

## Re: O'Keefe to leave NASA soon

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2004-12/1767.html>

---

**From:** Scott Hedrick (*dinehnm\_at\_yahoo.com*)

**Date:** 12/15/04

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 2004 23:07:02 -0500

"Bill the Cat" <bill@the.cat> wrote in message  
news:Xns95BFB9EEB7A9billthecat@216.196.97.131...

> >> *What would you consider "adequately funded?"*

> >

> > *Enough to do the job, in a manner that precludes easily altering the  
> > amount.*

>

> *You do realize that the latter is impossible, of course? In a democracy,  
> the government can \*always\* alter the amount.*

Which is the key factor in my refusing government employment. It was the  
dicking around with SSF that completely eliminated any interest I had in  
working for NASA.

> > *NASA would need something on the order of \$5-8G in \*additional\*  
> > funding for three or four years, then increasing upwards of \$15G for a  
> > decade (adjusted for inflation), to have a serious chance at  
> > accomplishing anything.*

>

> *You do realize how insane that is, right?*

Only if it's insane to adequately fund space exploration.

> *That's \$165-182 billion over 14  
> years! This is \*not\* a crash program - there is no need for a massive  
spike  
> in NASA spending.*

Only if you want to do it right. I said nothing at all about creating a  
crash program- I wanted to save the \*existing\* programs and add a new, far  
more expensive one.

> *Now, for the \*real\* numbers. The Congressional Budget Office projects that  
> the new program will cost \$63.8 billion through the first manned lunar  
> return in 2020. Contrast that to Project Apollo, which cost \$77.9 billion  
> through the first manned lunar landing (actually, through the end of FY69  
> on June 30, 1969, but close enough). Both of those figures are inflation-*

sci.space.history: Re: O'Keefe to leave NASA soon

> *adjusted to constant-year 2005 dollars.*

So, then, you're only interested in making one trip to the Moon? What happened to permanent lunar surface occupation and a trip to Mars?

> *That is an adequate amount of funding for the new program, in my opinion.*

And you're entitled to your opinion, as unrealistic as it is.