involved in planetary missions in co-operation with another agency, the European contribution was again estimated at about 250 MAU. If it was assumed that at least three such large projects were developed during a decade, the Executive concluded, then the total annual budget for space science should be set at the level of 200 MAU/year, which would also include a fixed provision (of the order of 5 %) for microgravity sciences. The new level could be achieved at the beginning of the 1990s by progressive increases of around 10 % per year as from 1982 (Figure 2).

### ***The Council's answer is no***

The Council discussed the "deplorable status of the science budget" at its meeting of 28-29 June 1979.<sup>59</sup> Most delegations accepted in principle the possibility of an increase in the mandatory science budget, but the required majority could not be reached and the Executive was then invited to make its plans on the basis of the package deal funding level. We are not surprised by this result. At that time, in fact, the Member States had not settled yet the financial questions related to the bad economic conditions in some of them, as well as the questions related to ESA's complex budgetary structure. The mandatory budget for 1979 had not been approved in due time and the meeting itself was still unable to find an agreement; consequently, the Council had to authorise continuation of the *provisional twelfths* system with regard to the general budget and the scientific programme budget beyond 30 June.<sup>60</sup> In this situation, it was hardly conceivable to secure the requested unanimous agreement to an increase in the mandatory budget.

The strongest opposition to the idea of reinforcing and extending the scientific programme came from France and the U.K. The former had always been very lukewarm towards ESA's mandatory scientific programme. As early as during the discussions on the first package deal, in 1971, the French delegation had insisted that the scientific programme should be made optional like the application programmes, and only with a drastic reduction of funds had it been finally agreed to keep it mandatory.<sup>61</sup> The French space science community had never been a big user of the ESRO/ESA scientific programme, its efforts being rather developed within the framework of France's strong national space programme and by co-operative ventures with scientific groups in Europe, the USA and the Soviet Union.

---

<sup>58</sup> This figure, the Executive noted, corresponded to that recommended by the LPAC in 1971, when actualised to 1979 price levels (see fn. 25).

<sup>59</sup> ESA/SPC(79)27, cit., p. 1. Council, 32nd meeting (28-29/6/79), ESA/C/MIN/32, 19/7/79.

<sup>60</sup> ESA/C/XXXII/Res. 7., 28/6/79.

<sup>61</sup> Russo (1993), p. 37.

Contrary to France, the U.K. had always been in favour of a co-operative European scientific programme, funded according to a GNP contribution scale. It considered, however, that the level of the science budget could not be increased, both because of the difficult economic situation in Europe and in order to prevent its national programme from being reduced accordingly. The high inflation rate in Britain had resulted in a dramatic increase of the contributions to ESA in national currency, and all pounds given to ESA meant that less funding was available for national scientific activities.<sup>62</sup> Moreover, the British delegation argued that the cost-effectiveness ratio of ESA's science programme was unduly low as compared to national programmes, and insisted that measures had to be taken to improve this ratio before speaking of increasing the budget level. Finally, the delegation opposed the funding of microgravity sciences from the envelope of the scientific programme.

The two other big Member States, i.e. Germany and Italy, were generally in favour of an increase in the mandatory budget, but while the former "wanted the scientific programme to be effectively reinforced and extended in the medium-term", the latter stated that "in view of the financial situation it was unable to enter into any new commitments".<sup>63</sup> The difference is easily understood. Germany's economic strength, low inflation rate and ambitious space programme (including Spacelab utilisation) allowed its political authorities to commit themselves to support ESA activities, being aware that the country's industrial system would certainly take advantage of the Agency's contracts. Italy, on the contrary, suffered from severe economic problems and high inflation rate; its contributions to ESA were escalating because of the changes in the conversion rates; and its industrial system was not able to keep pace with the "just return" principle.<sup>64</sup>

The most convinced advocates of the SAC arguments for an increase in the mandatory science budget were the smaller Member States whose scientific groups had most benefited from the ESRO/ESA programmes, i.e. Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland. "The Agency [should] remain faithful to its first calling, which was that of a scientific organisation", the Dutch argued, suggesting that ESA's overall funding should be equally split in three parts, one third going to science, one third to applications and one third to space transport systems, respectively. The Swiss and Danes concurred, while the Belgians and the Swedes qualified their statements: the former arguing that it would be difficult to secure approval of national authorities "if the Belgian scientific community could not be directly associated with the work done under the programme, from which during recent years it had been excluded by circumstances"; the latter observing that "financial considerations currently militated against an increase in the programme's budget envelope".<sup>65</sup> Finally, the Irish and Spanish delegations stated there was no way for their governments to approve additional resources to the mandatory budget.

While frustrating the SAC's and Executive's plea for a reinforcement of the mandatory scientific programme (and *a fortiori* rejecting the proposal that Ariane and Spacelab launches of scientific payloads be financed from outside the science budget), the Council agreed to the principle of setting up optional programmes in scientific areas connected with future applications, in particular in the field of Earth sciences. It also invited the Executive to produce a programme proposal for microgravity sciences, to be eventually implemented within the framework of a Spacelab utilisation programme.

The outcome of the Council meeting was bad news for the space science community. The SAC chairman advised the SPC that during the presentation of candidate projects for ESA's future scientific programme, to be made at a conference scheduled for November 1979 (see next section), "the scientific community should be informed of the fact that certain disciplines will have to be eliminated from the Agency's activities".<sup>66</sup> The SAC itself could only endorse the initiative of the Life

---

<sup>62</sup> Long negotiations had been developed in 1976-1978 among ESA Member States in order to find ways to compensate the negative effects of high inflation rates in the contributions of the U.K. and Italy. Cf. Council, 14th meeting (28/1/789), ESA/C/MIN/14, 17/2/77, with attached resolution ESA/C/XIV/Res.; 23rd meeting (Part II, 6-7/4/78), ESA/C/MIN/23(II), 20/4/78, with attached resolution ESA/C/XXIII/Res. 5.

<sup>63</sup> ESA/C/MIN/32, cit., p. 5.

<sup>64</sup> Italy's bad position with regard to the geographical distribution of ESRO/ESA industrial contracts between 1972 and 1989 is reported in *ESA Annual Report 1979*, p. 164.

<sup>65</sup> ESA/C/MIN/32, cit., pp. 5-6.

<sup>66</sup> SPC, 21st meeting (8-9/10/79), ESA/SPC/MIN/21, 25/10/79, p. 7.

Sciences and Material Sciences Working Groups to elaborate a joint research programme in microgravity sciences to be submitted to the Council outside the framework of the mandatory scientific programme, and put in the record that "one of its main tasks in the coming years, together with the Executive, would be to maintain efforts to convince the national delegations of the need to increase the mandatory budget".<sup>67</sup> These efforts, as we know, were to be crowned with success in January 1985, when the ESA Council meeting at ministerial level in Rome endorsed the *Horizon 2000* long-term scientific programme, worked out by the European space science community during the previous year, and agreed that the Agency's mandatory Space Science Programme should be increased by five percent a year until 1989.<sup>68</sup>

While failing in its aim of increasing the mandatory science budget, the SAC planning exercise of 1978 had however important consequences in shaping the future development of ESA scientific activities. The most important was the Council decision to exclude the new space science disciplines, i.e. Earth sciences and microgravity research, from the mandatory programme as well as from the terms of reference of the Science Directorate. An Earth Observation Programme and a Microgravity Programme were eventually set up to support activities in these fields, funded on an optional basis and managed by other Directorates. This did not help the case for an increase in the mandatory budget but, on the other hand, kept the scientific ESA programme well under the control of the established European space science community. By preserving the "traditional" pure-science character of the mandatory scientific programme in a phase of financial difficulties, the SAC and the Science Directorate wanted in fact to protect those research fields in which most of its constituency was actively involved at that time. If the support for space science of the ESRO period could not be recovered, and the SAC could not have many hopes in this respect, the ESRO spirit could however be safeguarded within the stronghold of a mandatory scientific programme including only the "classical" space science disciplines.

### **Studying future scientific projects**

While discussing the long-term strategy for the European space science, the ESA scientific advisory bodies were also involved in the selection process of the new project(s) to be adopted in the Agency's programme for launch in the mid-1980s. Taking into account the financial constraints imposed by the ongoing projects, the Executive estimated that a new project could be started in 1980 and a second one in 1981, and the SPC would be called to take a decision by the end of 1979 and 1980, respectively.<sup>69</sup> As usual, the decision-making process had started a few years earlier, back in the ESRO times. In March 1975, in fact, ESRO's Scientific Programme Board had approved a few mission definition studies to be performed during that year.<sup>70</sup> First priority was given to the Grazing Incidence Solar Telescope (GRIST), a facility originally designed as the European contribution to a dedicated solar physics Spacelab mission in collaboration with NASA. After NASA had failed to confirm its commitment to this co-operative project, the LPAC had recommended that the possibility of flying the GRIST alone should be studied, in order to fill a long-standing European gap in the field of solar physics.<sup>71</sup> In addition, the Executive was requested to undertake preliminary studies on three topics: i.e. an astrometry mission for accurate measurements of positions and proper motions of stars; small "throw away" satellites for infra-red astronomy to be launched from Spacelab; and the development in Europe of cryogenic technology for infra-red astronomy missions and of superconducting magnets for cosmic-ray missions. Two other studies were undertaken in the following months, after recommendations from the SSWG and the AWG, respectively. The first was about a solar probe to be directed towards the centre of the Sun after a Jupiter fly-by; the mission's objectives included the determination of the gravitational quadrupole moment of the Sun, tests of the

<sup>67</sup> SAC, 12th meeting (5-6/12/79), SAC(79)35, 3/3/80, p. 9.

<sup>68</sup> *European Space Science Horizon 2000*, ESA SP-1070, December 1984; *ESA Bulletin*, No. 41 (February 1985), 8-11.

<sup>69</sup> ESA/SPC(78)5, 16/5/78.

<sup>70</sup> SPB, 11th meeting (26/3/75), ESRO/PB-S/MIN/11, 24/4/75. See also ESRO/PB-S(75)2, 7/3/75.

<sup>71</sup> Russo (1995). The GRIST was to be one of a cluster of four telescopes for simultaneous measurements of the solar radiation over a wide range of wavelengths.

relativity theory, and in situ measurements of the interplanetary medium. The second study was about an exploratory astronomy mission in the spectral region of extreme ultraviolet and soft X-rays.<sup>72</sup>

A further extension of the Executive's study programme was agreed on in early 1976, after the Director General had urged the European space science community to suggest proposals for "scientific missions which do not have to be launched with the Shuttle". At that time, in fact, all five candidates for the next scientific project(s) to be selected in October that year depended on the availability of the Shuttle, either as launcher or as Spacelab carrier. "Although we have no grounds to believe that the Shuttle might not be available at the required time", the Director General advised, "sound planning demands that alternate, Shuttle-independent scientific missions be available to the Agency".<sup>73</sup> In other words, the Executive wanted establish a set of contingency scientific missions in order to fill a possible gap of one or two years in the scientific programme, should the Shuttle be delayed. Many mission proposals were discussed by the SSWG and AWG, and four new studies were eventually approved by the SAC: a Sun-Earth Observatory and Climatology Satellite (SEOCS); a "Dumb-bell" mission, foreseeing two spacecraft linked by a wire for geophysical and magnetospheric studies; a satellite for studying variable X-ray sources; and the Extreme Ultraviolet and X-ray Survey satellite (EXUV), already recommended by the AWG and now endorsed with first priority.<sup>74</sup>

The complete list of the eight mission definition studies undertaken by ESA in 1975-1976 is reported in Table 6. According to the usual ESA procedure, it was foreseen that, following these preliminary (mission definition) studies, four missions would have been selected in Autumn 1976 for feasibility (Phase A) studies, whose results would be the foundation for the final selection of the Agency's next scientific project(s).

The reports on the eight mission definition studies were discussed during a symposium held in Paris on 28 to 30 June 1976. Following the symposium, on July 1st, the AWG and SSWG discussed those projects which fell within their respective competence and issued their recommendations about which projects should be studied at Phase A level. The following day it was the turn of the SAC to do its job.<sup>75</sup>

Four projects were in the field of interest of the AWG, i.e. the astrometry mission and the three projects dedicated to astronomical observations in three different regions of electromagnetic spectrum, respectively: the infrared (IRSAT), the extreme ultraviolet (EXUV) and the X rays (variable sources). The first had originated within the French scientific community (the very first proposal was presented by P. Lacroute as early as March 1966), and preliminary studies had been performed during 1974 by the Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales (CNES).<sup>76</sup> The AWG recognised that the astrometry satellite would have "a very fundamental impact on astronomy [as] it will overcome basic problems in the fundamental system of stellar positions that have plagued astronomy for more than a century, and that have stopped developments in possibly very fruitful fields such as galactic dynamics". The Group then highly recommended a Phase A study, whose main objective should be the technical feasibility

<sup>72</sup> ESA/SPC(75)5, 19/9/75. Cfr. SSWG, 14th meeting (21-22/5/75), SOL(75)9, 1/9/75, and SOL(75)8, 28/5/75; AWG, 15th meeting (10-11/6/75), ASTRO(75)10, 18/9/75. The solar probe had been originally suggested by G. Colombo (cf. SOL(75)6, 13/6/75, annex 1).

<sup>73</sup> ESA/SPC(75)19, 5/12/75. The candidate Spacelab projects were a laser facility for atmospheric studies (LIDAR), an infrared telescope (LIRTS) and an X-ray instrument (EXSPOS); the two other candidate projects, designed to be launched on the Shuttle, were the Out-of-Ecliptic (OOE) mission and the Hubble Space Telescope. Cf. Russo (1995).

<sup>74</sup> SSWG, 17th meeting (29/1/76), SOL(76)5, 1/3/76; AWG, 18th meeting (28/1/76), ASTRO(76)4, 5/5/76; SAC, 1st meeting (24/2/76), SAC(76)4, 7/4/76. The SPC endorsed the SAC recommendations at its 3rd meeting (11/3/76), ESA/SPC/MIN/3, 13/4/76. The Executive's reference document, with a list of all mission proposals received, is SAC(76)1, 15/1/76. The working groups' and SAC's recommendations are reported in SOL(76)4, 9/2/76; ASTRO(76)3, 5/2/76, and SAC(76)3, 27/2/76, respectively. All these documents are also attached to ESA/SPC(76)6, 11/2/76, and Add. 1, 27/2/76.

<sup>75</sup> SSWG, 19th meeting (1/7/76), SOL(76)14, 15/9/76; AWG, 21st meeting (1/7/76), ASTRO(76)10, 30/9/76; SAC, 13th meeting (2/7/76), SAC(76)11, 27/8/76. The SSWG's recommendations are reported in SOL(76)12, 1/7/76, and SOL(76)13, 5/8/76; the AWG's recommendations are reported in ASTRO(76)9, 1/7/76, and ASTRO(76)11, 13/7/76; The SAC's recommendations are reported in SAC(76)10, 2/7/76, and SAC(76)12, 1/9/76. All these documents are attached to ESA/SPC(76)25, 3/9/76. These were the same meetings where the LIRTS, the Space Telescope project and the OOE mission were recommended for adoption in the ESA scientific programme at the end of the previous selection process: cfr. Russo (1995), pp. 49-64.

<sup>76</sup> Perryman & Hassan (1989).



of the required accuracy. As regards the three astronomical satellites, the AWG recommended a Phase A study on the EXUV project: "This satellite will [...] make a survey in a spectral region that hitherto has been largely unknown [and], as in all new surveys, completely unexpected results may be obtained".<sup>77</sup> Two main reasons were given for discarding the IRSAT project as then designed. Firstly, because it was felt that its objectives should be redirected towards measurements of the fluctuations of the microwave background; secondly, because some of its scientific goals would be achieved through the Dutch infrared satellite IRAS under development. Finally, the X-ray satellite was not regarded as being extremely fundamental.

The four other projects listed in Table 6 fell within the aegis of the SSWG, i.e. the Spacelab solar telescope GRIST, the climatology satellite SEOCS, the solar probe and the "dumb-bell". The GRIST, if eventually adopted in the ESA programme, would have met the long-standing expectations of European solar physicists to have a dedicated European mission in their field of interest. Therefore the group advocated the scientific interest of the X-ray solar telescope and recommended the start of a Phase A study on this instrument. The SEOCS was the second project recommended by the SSWG for a feasibility study. This satellite, the Group argued, "responds to the urgent need to obtain a better understanding of the Earth's atmosphere-surface-ocean system", a need which was recognised by the international Global Atmospheric Research Programme (GARP). The SSWG also underlined that the proposed SEOCS mission was "basically a *scientific* mission", indeed the first ESA spacecraft devoted to atmospheric science, but it recognised that, in the long run, "practical climatology and meteorology will benefit from the results".<sup>78</sup> While recommending these two projects for immediate Phase A study, the SSWG did not discard the other two. In fact, both the solar probe and the dumb-bell were considered scientifically very interesting projects, and the Group recommended that some complementary studies should be undertaken on a few critical aspects, in preparation for eventual Phase A studies to be undertaken in the future.

The SAC endorsed the Working Groups' recommendations. The endorsement of the GRIST, as recalled above, was a kind of a moral obligation towards the solar physics community which had strongly advocated keeping the project alive after the abandonment of the joint ESA/NASA Solar Telescope Cluster. Moreover, it was also the only important scientific project on Spacelab, after financial considerations had forced the abandonment of the infrared telescope LIRTS and the X-ray facility EXSPOS.<sup>79</sup> The SAC then recognised the scientific importance of the exploratory mission to be accomplished by the EXUV satellite in a new field of astronomy, which bridged the gap between the "traditional" UV band and the medium-energy X-ray region already studied in some detail from space. Observations in the 10-1000 Å band, they stressed, would provide information on the interstellar medium, stellar atmospheres and stellar evolution. As regards the SEOCS and the astrometry mission, both these projects were a novelty within the ESA scientific tradition, the former reflecting the new interest of atmospheric scientists and geophysicists in the complex phenomena which affect the Earth's climatic system, the latter involving a sector of the astronomy community hitherto alien to space technologies. The Committee, in particular, recognised the great scientific value of the SEOCS project ("an outstanding opportunity [...] to study the interactions between the Sun and the Earth up to the level of the upper atmosphere", in the words of R. Bonnet, who referred to the "excellent scientific case made at the symposium"), as well as its interest to the future meteorology programme. As to the astrometry mission, the SAC considered that its technical feasibility deserved careful investigation and that the astrometry community should be encouraged to address the problems related to the required instrumentation.<sup>80</sup>

The feasibility studies on these four candidate projects were carried out during 1977 and early 1978 by four different teams of scientists, who defined in detail the scientific objectives and justifications, as well as the instrumental and mission requirements, while the technical, operational and managerial

---

<sup>77</sup> ASTRO(76)11, cit., p. 3.

<sup>78</sup> SOL(76)13, cit., p. 4, underlined as in the original.

<sup>79</sup> Russo (1995). As a matter of fact, the LIRTS telescope and the focal plane instruments did remain under study in 1977-78, but it was definitely abandoned when it became clear that its low cost-effectiveness as a Spacelab facility was unacceptable: cfr. ASTRO(77)1, 7/3/77, and ASTRO(78)8, 31/5/78.

<sup>80</sup> SAC(76)11, cit., p. 8.

aspects were taken care of by ESA staff and by study contracts with industry.<sup>81</sup> They were reviewed by the AWG and SSWG, which confirmed their interest in these projects and suggested complementary studies in view of the final decision scheduled for the end of 1979.<sup>82</sup>

Two important aspects can be pointed out. Firstly, the fact that the three satellite missions (astrometry, SEOS and EXUV) were designed for launch with Ariane, a consequence of the decision to use the European launcher for future ESA missions. This, in particular, caused an important change in the design of the astrometry mission, now renamed Hipparcos after the name of the Greek astronomer of the 2nd century B.C. who discovered the precession of the equinoxes and prepared the first stellar catalogue based on accurate observations of star positions. The previous concept of a near-Earth spacecraft in polar Sun-synchronous orbit was abandoned and the spacecraft was designed for being operated in geostationary orbit, thus improving the chance of sharing an Ariane launch with another (presumably application) satellite. The main change regarded the attitude control system: in fact the original idea of passive stabilisation by the Earth's gravity field had to be abandoned because the gravitational stabilising force is too small at the geostationary distance from Earth, and an active attitude control was adopted, based on the use of reaction wheels in the spacecraft. This system, however, posed severe technical problems because the small disturbances from the mechanical bearings (the so-called "attitude jitters") might have jeopardised the astrometric goal of achieving angular measurements in the range of 2 milliarcsec. It was only in 1982, two years after the mission had definitely been adopted in the ESA programme, that the problem of "attitude jitters" could be solved by the introduction, by the satellite prime contractors of, attitude control by cold-gas jets.<sup>83</sup>

The second aspect was the recognised high operational costs of the GRIST. It was evident that the development costs of the instrument, plus the costs for a minimum programme of three Spacelab flights would be disastrously high, and it became necessary for the SAC to reappraise the mission, unless an agreement could be reached with NASA for a free flight in exchange for data, "which was however not considered likely". Following a suggestion from W. Axford, the SAC recommended that the possibility of a "descoped" GRIST be studied, "in view of the importance of including solar physics in the ESA programme and the fact that NASA still considered GRIST as part of the Solar Telescope Cluster".<sup>84</sup> The study was eventually undertaken, but after NASA had confirmed that it was not interested in a co-operative mission, it was definitely removed from the list of candidate missions.<sup>85</sup>

### ***The comets and the Moon***

In the second half of 1978, an important new element was introduced in the decision making process. Within the framework of a general re-organisation of the planning and selection procedures of scientific projects, the Executive informed the Working Groups and the SAC that it was possible to undertake Phase A studies on two new projects to be added to the list of candidate missions for the end-1979 selection.<sup>86</sup> The AWG and the SSWG were then requested to make their recommendations on potential new candidates, on the basis of the pool of mission proposals already discussed within the framework of their long-term planning. The former decided to maintain its emphasis on the two

---

<sup>81</sup> ESA/SPC(78)4, 12/5/78.

<sup>82</sup> AWG, 31st meeting (9/5/78), ASTRO(78)7, 2/8/78; SSWG, 27th meeting (8-9/5/78), SOL(78)6, 13/6/78. Also ASTRO(78)8, 31/5/78, and SOL(78)8, 8/6/78, both attached to SAC(78)12, 8/6/78.

<sup>83</sup> Perryman & Hassan (1989), p. 81. The EXUV spacecraft, whose planned orbit was highly eccentric (apogee about 120,000 km), was also originally designed for a tandem launch on Ariane with an application spacecraft aimed at geostationary orbit, but eventually a dedicated Ariane launch was envisaged and the spacecraft design parameters were established accordingly.

<sup>84</sup> SAC, 12th meeting, 19/6/78, SAC(78)15, 21/7/78, p. 6.

<sup>85</sup> ESA/SPC(78)25, 27/10/78; SPC, 18th meeting (23-24/1/79), ESA/SPC/MIN/18, 22/2/79, p. 6. As a matter of fact, new hope of including again the GRIST in the selection process arose during the SAC mission to NASA in October 1979 (fn. 52), when the American space agency informed that there was a possibility of flying in the same Spacelab payload (without charge to ESA) the GRIST and an American Solar Optical Telescope (SOT). This possibility, however, did not materialise. Cf. SAC(79)24, 11/9/79, SAC(79)32, 29/11/79, and SAC(79)34, 7/12/79.

<sup>86</sup> The new procedures, which aimed at shortening the period between conception and approval of new projects, are described in ESA/SPC(78)17, 9/10/78, reproduced with two minor changes in ESA/SPC(78)17, rev. 1, 16/11/78. They reflected the change in the ESA directorate structure which gave responsibility for studying future scientific projects to the Directorate of Scientific Programmes, as discussed above.

projects within its competence which were already under study, i.e. Hipparcos and EXUV, and recommended that the Executive should perform complementary studies on these rather than study any further project at Phase A level.<sup>87</sup> The SSWG, on the contrary, found itself in the embarrassing situation of prioritising three mission proposals which it had already considered equally interesting: a cometary mission, an orbiting lunar observatory and an oceanography satellite. We shall spend a few words on them.

The idea of a cometary mission had been discussed in the early days of ESRO as the second large project after the ill-fated Large Astronomical Satellite (LAS). Subsequently, the SSWG had recommended such a mission in its 1973 report to the LPAC on long-term priorities in the areas within its competence. The Working Group, in particular, expressed at that time its interest in a mission to comet Encke then under study in Germany as a follow-up to the US/German HELIOS programme. At the insistence of the German delegation in the Scientific Programme Board, the cometary mission to Encke was submitted to a mission definition study during 1974, but it was eventually abandoned because of its high cost.<sup>88</sup> After the creation of ESA, the SSWG made a case for Europe to undertake deep space missions in its 1976 report on long-term scientific strategy. In this framework, two possibilities for a cometary mission were suggested: firstly, a co-operative mission with NASA, e.g. a dual spacecraft mission in which ESA would provide a simpler daughter spacecraft; secondly, a purely ESA mission to several comets, using the Earth or Venus to make the required trajectory changes.<sup>89</sup> By mid-1978 the first possibility became a concrete option when NASA invited Europe to cooperate in a mission to comet Tempel-2, to be launched in 1985. The NASA project foresaw a large spacecraft driven by a solar-electric propulsion system (SEPS) to a rendezvous with the comet during its 1988 apparition; a passive probe provided by ESA would be released from the main spacecraft to meet the comet Halley at the end of 1985.

A workshop on cometary missions was held in April 1978 in Darmstadt, which was attended by more than 60 European scientists and whose results were summarised as follows:

*From this meeting, it was clear that the European cometary community is growing very fast, because space scientists not previously involved in cometary studies realised that they could exercise their expertise in one of the many aspects of a cometary mission. [...] It was clear that a good deal of instrumental expertise does exist in Europe, in all domains addressed at. [...] It was concluded that a cometary mission is mature enough to drive in Europe a tremendous interest among many scientists of various fields.<sup>90</sup>*

The advocates of the cometary mission insisted that, in case the NASA rendezvous mission should be postponed, ESA should anyway undertake a purely European ballistic mission, using Ariane to launch a space probe aiming at flying-by two comets (or a comet and an asteroid) with the help of Earth-gravity assist.

Their plans, however, were opposed by those scientists who argued that Europe should enter the field of planetary exploration by a mission to the Moon, more precisely a Polar Orbiting Lunar Observatory (POLO) aimed at "geochemical and geophysical mapping of the whole surface of the Moon, including the far side and the polar regions". The report of a meeting held in Paris in April 1978 goes on as follows:

*There exists a broad well-defined scientific community in Europe which has already been involved in NASA lunar programs and therefore is acquainted with problems of lunar research. About 30 laboratories in Europe have been involved in lunar sample analysis, lunar data interpretation and synthesis, or even directly participating as investigators in various missions to the Moon. [...] Thinking of future planetary missions, a POLO could be the ideal precursor [as] its instrumentation could be adapted to other planetary orbiters, like a Mars or Mercury polar orbiter and precursor for future lunar exploration*

<sup>87</sup> AWG, 32nd meeting (13/6/78), ASTRO(78)11, 5/7/78. Cf. also ESA/SPC(78)24, 18/10/78.

<sup>88</sup> Russo (1995). Cf. SSWG, *Priorities for the Eighties*, SOL(73)16, December 1973. The possibility of a special project mainly funded by Germany was also discussed but could not be realised.

<sup>89</sup> SSWG, *An approach to long range planning 1980-1990*, Vol. I, SOL(76)9, September 1976.

<sup>90</sup> SOL(78)8, 8/6/78, annex 5, p. 3.

*and utilisation. [...] It is a mission that can be done within the budgetary constraints of ESA in the next decade as a fully European enterprise but not excluding co-operation with NASA.*<sup>91</sup>

The third mission had been recommended by the SSWG's Panel on Earth Sciences, following a workshop on Space Oceanography, Navigation and Geodynamics (SONG) organised at Schloss Elmau in January 1978. This was a 3-axis stabilised Long-Life Oceanographic and Ice Dynamics Satellite (LLOIDS), to be launched by the end of 1985 into a near-polar orbit with an altitude of about 1000 km. The general objectives of this mission were to provide global information on ocean surface phenomena (general dynamics of the oceans, tidal dissipation, interaction between the oceans and the atmosphere) and to measure the bulk change of ice caps.<sup>92</sup>

As we have anticipated, the SSWG did not award any priority among these three projects, all being considered of comparable scientific value and each of them being supported by an important constituency. In June 1978, however, the Group was requested to indicate which of the three project studies should be started first, and performed at an accelerated pace (Phase A level) in order that it might be included as a candidate in the decision cycle for selecting ESA's next scientific project at end-1979. The two other studies would be normally performed at mission definition level, on a time schedule compatible with the following decision point at the end of 1980.<sup>93</sup> The real contrast, actually, was between the POLO project and the cometary mission, as the LLOIDS was not presented as a candidate for such a quick study. While, in fact, the Earth sciences were already covered by the SEOCs in the list of candidate projects, an exploratory mission to a solar system body, either the Moon or a comet, was a real first in the history of Europe in space. Here is a summary of the main arguments presented by the supporters of the two options, as recorded in the final resolution.<sup>94</sup> The first two are from the comet supporters, the following three are from the moon-lovers:

- 1 The exploration of the comets is an entirely new and very appealing scientific subject and, moreover, a cometary mission would look attractive for the general public.
- 2 A decision in favour of POLO would automatically exclude the possibility of participating in the Halley/Tempel-2 mission because of the tight time schedule imposed by the launch window in 1985; on the contrary, giving priority to the cometary mission would not exclude the lunar mission, for which a decision would be delayed by one year and that, in any case, was not constrained by a launch window.
- 3 The foregoing argument is hardly convincing; in fact, owing to the overall constraints of the ESA programme, it is very unlikely that a second project in planetary exploration would be selected one year after the selection of the cometary mission.
- 4 The lunar polar orbiter is scientifically very good, it can easily be launched by Ariane, and the technical risks are very limited; on the contrary, several managerial problems are to be expected for the joint ESA/NASA cometary mission, while a purely European fly-by mission would have a poor scientific return because of the short duration of the encounter.
- 5 A co-operative venture with NASA would have a twofold disadvantage: firstly, coming after the Space Telescope and the Out of Ecliptic mission, the joint cometary mission would make the ESA scientific programme dangerously dependent on the US space policy; secondly, because of the limited contribution of ESA to a common project (estimated at 20 to 25 %), the participation of European scientists to the mission's scientific harvest would be limited as well.

After two days of lively discussion, a general consensus could not be reached and a vote had to be taken. The result dramatically showed the discord within the Working Group, reflecting the existence of substantial communities supporting both planetary missions: six votes were in favour of the lunar

---

<sup>91</sup> SOL(78)8, cit., annex 6, p. 2.

<sup>92</sup> SOL(78)8, cit., annex 7.

<sup>93</sup> SSWG, 28th meeting (21-22/6/78), SOL(78)11, 10/8/78.

<sup>94</sup> SOL(78)10, 22/6/78.

polar orbiter, four in favour of the cometary mission, two members abstained. As a consequence, this was the obvious conclusion, if only one mission could regretfully be studied within the time frame of the decision cycle ending in late 1979, then the POLO mission should have priority. Halley's comet was definitely lost.

The minutes do not inform us about the votes expressed by the twelve SSWG members participating in the meeting, but J.-L. Bertaux, from the French CNRS' Service d'Aéronomie in Verrière-le-Buisson, and U. Fahleson, from the Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm, asked that their dissent from the majority opinion be explicitly reported. A third vote in favour of the cometary mission can be ascribed to H. Fechtig, from the Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik in Heidelberg, a specialist in mass spectrometry of meteoritic material and interplanetary dust, and an ardent advocate of cometary studies.<sup>95</sup>

This was not the end of the story, however. The supporters of the comets, in fact, had a powerful ally in ESA, namely E. Trendelenburg, and an influential advocate in the SAC, namely W. Ian Axford, the director of the Max-Planck-Institut für Aeronomie in Lindau, where several research groups were already designing instruments for the envisaged cometary mission. They succeeded in convincing the SAC chairman R. Bonnet that the matter deserved further discussion, and thus the issue of priorities for future studies was put on the agenda of the SAC meeting scheduled for 28 September. The timing was quite appropriate: NASA had confirmed its plans for its 1985 cometary rendezvous mission, and an European team was expected in Washington on 11-12 October to discuss the technical and managerial aspects of the envisaged Tempel-2/Halley dual-spacecraft mission.<sup>96</sup>

At the SAC meeting, Trendelenburg pointed out that "letters had been received from European scientists expressing disappointment at the outcome of the study priority set up by the SSWG", and invited the Committee to "act as an arbitrator in this case and to express a view as to whether the priority set by the SSWG should be maintained". After extensive discussion, the SAC reversed the SSWG priority and recommended that a study on the joint ESA/NASA cometary mission be started immediately, "with the goal of being ready for a decision by the end of 1979". At the same time, it definitely excluded the possibility of studying a purely European fly-by mission.<sup>97</sup>

In the following days the protest of the supporters of the lunar mission could not prevent Trendelenburg's Directorate from undertaking intensive studies in-house and with the Americans on the Halley probe to be carried on NASA's mother spacecraft to Tempel-2, for what was now called the International Cometary Mission (ICM). Several members of the SSWG blamed the SAC for acting "in an undemocratic manner", some explicitly challenging its right to give advice "independent of and even in contradiction of Working Groups' recommendations". These arguments, however, could not change the situation. Bonnet claimed that the SAC had in fact acted in accordance with its procedures in making its recommendation to the Executive, "which the Executive had thought it correct to pursue". Trendelenburg, for his part, stated that "the Executive could if it deemed it necessary, or had any grounds for disagreement with the Working Groups' views, seek the advice of the SAC, as the senior scientific advisory body".<sup>98</sup>

### **The selection of ESA's next scientific mission**

The decision on ESA's next scientific mission was eventually postponed to February 1980 in order to fit within the American policy-making process. In the USA, in fact, the cometary mission was in competition with a Venus Orbiter mission, both of them being launch-window dependent, and the probability of the former being approved by NASA and the Congress was hardly higher than 50 %. A

---

<sup>95</sup> Calder (1992), p. 21-22. Calder's lively book is essentially based on personal interviews with the main protagonists of the history of the Giotto mission. He informs us that the main lobbying for POLO came from the British scientists.

<sup>96</sup> The ESA/NASA October meeting is reported on in ESA/SPC(78)25, cit., p. 3. Cf. also Calder (1992), p. 20.

<sup>97</sup> SAC, 14th meeting (28/9/78), SAC(78)21, 20/11/78, pp. 3-4. Only four members of the SAC attended the meeting, namely Bonnet, Axford, Pinkau and Wiin-Nielsen, together with the chairmen of the AWG (Setti), SSWG (Petit) and MSWG (Weiss). The two other members, Colombo and Wolff, were unable to attend.

<sup>98</sup> SAC, 15th meeting (19/12/78), SAC(78)23, 8/1/79, pp. 2-3.

first indication as to whether the ICM would receive a positive response was expected by January 1980, if in the NASA budget presented by the President to the Congress there would have been a request for the development of the SEPS technique required to drive the spacecraft towards its rendezvous with Tempel-2. At the same time, in order to comply with the NASA selection procedures for the instruments to be included in the payload of scientific satellites, the SAC agreed to deviate from the usual ESA policy of issuing an Announcement of Opportunity (AO) to the scientific community only after project approval. NASA, in fact, planned to release an AO for the ICM in late Spring 1979, therefore either ESA would have to issue a joint AO with NASA at that time or the European scientific community would be unduly penalised in the final definition of the payload. There was no room for a choice but to accept the first option, even though "experimenters wishing to bid for space on other candidate ESA satellites might feel themselves being at a disadvantage".<sup>99</sup> The SPC endorsed the SAC decision but made it clear that "[this] did not imply that the SPC accorded priority to the cometary mission, [and] the issuing of the AO should not be invoked as a reason for giving the cometary mission priority over other candidates".<sup>100</sup> This was quite fair, nevertheless the preparation of experiment proposals in view of the forthcoming AO (eventually issued in October) did reinforce the cometary scientific constituency already established in Europe.

After the dismissal of the GRIST and the addition of the ICM, three other changes occurred in the list of candidate projects for the February-1980 selection. Firstly, the elimination of the SEOCS from the list, as it was agreed that this project should be considered as part of the optional Earth-observation programme, and then funded from outside the mandatory science budget. Secondly, the addition of a general Spacelab facility for life-sciences experiments, called Biorack. This was a set of holding units and incubators for plants, cells and tissues, and lower vertebrates, similar to those widely used in standard laboratory research. The Biorack, whose cost was estimated at less than 5 MAU, had been strongly recommended by the LSWG and endorsed by the SAC, and the SPC had eventually agreed that it be included in the list of candidate projects for the mandatory programme.<sup>101</sup> Finally, the SAC and the SPC endorsed the Executive's proposal to consider for inclusion in the programme the utilisation of the GEOS spacecraft for a bold scientific mission to be launched at no or very low cost on one of the Ariane test flights. This so-called GEOS-3 mission would aim at exploring the Earth's magnetospheric tail (i.e. the magnetospheric region in opposition to the Sun) beyond the orbit of the Moon, at about 230 to 260 earth radii from the Earth.<sup>102</sup>

The list of candidate projects at end-1979 is reported in Table 7.<sup>103</sup> According to the usual ESA procedure for the selection of the new scientific project(s), the results of the Phase A studies were to be presented to the scientific community and discussed at a symposium scheduled for 22 January 1980 in ESTEC. Following this presentation, the Working Groups would be called to discuss the projects within their competence and issue their recommendations. Subsequently, it was up to the SAC to make its recommendation to the SPC, whose final decision was scheduled for 4-5 March.

### ***The comet and the stars: telex lobbying***

When the ESTEC symposium was being prepared, it was announced in the USA that the required funding for the SEPS had not been included in the President's budget. As solar electric propulsion was an essential element of the Tempel-2/Halley mission, it had to be acknowledged that the basis for the co-operative cometary mission no longer existed.<sup>104</sup> Facing the new situation, the Executive decided to resurrect a proposal, originally made in early 1979 by G. Colombo, which combined the GEOS-3 project and a mission to Halley. This mission, called HAPPEN (Halley Post-Perihelion Encounter),

<sup>99</sup> SAC, 16th meeting (22-23/1/79), SAC(79)4, 9/3/79, p. 6.

<sup>100</sup> SPC, 18th meeting (23-24/1/79), ESA/SPC/MIN/18, 22/2/79, p. 6.

<sup>101</sup> SAC, 14th meeting (28/9/78), SAC(78)21, 20/11/78; SPC, 17th meeting (14/11/78), ESA/SPC/MIN/17, 5/12/78. Cf. ESA/SPC(78)19, 16/10/78.

<sup>102</sup> The GEOS-3 concept was first presented in ESA/SPC(78)26, 6/11/78, and add. 1, 10/11/78. Several mission profiles were studied in the following months in consultation with the SSWG. Cf. SAC, 6th meeting (22-23/1/79), SAC(79)1, 9/3/79, pp. 6-7; SSWG, 31st meeting (3-4/5/79), SOL(79)10, 25/6/79.

<sup>103</sup> The reports on the phase A studies for the classical science projects, all dated December 1979 and coded SCI(79)9 to 12, are available in *D/Sci archives*. The report on the phase A study for Biorack, prepared under the responsibility of the Directorate of Future Programmes, is coded DP/ST(80)1.

<sup>104</sup> The history of US plans for a cometary mission are discussed by Logsdon (1989).

foresaw that the GEOS-3 spacecraft, instrumented for Earth-magnetotail research but suitably reconfigured, could be targeted to intercept the tail of comet Halley at the end of its magnetotail mission. The encounter with Halley would occur in March 1986, after it had rounded the Sun, instead of the pre-perihelion encounter in November 1985 foreseen in the ESA/NASA mission.<sup>105</sup>

The GEOS-3/HAPPEN mission proposal was discussed at the ESTEC symposium in January, and it was supported by the GEOS experimenters: "The Happen proposal would, after the likely cancellation of the ESA/NASA comet mission, present a unique opportunity for cometary plasma research", they recommended to the SSWG.<sup>106</sup> The Working Group, however, did not agree. At their meeting of 24 January, the SSWG did strongly recommend GEOS-3 for selection for the new ESA scientific project, but rejected the HAPPEN extension: "Opinions were somewhat divided", the SSWG concluded, "but, on balance, [...] the probable science to be achieved by this mission did not justify the estimated [additional] expenditure of 30 MAU".<sup>107</sup> The comet was thus lost again. The minutes of the meeting do not give details of the discussion, but several members regretted that, after the loss of POLO, the crisis of the cometary mission had again caused a situation in which no planetary mission was left for selection, and the Working Group had to continue to recommend only projects in the same discipline of magnetospheric research.<sup>108</sup>

Opinions were also divided within the AWG, whose task it was to award priority to one of the two projects under its competence, the astrometry satellite Hipparcos and the EXUV mission. Of the 13 members attending the meeting, 8 voted in favour of Hipparcos and 5 in favour of its competitor. While both missions were considered as promising good scientific return, two main arguments were raised against EXUV. Firstly, the controversial combination of two experiments in the same payload; secondly, the fact that the scientific objectives of this mission were being covered by two different missions planned by NASA and Germany, respectively. In support of Hipparcos there was a large constituency, including both the astronomers community (a resolution supporting the astrometry mission had been adopted in August 1979 by the International Astronomical Union's General Assembly) and the scientific community interested in geodesy (precise astrometric data are required for measuring the Earth rotation and the shape of the Earth surface).<sup>109</sup>

Given the results of this formal consultation, the task for the SAC was now to decide on two main questions. Firstly, whether to recommend GEOS-3 or Hipparcos for immediate adoption in the ESA scientific programme; both projects, in fact, could not be accommodated in the 1980 budget, but the loser would anyway remain on the list of candidate projects for the next selection in early 1981. Secondly, whether to recommend Biorack for funding out of the science budget. The latter had been strongly recommended by the LSWG, and its scientific interest was not questioned, but its inclusion in the mandatory budget was not politically innocent *vis-à-vis* the on-going debates about Spacelab utilisation.<sup>110</sup>

The SAC meeting was scheduled for 6-7 February, with the German physicist Klaus Pinkau replacing Bonnet in the chair (Table 8).<sup>111</sup> There were ten days for the supporters of the cometary mission to rescue their project. Insisting on the GEOS-3/HAPPEN concept was out of the question, after the SSWG resolution. In fact, the combination of two different objectives within one mission could be criticised

---

<sup>105</sup> The HAPPEN mission had been discussed by the SSWG at its 31st meeting (3-4/5/79), SOL(79)10, 25/6/79, but it had been discarded in view of the on-going planning for the ESA/NASA (Tempel-2/Halley) cometary mission. Cf. the SSWG's recommendation reported in SOL(79)9, 4/5/79. The GEOS-3/HAPPEN mission as proposed by the Executive is described in SCI(80)2, January 1980.

<sup>106</sup> Copy of this recommendation, dated 24/1/80, typewritten and signed by nine GEOS experimenters, is in *D/Sci archives*.

<sup>107</sup> SOL(80)3, 29/1/80.

<sup>108</sup> SSWG, 33rd meeting (24/1/80), SOL(80)4, 7/5/80. An explicit criticism to the Executive for introducing GEOS-3 in the decision process instead of concentrate its efforts on assessment studies of POLO in order to have this project ready for a decision at the same time as the cometary mission was made by G. Neukum in a letter to G. Haskell (SSWG secretary), 20/2/80, *D/Sci archives*.

<sup>109</sup> ASTRO(80)2, 30/1/80. Cf. AWG, 39th meeting (24/1/80), ASTRO(80)3, 21/3/80.

<sup>110</sup> The various financial implications arising from the selection of any of the candidate projects (including EXUV) were described by the Executive in SAC(80)5, 31/1/80. The LSWG recommendation on Biorack is reported in LIFE(80)1, 30/1/80.

<sup>111</sup> SAC, 21st meeting (6-7/2/80), ESA/SAC/MIN/21, 17/4/80.

from both the scientific and the technical point of view: the GEOS-3 spacecraft could not be instrumented appropriately for studying the comet without detracting substantially from the effectiveness of the magnetotail mission, and important instruments for cometary studies such as a camera, a neutral mass spectrometer and an instrument for measuring dust composition could not be included in the payload. Moreover, the cometary mission had a definite launch window in 1985, what could only be achieved if it was adopted now. As a consequence, the adoption of Hipparcos would definitely have killed GEOS-3/HAPPEN, while, on the contrary, GEOS-3 alone could still remain in the list of candidate projects for the early-1981 selection, which the magnetospheric scientists certainly preferred. In conclusion, a new proposal for a cometary mission was required.

The proposal came in a telex to Trendelenburg from an impressive group of German physicists, many of whom already involved in designing experiments for the ill-fated ESA/NASA mission. "Comet Halley will be the only comet in this century that is active enough to make it an outstanding target for a flyby mission", they wrote, and then made their proposal as follows:

*A separate spacecraft, such as of GEOS type, solely dedicated to cometary science is much more adequate. This spacecraft could be launched together with GEOS-3 in its original version. The production of two similar spacecraft and their simultaneous launch will probably be only slightly more expensive than the figure (60 + 30 MAU) quoted for the HAPPEN mission. The extra cost over GEOS-3 should be comparable to that of the probe (50 MAU) for the NASA/ESA mission.<sup>112</sup>*

There were several advantages in launching a pure comet probe jointly with GEOS-3, they argued. Firstly, the use of two similar (existing) spacecraft for the magnetotail and the comet reduced the cost of each spacecraft; secondly, a dual launch would use the full capability of Ariane, help optimising mission planning, and cause no extra launch costs for the cometary mission; last but not least, ESA would fly its first interplanetary mission, a purely European cometary mission, for the extra cost of an inexpensive satellite.

Trendelenburg was delighted to receive this telex, but his staff had just one week to work out a credible technical proposal to be presented at the forthcoming SAC meeting. Only a rough outline could be prepared, which could hardly win approval against Hipparcos. The latter had a convinced advocate in the SAC, the French scientists J. Kovalevsky, who had contributed to the Phase A study. The crucial question was whether the scientific appeal of the cometary mission was sufficient to justify a delay in taking a decision on the next project, i.e. until the technical and scientific feasibility of this new proposal could be established beyond doubt. Another three-months study was required, Trendelenburg said to the SAC.<sup>113</sup>

After presentations of all candidate projects (including EXUV) and some general discussion, it took two restricted sessions for the SAC to reach agreement on the final resolution, ... and the comet was rescued. The SAC, in fact, unanimously recommended that the proposed Comet/GEOS-3 dual mission be selected as the next scientific project, provided that, within a period of three months, the scientific value of the project be confirmed, its technical feasibility demonstrated, and the estimated cost not be higher than 120 MAU.<sup>114</sup> The engineers hurried to work, and the cometary mission acquired a charming name: Giotto. This was motivated by the consideration that the earliest realistic portrait of Halley's comet was painted by the great Italian artist in one of the beautiful frescoes in the chapel of the Scrovegni family in Padua. The star of Bethlehem in the painting of the Adoration of the Magi, in fact, is but a faithful representation of the famous comet, as Giotto saw it during its sensational appearance in 1301.

---

<sup>112</sup> The telex, dated 29/11/80, was signed by 19 physicists, among which H.U. Keller, W.I. Axford, L. Biermann, H. Fechtig, R. Lüst, F. Neubauer, U. von Zahn. Copy of this telex, as well as a few others sent by other scientists to protest against the SSWG negative decision on the GEOS-3/HAPPEN proposal, is in *D/Sci archives*. Cf. Calder (1992), pp. 32-34.

<sup>113</sup> SAC, 21st meeting (6-7/2/80), ESA/SAC/MIN/21, 17/4/80.

<sup>114</sup> SAC(80)7, 11/2/80. No minutes of the restricted sessions are available, but Kovalevsky asked that its doubts that in-depth studies on the combined Comet/Geos-3 mission could be done in a three-months period be recorded.



There are three main reasons for the SAC decision. The first is obviously the firm commitment of Trendelenburg's Scientific Directorate to undertake the cometary mission. While the SAC was formally independent in making its recommendations, nevertheless it was the Directorate which provided the necessary inputs in terms of technical assessment and financial estimates of mission proposals. Had Trendelenburg not decided to hurry studies on the GEOS-3/HAPPEN project and then on the purely cometary mission, and had he not insisted for submitting both projects to the SSWG and the SAC, the Halley's comet mission would definitely have been lost to ESA. Public relation considerations seem to have had a major role in Trendelenburg's effort in supporting the cometary mission. Visiting a famous comet and sending close-up images of its nucleus to TV screens on Earth was certainly more appealing to popular eyes than accurate measurement of star positions, and would have added glamour to the European space effort which lacked space walks and footsteps on the Moon. If, after all, the ESA programme depended on taxpayers' money, why not offer them a colourful vision of the wonders of nature in addition to esoteric papers in scientific journals?<sup>115</sup>

The second reason was the strong interest of the magnetospheric physics community, in particular the GEOS-3 experimenters, in linking their pet project to an independent cometary mission. From the scientific standpoint, during Giotto's long journey to its encounter with Halley, important data on the interplanetary medium could be obtained that would enhance the scientific value of GEOS-3. This was not the only element, however. The GEOS-3 constituency, in fact, could hardly win a competition against the powerful astronomy community supporting Hipparcos, but their chances would certainly have been higher if the magnetospheric mission could be coupled to such a stimulating objective as studying a comet *in-situ*. Facing the challenge of a technically sophisticated astronomical mission, the old tradition of ESA magnetospheric studies would be dramatically reinforced by its association with Europe's first interplanetary mission.

Last but not least, there was some weakness in the Hipparcos project itself. Some technical uncertainties regarding its feasibility had been expressed in the Phase A report; the question of the complex data handling had not yet been settled; and the high cost of the project had been recognised, in particular because it was suggested that the payload should be financed by ESA. No unanimous consensus, as we know, had been expressed by the AWG on awarding priority to Hipparcos against EXUV, and an influential SAC member, the British physicist H. Helliot, argued that "a definite decision to go ahead with Hipparcos could not yet be taken because of the absence of complete confidence in the technology".<sup>116</sup> These doubts were reflected in the SAC resolution, which requested that the three-months period should also be used for further technical studies on the astrometry mission, and to find ways and means whereby the payload could be funded nationally. The SAC clearly stated that, in case the comet mission should not be feasible, Hipparcos should then be the first choice (against EXUV and GEOS-3 alone) only provided that the payload was funded outside the mandatory budget. The resolution then concluded:

*In the event that the Hipparcos payload would need to be funded within the mandatory programme, the SAC was divided as to whether Hipparcos should then remain the Agency's choice or EXUV should be carried out because this mission was considered by some members to be just as interesting.*<sup>117</sup>

A last word must be said regarding Biorack. The SAC did not endorse this project at this stage but requested the Executive to undertake a further study to firm up the estimated cost of the facility, and to issue an Announcement of Opportunity in order to establish a possible payload for the first Biorack mission: "The recommendation whether to go ahead with the funding of Biorack and its ancillary equipment would be made following evaluation of the science proposed".<sup>118</sup> We will not follow further on this topic as the Biorack was eventually included in the optional microgravity programme,

---

<sup>115</sup> Calder (1992), p. 23. It is worth recalling here that the public relations aspect of the Giotto mission was very badly managed by ESA as well as by the scientists involved in the experiments. In particular, while everybody was expecting to see beautiful colour pictures of the comet nucleus, what was shown on several hundred million television screens on "the night of the comet" was a series of coded isophotes totally incomprehensible to the public.

<sup>116</sup> ESA/SAC/MIN/21, cit., p. 4.

<sup>117</sup> SAC(80)7, 11/2/80, p. 2.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*

established in February 1982. We will deal with the origin and early development of this programme in a subsequent report.

The SAC decision came as a bombshell in the scientific community. Pinkau and Trendelenburg, as well as the SPC chairman and the ESA Director General, were flooded with telexes and letters from all over Europe, blaming, on the one hand, the unusual and "arbitrary" procedure of recommending a project not supported by technical studies and not preliminarily discussed by the SSWG, and claiming, on the other, the great support that Hipparcos enjoyed within the scientific community. The chairman of the Hipparcos Consortium, P.L. Bernacca, wrote that 170 research proposals for the astrometry mission had been presented by 125 astronomers from 12 countries, recalling that 24 institutes from 8 countries were available to put manpower in hardware and software activities, and 5 were already working hardware and software aspects on their funds. The cometary lobby was as much active, however, and many telexes arrived expressing satisfaction for the SAC decision and whole-hearted support for Giotto, "which is a once in a lifetime opportunity".<sup>119</sup>

### *The SPC decision*

It was up to the Science Programme Committee, whose meeting was scheduled for 4-5 March under the chairmanship of the Italian physicist Edoardo Amaldi, to say the last word on the selection process for ESA's next scientific project. In this political body, made up of national delegations where senior scientists and space policy makers sat side by side, even an appealing scientific idea could not do without sound technical and financial credentials, all the more so as the idea was so controversial. Pending the results of the on-going study, the information Trendelenburg could provide in support of the Director General's formal proposal to select the combined Giotto/GEOS-3 mission was rather poor.<sup>120</sup> In fact, the lack of information and the hurried decision which the SPC had to confront was regretted by most SPC delegations, and the French explicitly questioned the Executive for presenting a proposal which was not "politically advisable since it had not met with a general consensus in the scientific community and could possibly lead to a complete split in the Committee".<sup>121</sup> Only Germany and Sweden advocated the dual Giotto/GEOS-3 mission, as was to be expected given the involvement of German and Swedish scientists in the former NASA/ESA cometary project and magnetospheric studies, respectively. France (of course), Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Italy, Switzerland and Spain supported Hipparcos. The British delegation requested that the decision be deferred until more information was available on both Hipparcos and the combined Giotto/GEOS-3 mission; and the Irish said that among Irish scientists there was an equal interest in both projects.

The long discussion in the SPC brought into evidence two elements: firstly, that if a vote had been taken, then Hipparcos would have been chosen as ESA's next scientific project; secondly, that such a decision would anyway have left several delegations and a large fraction of the scientific community deeply dissatisfied. Apart from Germany and Sweden, Italy did not want to abandon GEOS-3, as only "a slight preference" had been expressed for Hipparcos within its scientific community; Switzerland wanted anyway GEOS-3 or Giotto (both being impossible) in addition to the astrometry mission; an "important minority" of the Belgian scientific community had expressed interest in the cometary mission; and even France suggested to explore the possibility of undertaking a mission to comet Halley in co-operation with NASA.

In the event, a compromise agreement was finally reached: Hipparcos was reinstated as the next scientific project, with the provision that ESA should also take responsibility for the payload development, but the Executive was instructed to pursue the study of the Halley mission until the end of June, definitely discarding GEOS-3. If Giotto proved to be scientifically interesting and technically

---

<sup>119</sup> All telexes are in *D/Sci archives*. The last quotation is from one signed by a group of physicists of the M.P.I. für Kernphysik in Heidelberg and the universities of Bochum and Bonn. The "arbitrariness" of the SAC action was blamed by SSWG members A. Brahic and A. Cazenave, from Toulouse. "Great enthusiasm" was expressed, on the contrary, by the original proponents of the dual comet/GEOS-3 mission. The rationale for the SAC decision are expressed in a letter sent by Pinkau to the AWG chairman C. de Jager, dated 17/3/80, a copy of which is in *D/Sci archives*.

<sup>120</sup> The Working Groups and the SAC acted as advisory bodies to the DG, and it was the latter who formally made proposals to the policy making SPC. The terms of reference of the ESA scientific advisory structure are described in ESA/ADMIN(79)10, 22/5/79. The DG's proposal to the SPC is in ESA/SPC(80)4, 13/2/80.

<sup>121</sup> SPC, 23rd meeting (4-5/3/80), ESA/SPC/MIN/23, 3/4/80, p. 3.

feasible within a cost envelope of 80 MAU, then it would be included in the ESA programme, "on the understanding that the Hipparcos project could be stretched to accommodate the cometary mission". The stars could wait, while the comet could not be stopped in its journey through the solar system, and the two-week launch window of July 1985 could not be missed.<sup>122</sup>

The compromise did not make the SAC happy, at least not its chairman who went as far as offering his resignation to Trendelenburg. "It apparently is true that comets are a bad omen", Pinkau wrote his fellow SAC members.<sup>123</sup> Firstly, facing the grim financial situation of the science programme, he did not like the SPC decision to finance the Hipparcos payload out of the mandatory budget. It was customary for ESA scientific satellites that the payloads be financed nationally, but Hipparcos was now the third astronomy project, after Exosat and the Space Telescope, for which the SPC had voted in favour of paying also for the payload: "Thus [it] is beginning to establish a policy", Pinkau remarked, and such a policy implied of course that less funding would have been available for new projects. Secondly, according to the SAC chairman the ESA decision-making process favoured "big science" projects, the main determining factors being financial feasibility and Ariane launch, rather than the "value for money" of the proposed missions. The dual Giotto/GEOS-3 mission would have supported "a very large community with very good science at low cost", Pinkau argued, but the SPC had not considered the magnetotail mission worth the price difference between the financial frame of the cometary mission (80 MAU) and the combined Giotto/GEOS-3 mission (120 MAU). This difference was roughly equal to the price of the Hipparcos payload. Finally, Pinkau remarked the unfair distribution of resources between astronomy and solar system science, the former taking by far a larger fraction of the available funds for the 1980s.

### *Giotto and Hipparcos adopted*

The Giotto study was duly prepared by mid-May and the final report discussed at a meeting of the interested scientific community on 30 May. It foresaw a flyby mission launched in July 1985 either by Ariane in association with an application satellite or by a Thor-Delta rocket, a significant involvement of American scientists in the scientific investigations being foreseen in the latter case. The Halley encounter was scheduled for March 1986 (four weeks after perihelion) with a flyby velocity of 68 km/sec, active trajectory control and adequate shielding guaranteeing spacecraft operations up to a few hundred kilometres from the comet's nucleus. The model payload, with a total mass of 53 kg, included an imaging camera; neutral, ion and dust mass spectrometers; a dust impact detector; a plasma analyser; a magnetometer; and a UV-spectrometer. The estimated cost was 85 MAU, plus 2 MAU for the use of the large antenna of the Parkes Radio Observatory in Australia for tracking and data acquisition during the short encounter phase. The inclusion of Giotto in the programme implied a delay of the Hipparcos project by about 6 months and a delay in the selection of the next scientific project by about one year. An immediate decision had to be taken in order to respect the 1985 launch date.<sup>124</sup>

On the basis of the results of the study, the SSWG unanimously expressed its enthusiastic support to the Giotto project, which it considered "an exciting and cost-effective scientific opportunity", and recommended its inclusion in the ESA programme as a purely European mission launched by Ariane.<sup>125</sup> Two weeks later, the SAC fully endorsed this recommendation.<sup>126</sup>

When, however, the matter came up for discussion, and final decision, at the SPC, two clouds hindered the conclusion of the selection process. Firstly, there was the request of Germany to re-discuss the issue of the ESA funding of the Hipparcos payload. If Giotto and Hipparcos (payload included) were approved, the German Minister for Research and Technology warned the Director

<sup>122</sup> ESA/SPC/XXIII/Res. 1, 7/3/80. The resolution was approved with the only abstention of the Netherlands delegation.

<sup>123</sup> Pinkau, letter to the SAC members, 14/3/80, copy in *D/Sci archives*. Cf. also Pinkau's letter to M. Rees, also dated 14/3/80, and Bonnet's letter to Pinkau, 21/4/80, *ibid.*

<sup>124</sup> The report, coded SCI(80)4, 14/5/80, is available at *D/Sci archives*. Cf. also ESA/SPC(80)13, 6/6/80. Negotiation with NASA about the possible use of a Thor-Delta launcher were still ongoing. The possibility of using the Parkes facility at such a good price compared to NASA's Deep Space Network (4 to 10 MAU) materialised only after the completion of the report, but, to Trendelenburg's relief, before the SPC meeting (*infra*). Calder (1992), p. 37, writes that Parkes' request was 200,000 dollars (about 0.14 MAU), which is obviously incorrect.

<sup>125</sup> SOL(80)6, 30/5/80. Cf. SOL, 34th meeting (30/5/80), SOL(80)7, 30/6/80.

<sup>126</sup> SAC, 22nd meeting (16-17/6/80), ESA/SAC/MIN/22, 5/9/80. The SAC resolution is reported in SAC(80)15, 17/6/80.

General, the science budget would be blocked for a long period, making it impossible to support other areas of space science. The suggestion was that the Hipparcos payload should be funded in the form of an optional programme by the Member States interested in the astrometry mission.<sup>127</sup> The second cloud derived from the French request that the cometary mission should anyway be open to American investigators, even in case the mission was launched by Ariane. The collaboration with the USA was considered indispensable "both from the point of view of the scientific results to be obtained and from the point of view of the security of the mission itself". This was an important policy question which could only be decided upon by the Council, but the French delegation insisted that the SPC resolution should include a statement to this respect and be referred to the Council in the form of a recommendation.<sup>128</sup>

After a long discussion, the German delegation agreed to withdraw its request regarding the funding of the Hipparcos payload, in order to remove "a major obstacle for the approval by some delegations of the Giotto mission". France, on the contrary, formally stated that, unless the resolution explicitly indicated that the call for experiment proposal would be open to USA experimenters, it would vote against it, which it eventually did. Giotto was thus adopted in the ESA programme with ten votes in favour and one against. The last word was Trendelenburg's, and his satisfaction is quite evident:

*The Director of the Scientific Programme underlined the importance of the decision taken; he stressed that the Giotto project was certainly more risky than any other project undertaken by the Agency to date, but believed that ESA had demonstrated that it was technically able to undertake such a project and hoped delegations would fully support the Executive in its endeavours to carry out the mission successfully.*<sup>129</sup>

## Epilogue

The Giotto spacecraft was successfully launched by an Ariane-1 vehicle on 2 July 1985, carrying on board a 59-kg scientific payload including ten experiments. The following day, its solid-propellant Transfer Propulsion System was fired as planned and the spacecraft was put correctly on course for its rendezvous with Halley's comet.<sup>130</sup> Giotto was to act as a sort of kamikaze, approaching the comet at about 600 km in order to get a close-up view of the nucleus and its atmosphere. Passing at a speed of about 70 km per second through the thick cloud of dust and gas surrounding the cometary nucleus, there was very little chance of survival for the spacecraft and its scientific instruments. The Giotto mission, which had required two years for decision-making (including the preparation of the ill-fated NASA/ESA mission), five years for building the spacecraft, and eight months of cruising in space, was to collect all its relevant data in the very last hour of its lifetime.<sup>131</sup>

The encounter phase started at about 6 p.m. GMT on 13 March 1986 and Giotto's closest approach to the comet occurred at 00:11:0.5 GMT on 14 March, at a distance of about 596 km from the comet's nucleus and 144 million km from the Earth. Although the encounter was formally over 15 minutes after that moment, payload operations continued until 02:40 GMT on 15 March when the scientific mission was terminated and the payload switched off.<sup>132</sup> As the spacecraft and several instruments survived the dramatic encounter with Halley, it was eventually decided to extend the mission and to redirect Giotto to encounter comet Grigg-Skjellerup by means of Earth-swing-by manoeuvre. The

<sup>127</sup> W. Finke's letter, dated 25/3/80, was circulated under cover ESA/SPC(80)10, 9/4/80. Finke's arguments echoed Pinkau's and one can reasonably guess that the latter, who was an influential scientific adviser to the German government on space matters and a former SPC delegate, exerted some influence.

<sup>128</sup> SPC, 24th meeting (8-9/7/80), ESA/SPC/MIN/24, rev. 1, 13/8/80, p. 3. There is no explicit reason given for the French insistence in having the Giotto payload open to USA investigators. Most probably this was due to the fact that the French space policy makers did not believe that the most important Giotto instrument, the imaging camera, could be built in Europe and wanted to secure the experience of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory's group which had built the camera for the Voyager spacecraft. At that time, in fact, one of the most influential French advisers for space policy matters, Jacques Blamont, was visiting JPL, trying to convince them to devise a camera for Giotto. Cf. Calder (1992), p. 40.

<sup>129</sup> ESA/SPC/MIN/24, cit., p. 5. The final resolution is reported in ESA/SPC/XXIV/Res. 1, 9/7/80.

<sup>130</sup> Wilkins (1985).

<sup>131</sup> Russo (1994).

<sup>132</sup> "Giotto special issue", *ESA Bulletin*, n. 46 (May 1986). A lively account of the "night of the comet" is in Calder (1992).

encounter took place on 10 July 1992, with the spacecraft passing within approximately 200 km of the cometary nucleus, at 214 million km from the Earth.<sup>133</sup>

Hipparcos was launched on 8 August 1989 by an Ariane-4 vehicle, one year later than originally scheduled because of various delays in the Ariane launch schedule. The launch was successful and the spacecraft was injected into the elliptical transfer orbit (210 km perigee and 36,000 km apogee) with high precision. About 36 hours after launch, the apogee boost motor was due to be fired to put the satellite into its final geostationary orbit. However, the firing attempt failed, as did several subsequent attempts to ignite the motor, and it became clear that an irrecoverable on board hardware failure had occurred. A recovery mission was then designed for Hipparcos, with the satellite remaining in a highly eccentric orbit (500 km perigee and 36,000 km apogee) and orbital coverage being carried out by ground stations in Odenwald (Germany), Perth (Australia) and Kourou (French Guiana). The implementation of the recovery mission was completed in early November and then the satellite was commissioned for scientific use. Targeted for an operational lifetime of three years, Hipparcos lived one year longer, performing accurate astrometric measurements of about 120,000 stars until 15 August 1993, when the mission was terminated.

A discussion of the important scientific results obtained by these two ESA missions is outside the scope of this report. It is worth recalling, however, that both represented a striking novelty in space science, Giotto offering for the first time the possibility of studying cometary phenomena by close-up imaging and *in situ* measurements, and Hipparcos providing a space platform to the most ancient branch of astronomy. Moreover, Giotto's glamorous encounter with Halley's comet, TV broadcast all over the world, finally gave the European Space Agency a place in the popular imagery regarding space exploration. From the historical point of view, however, the great scientific interest of Giotto and Hipparcos, as well as their successful performance, should not make one forget the political factors which led to their adoption in the ESA programme against POLO and EXUV, respectively. Had Germany and France not strongly supported the cometary mission and the astrometry mission, respectively, these would probably not have passed the selection process, perhaps not even started it.<sup>134</sup> In the event, it was a compromise between ESA's two biggest Member States which ended the decision making process: Germany agreed that ESA fund the Hipparcos payload, and France accepted a delay of the astrometry mission in order to have Giotto launched in due time.

Both missions were purely European projects, launched by Ariane: this prompts our second historical consideration. In the early 1980s, in fact, all ambitious plans for scientific co-operation between ESA and NASA fell apart. We have above discussed the end of the envisaged joint cometary mission in January 1980. Later that year, as a result of technical and financial difficulties with the Space Shuttle development programme, NASA announced a two-year delay in the launch of the ESA/NASA dual-spacecraft International Solar Polar Mission (ISPM). This meant, firstly, that the launch window of February 1983 could not be met, thus jeopardising the mission's main scientific objectives, and, secondly, that the ESA spacecraft, whose development was near completion, had to be stored until the new launch date. Things went even worse the following year, as NASA unilaterally announced that it would not continue with development of its ISPM spacecraft, and that the launch of the ESA spacecraft would be delayed even further. All efforts to reverse the American decision were frustrated, and ESA Member States eventually agreed to proceed with a single spacecraft mission, named *Ulysses*.<sup>135</sup> The spacecraft was scheduled for launch on the Shuttle Challenger in May 1986, but the tragic accident of 28 January that year, when Challenger exploded soon after lift-off killing its crew, put a brake on the Shuttle programme. Thus, when Giotto was heralding its historic encounter with Halley, *Ulysses* was sadly being placed into storage for a long period. It was eventually launched by the Shuttle Discovery on 6 October 1990, as much as seven years after the construction of the spacecraft had been completed.

After the Tempel-2/Halley cometary project was aborted, the joint ISPM mission abandoned, and the plans for co-operative utilisation of the Shuttle/Spacelab system frustrated, the Hubble Space

---

<sup>133</sup> Schwehm (1992).

<sup>134</sup> Russo (1995), pp. 15-25.

<sup>135</sup> Bonnet & Manno (1994), pp. 98-108. Cf. also Johnson-Freese (1990), pp. 35-44.

Telescope remained the only ESA/NASA co-operative project, with ESA acting as a junior partner. Hubble was originally scheduled for launch on the Space Shuttle in December 1983 but the launch date had been put back several times, resulting in a three-year delay overall. Its launch was eventually scheduled for October 1986 but the Challenger accident caused a further delay. The telescope was finally launched by the Shuttle Discovery on 24 April 1990, thus joining Hipparcos, to the benefit of the astronomy community at large. By this time, Europe could rightly claim to have overcome a period of junior partnership with the United States and entered a new period of equal partnership and competition in many areas of space activities: strong competition in the launcher domain, with Ariane taking up a larger and larger share of the market, and "real partnership" claimed as the necessary foundation for co-operating in the future development of the Space Station.<sup>136</sup>

The dramatic problem of the science budget could not be solved in the period covered by this paper. In spite of the many arguments put forward by the SAC in its 1978 report, the bad economic conditions of the 1970s prevented the ESA Member States from approving an increase in the mandatory budget, as requested by the spokesmen of the space science community. The consequences were rather severe, as demonstrated by the evolution of the launch rate of scientific satellites. Seven satellites were launched by ESRO in the 1968-72 period, i.e. before the impact of the first package deal. A 3-year standstill followed, then three satellites were successfully launched by ESA between 1975 and 1978 (COS-B, ISEE-2 and GEOS). The next ESA satellite, EXOSAT, originally scheduled for launch in 1979, suffered from many delays because of budgetary problems and was eventually launched four years later, in 1983. Then Giotto came in 1985 and Hipparcos in 1989, certainly a far cry from the event rate of about one satellite launch per year that the SAC had considered necessary in order to keep a viable space science activity in Europe in the 1980s.

Facing this situation, which was a cause of much frustration and disappointment within the European space science community, ESA's scientific policy makers could no longer avoid the difficult task of establishing a general framework for a long-term programme in which a proper balance could be maintained between large and smaller projects, between purely European and co-operative projects, and between the various research fields. ESA's scientific missions could no longer be selected on an ad hoc basis, through a competitive procedure driven by incidental power relations within the advisory bodies, as and when funds became available in Europe or the United States. The future space science programme had to be put into perspective, so that hundreds of scientists in Europe who were making use of space investigations could feel confident that a flight opportunity would be given in a definite time framework, and plan their work accordingly. The battle for more money in the 1980s had been lost, the next effort was to be working out a plan to the year 2000.

---

<sup>136</sup> Lüst (1987). This is the text of an address the ESA Director General presented in Washington on 4 April 1987. About Europe's "hard negotiating line" regarding future co-operation in the Space Station programme, cf. Bonnet & Manno (1994), pp. 108-119. The role of Europe in the new patterns of international co-operation in space in the 1990s is discussed in Johnson-Freese (1990).

## Bibliography

### **Bonnet (1985)**

R. Bonnet, "G. Colombo: a pioneer of new worlds - in memoriam", *ESA Bulletin*, n. 43 (August 1985), 77-81.

### **Bonnet & Manno (1994)**

R. Bonnet, V. Manno, *International co-operation in space. The example of the European Space Agency*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.

### **Calder (1992)**

N. Calder, *Giotto to the comets*, London: Presswork, 1992.

### **Johnson-Freese (1990)**

J. Johnson-Freese, *Changing patterns of international co-operation in space*, Malabar: Orbit Book Company, 1990.

### **Krige & Russo (1994)**

J. Krige, A. Russo *Europe in space 1960-1973*, ESA SP-1172, September 1994.

### **Logsdon (1970)**

J. M. Logsdon, *The decision to go to the Moon: Project Apollo and the national interest*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1970.

### **Logsdon (1989)**

J.M. Logsdon, "Missing Halley's comet: the politics of big science", *Isis*, 80 (1989), 254-280.

### **Lord (1987)**

D. R. Lord, *Spacelab. An international success story*, Washington: NASA SP-487, 1987.

### **Lüst (1987)**

R. Lüst, "Co-operation between Europe and the United States in Europe", *ESA Bulletin*, n. 50 (May 1987), 98-104.

### **McCurdy (1990)**

H. E. McCurdy, *The space station decision. Incremental politics and technological choice*, Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1990.

### **Newell (1980)**

H.E.Newell, "Beyond the atmosphere. Early years of space science", Washington: NASA SP-4211, 1980

### **Perryman & Hassan (1989)**

M.A.C. Perryman, H. Hassan, "The Hipparcos project", *ESA Bulletin*, 58 (May 1989), 77-87.

### **Russo (1993)**

A. Russo, *The definition of a scientific policy: ESRO's satellite programme in 1969-1973*, ESA HSR-6, March 1993.

### **Russo (1994)**

A. Russo, "Big science in space: the case of the Giotto mission of the European Space Agency", in J. Krige and A. Russo, *Reflections on Europe in Space*, ESA HSR-11, January 1994, 37-49.

**Russo (1995)**

A. Russo, *The scientific programme between ESRO and ESA: choosing new projects (1973-1977)*, ESA HSR-16, February 1995.

**Russo (1997)**

A. Russo, *Big technology, little science: the European use of Spacelab*, ESA HSR-19, August 1997.

**Schwarz (1979)**

M. Schwarz, "European policies on space science and technology 1960-1978", *Research policy*, 8:3 (July 1979), 204-243.

**Schwehm (1992)**

G.H. Schwehm, "Giotto's encounter with comet Grigg-Skjellerup: the first results", *ESA Bulletin*, n. 71 (August 1992), 10-13.

**Sebesta (1995)**

L. Sebesta, *United States-European space co-operation in the post-Apollo programme*, ESA HSR-15, February 1995.

**Sebesta (1997)**

L. Sebesta, *Spacelab in context*, paper presented at the Workshop on the History of Spacelab, ESTEC, April 1997.

**Wilkins (1985)**

Wilkins, "Giotto on-course for Halley's comet", *ESA Bulletin*, n. 43 (August 1985), 14-18.



## **Appendix 1: Tables**

**This page deliberately left blank.**

**Table 1**  
**Participants in the SAC extraordinary meetings on long-term planning**  
**(25 February and 26-27 September 1978)**

<i>Members of the SAC:</i>	R. Bonnet (chairman) W. Axford G. Colombo * K. Pinkau A. Wiin-Nielsen H. Wolff
<i>Outgoing members of the SAC:</i>	M. Rees * L. Houziaux **
<i>Chairmen of Working Groups:</i>	
Astronomy	G. Setti
Solar System	M. Petit
Solar Telescope	F. Pacini
Life Sciences	(H. Wolff)
Material Sciences	H. Weiss
<i>Outgoing Chairmen of Working Groups:</i>	
Solar System	J. Geiss *
Life Sciences	H. Bjurstedt
<i>Chairman of the SPC:</i>	H. Curien
<i>European Science Foundation:</i>	
Chairman, Space Science Committee	H. Massey (R. Boyd) ***
Chairman, Astronomy Committee	R. Lüst
Invited Expert	H. van de Hulst
<i>ESA:</i>	
Director General	R. Gibson
Dir. of Planning and Future Progrs.	A. Lebeau
Dir. of Scientific and Meteorological Progrs.	E. Trendelenburg
Deputy Director of Planning	A. Dattner
Head of Future Scientific Progrs. Dept.	E. Peytremann
Head of Space Science Dept. (ESTEC)	D. Page
	V. Manno

\* Only attending the February meeting.

\*\* Only attending the September meeting.

\*\*\* Massey was unable to attend the September meeting, but was represented by Boyd.

**Table 2**  
**Development of space science within ESA in the 1980s according to the Working Groups' long-term programmes**

Disciplinary field	Programme elements	Remarks
Astronomy and astrophysics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exploitation of the Space Telescope</li> <li>- The UV and X-ray survey satellite EXUV</li> <li>- The astrometry satellite Hipparcos</li> <li>- One Spacelab pallet per year for small experiments</li> <li>- A large observatory for IR astronomy (LIRTS concept)</li> <li>- A large observatory for X-ray astronomy (EXSPOS concept)</li> </ul>	<p>"This programme will guarantee the necessary continuity in the development of the various branches of astronomy. In the absence of the necessary funding for this continuity, programme planning becomes meaningless."            (ESA SP-1015, p. 28)</p>
Solar System Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two missions in the areas of planets or comets</li> <li>- An X-ray solar telescope on Spacelab (GRIST)</li> <li>- A satellite or Spacelab facilities for space plasma studies</li> <li>- A standard platform for atmospheric sciences</li> <li>- A standard platform for geodynamics</li> </ul>	<p>"This reduced [programme] is subcritical, as it represents only one mission per decade in each discipline. Any further reduction would imply that some disciplines would be excluded from the ESA programme, [...] an option totally unsatisfactory."            (ESA SP-1015, p. 29)</p>
Earth sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participation in the Global Atmospheric Research Programme (GARP), e.g. by the SEOS satellite project</li> <li>- An ocean and ice programme</li> <li>- A solid-earth physics satellite</li> </ul>	<p>Programme recommended by the SSWG's Ad Hoc Panel on Earth Sciences.</p>
Material sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participation in one Spacelab mission per year</li> </ul>	<p>Exploratory phase, also including rocket flights</p>
Life sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Studies of the human vestibular system by the Sled facility</li> <li>- Bioreack facility for the study of plants, cells and bacteria</li> </ul>	<p>Exploratory phase</p>

**Table 3**  
**Comparison of launch costs per kg experiment for Shuttle/Spacelab, conventional launchers**  
**and sounding rockets [SAC(79)12]**

Project	Experiment mass	Mission implementation costs (excl. experiment development costs)	Cost/kg experiment
13 ESRO/ESA scientific satellites	672.5 kg (51.7 kg average)	1111 MAU	1650 KAU/kg
First Spacelab Mission (FSLP)	1392 kg (European share)	21.7 MAU (excl. Shuttle launch costs)	15.6 KAU/kg
Demonstration mission DM2 (5 pallets)	5960 kg	60 MAU (incl. 25 MAU for NASA launch services)	10 KAU/kg
Module-only demonstration (DM1)	3900 kg	54.6 MAU (incl. 25.6 MAU for NASA launch services)	14 KAU/kg
Sounding rockets (e.g. Texus II)	240 kg	1.7 MAU	7 KAU/kg

**Table 4**  
**Specific launch costs of various launch vehicles [SAC(79)12]**

Launcher vehicle	Costs per kg bare experiment mass (only launcher costs involved)
Spacelab (4000-6000 kg experiment, 25 MAU for NASA Shuttle/Spacelab services)	4.2 - 6.3 KAU/kg
Thor Delta (low orbit, 15 MAU, 25 % experiments of (2914) 1950 kg payload)	30.8 KAU/kg
Ariane (low orbit, 32 MAU, 25 % experiments of 4500 kg payload)	28.4 KAU/kg
Scout (UK 6, 625 km orbit, 62 kg experiments)	64.8 KAU/kg

**Table 5**  
**Comparison of experiment development costs for some free-flyers and the FSLP**  
**[SAC(79)12]**

Free-flyers	Experiment original cost/kg (KAU/kg)	Cost/kg (1978 price level) (KAU/kg)
Meteosat (experiment only, 1973)	273	382
Several small (5 kg) experiments in ESRO I and ESRO II	200	279
COS-B (experiment only, 1971)	165	264
HEOS A2 (experiment only, 1968)	250	488
ESRO IV (experiment only, 1969)	193	354
Spacelab experiments (FSLP)	Mass (kg)	Cost/kg (1978 price level) (KAU/kg)
Charged particle beams (ES020)	41.5	27.9
Solar constant (ES021)	5.5	18.6
X-ray astronomy (ES023)	20.5	29.0
Sled (ES200)	165.0	26.5
Material science double rack (ES300)	467.0	33.8
Grille spectrometer (ES013)	137.0	42.7
Microwave remote sensing expt.	153.0	38.9

**Table 6**  
**ESA mission definition studies in 1975-1976**

Mission	Scientific Objectives
Space Astrometry	Accurate measurements of positions, proper motions and parallaxes of celestial objects.
Sun-Earth Observatory and Climatology Satellite (SEOCS)	Measurement, monitoring and mapping of the Earth's radiation budget (incoming solar flux and radiation fluxes leaving the Earth to space).
Grazing Incidence Solar Telescope (GRIST)	An X-ray telescope carried by Spacelab, using the Instrument Pointing System, to observe the Sun in the 10-170 nm wavelength range, with high spatial and spectral resolution.
Extreme Ultraviolet and soft X-ray Survey Satellite (EXUV)	Astronomical observations in the 1-100 nm spectral band to study the interstellar medium, stellar atmospheres and stellar evolution.
Solar Probe	A spacecraft directed to "graze" the Sun (at a few solar radii) using a swing-by around Jupiter, to study the solar quadrupole moment, parameters related to gravitational theory (general relativity tests), and the Sun's immediate surroundings.
Infrared Satellite (IRSAT)	A satellite carrying a telescope cooled to the temperature of liquid helium to measure, in the far infrared, the spectrum and spatial distribution of the infrared diffuse flux.
Dumb-bell	Two spacecraft linked by a wire to measure the Earth's gravitational field in order to get information on plate tectonics and convective motions in the Earth's interior. Also magnetospheric and plasma studies
Transient X-ray Sources Satellite	Sky survey in order to detect, observe and monitor variable X-ray sources.

**Table 7**  
**Candidate projects for adoption in the ESA Science Programme (February 1980)**

Mission	Scientific objectives and technical characteristics
Space Astrometry (Hipparcos)	Accurate measurements of parallaxes, proper motions and positions of about 100,000 selected stars. The scientific payload, including a 25-cm Baker-Schmidt telescope, would be mounted on a three-axis stabilised spacecraft launched by Ariane into a circular geosynchronous orbit.
Extreme Ultraviolet and Soft X-ray Survey Satellite (EXUV)	Search for extreme UV points and nebular sources in the band 100-1000 Å, and mapping of the diffuse emission in the band 10-250 Å. Two telescopes mounted on a three-axis stabilised spacecraft launched by Ariane into a highly eccentric (apogee 120,000 km), low inclination orbit.
International Cometary Mission (ICM)	A joint NASA/ESA mission to rendezvous with comet Tempel-2 in 1988 and to fly-by comet Halley in 1985. A main spacecraft provided by NASA and a Halley probe provided by ESA launched together from the Shuttle, using an Inertial Upper Stage, and driven by SEP system. At Halley encounter, the probe is released from the spacecraft and targeted to approach to within a few hundred kilometres of the comet's nucleus.
Earth's Magnetospheric Tail Explorer (EMTEX, formerly GEOS-3)	Exploration of the Earth's magnetotail beyond the orbit of the Moon, perhaps as far as 260 earth radii from the Earth. A spacecraft based on the GEOS-1 and -2 design, and using a certain amount of hardware from the GEOS programme, would be launched by Ariane into the geomagnetic tail. Two orbit options were foreseen.
Biorack	A Spacelab multi-user facility for research in the areas of developmental and genetics studies in biology, with accommodation for cells, tissue, micro-organisms, small insects, etc., and enabling these specimens to be exposed to weightlessness and cosmic radiation.



**Table 8**  
**SAC membership and Working Group Chairmen in 1980**

<i>Members of the SAC</i>	K. Pinkau (chairman)
	A. Egidi
	H. Elliot
	J. Kovalevsky
	G. Tammann
	H. Weiss
 <i>Chairmen of Working Groups</i>	
Astronomy	C. de Jager
Solar System	A. Gabriel
Life Sciences	H. Wolff
Material Sciences	Y. Malmejac
Earth Observation	E. Raschke
Space Telescope	F. Pacini

**This page deliberately left blank.**

## **Appendix 2: Figures**

**This page deliberately left blank**




Figure 1 Expenditure of ESRO, ELDO and ESA, normalised to mid-1978 price levels (ESA SP-1015, p.9)




Figure 2 Contribution of Member States to the Mandatory Budgets, assuming an increase of 10% in the Science Budget from 1982 onwards (ESA/SPC(79)27)



**European Space Agency**  
**Agence spatiale européenne**

*Contact: ESA Publications Division*

c/o ESTEC, PO Box 299, 2200 AG Noordwijk, The Netherlands

Tel (31) 71 565 3400 - Fax (31) 71 565 5433