

## Re: O'Keefe to leave NASA soon

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2004-12/1853.html>

---

**From:** Bill the Cat ([bill\\_at\\_the.cat](mailto:bill_at_the.cat))

**Date:** 12/17/04

Date: Thu, 16 Dec 2004 21:16:00 -0600

"Scott Hedrick" <[dinehm@yahoo.com](mailto:dinehm@yahoo.com)> wrote in  
news:gy2wd.64\$Dv1.6@bignews6.bellsouth.net:

> "Bill the Cat" <[bill@the.cat](mailto:bill@the.cat)> wrote in message  
> news:Xns95BFED122BE01billthecat@216.196.97.131...  
>> "Scott Hedrick" <[dinehm@yahoo.com](mailto:dinehm@yahoo.com)> wrote in  
>> news:bJOvd.79747\$fY.36141@bignews3.bellsouth.net:  
>>  
>>> "Bill the Cat" <[bill@the.cat](mailto:bill@the.cat)> wrote in message  
>>> news:Xns95BFB9EEB7A9billthecat@216.196.97.131...  
>>>  
>>>> 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.  
>>>  
>>>> OK, at least we've established that you live in a fantasy world.  
>>>  
>>>> Which is exactly like the real world, even to the point of having you  
>>>> in it.

No, it's most definitely a fantasy world if you believe that a proposal like yours will ever get funded. In the real world, very similar programs have been proposed twice - Paine's expansive shuttle/station/moon/Mars proposal in 1969-70, and Bush the Elder's SEI in 1989. Both programs were basically dead on arrival - and so will any program of similar magnitude that you'd care to propose.

> In a way,  
>> you're very similar to Bob Haller  
>  
> In that I breathe oxygen, yes.

Judging from your delusions, I suspect you and Haller have both been inhaling something, and it sure ain't oxygen.

>>In

>> *the real world, there is no political support for large increases in*

> *NASA's*

>> *budget.*

>

> *That is exactly right. That is why I said that now is not the time to*

> *do it, and also why the plan as presented by Bush is completely*

> *inadequate and will not work.*

And that situation won't change within your lifetime – or mine. That is something that the space cadets just don't get. They cling to the delusion that all that's needed is the right leader at the right time to propose a return to the glory days of Apollo and all will be right. That ain't gonna happen, and those who persist in believing in it are going to die as bitter old men feeling betrayed by a world that doesn't share their "vision".

>> > *So, then, you're only interested in making one trip to the Moon?*

>>

>> *No, I did not say that, and it is dishonest of you to imply that I*

>> *did.*

>

> *To the contrary, you \*specifically stated\* that your budget included*

> *money "through the first manned*

> *lunar return in 2020". Reread your own posts first before replying*

> *next time.*

Of course, you conveniently snipped out my \*actual\* words so that you could spin them as you wish. "Argument by snipping" is a favorite hallerb tactic, by the way. For the record, here's what I actually said:

"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)."

So you really believe that "first" is a synonym for "only"? And I didn't say that "the budget" only included money through the first landing – I said that the CBO's \*projection\* only went as far as the first landing. Try reading for comprehension next time.

>> *I chose the first landing because that allows for an apples-to-apples*

>> *comparison of development costs between Apollo and the new program.*

>

> *Since the two programs have different goals, you're still comparing*

> *apples to oranges. The goal of Apollo was to beat the Soviets in the*

> *area of national prestige during the Cold War.*

And that's one reason it was so expensive – not only was cost no object, conspicuous consumption was part of the \*point\* – to demonstrate that the US was rich enough to do things the Soviets could barely dream of.

>> > *What*  
>> > *happened to permanent lunar surface occupation and a trip to Mars?*  
>>  
>> *Those comes after 2020, which is as far as the CBO analysis went.*  
>> *Which you'd have known, if you'd actually read anything about the new*  
>> *program.*  
>  
> *You assume that I didn't. I chose to discuss a real program with real,*  
> *useful goals instead of the imaginary pie-in-the-sky inadequately*  
> *funded one discussed by the CBO.*

Yours is a "real program" that will remain on paper for the rest of your life, because it will never be affordable.

>> >> *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.*  
>>  
>> *It's unrealistic to think that we can return to the moon for 80% of*  
>> *the inflation-adjusted Apollo budget?*  
>  
> *Yes, if you also want to do something useful and also establish a*  
> *permanent presence.*  
>  
> *Especially now that most of the unknowns*  
>> *have been solved and there's no insane schedule pressure?*  
>  
> *Except that there \*are\* unknowns...*

Of course there are, but they are trivial compared to the unknowns Apollo faced when it was first announced. At that time, we had no idea if humans could survive in space for the duration of a lunar mission, or if rendezvous or EVA were feasible, or if the lunar surface could support a lander, or any of a number of fundamental questions. Now the questions are more like, "should we use heavy lift or orbital assembly", "where's the best place to build the first base", "should we bury the base for protection against radiation", etc. Important questions, but hardly fundamental.

>> >> > *The plan as proposed just takes money from*  
>> >> > *science and aviation programs.*  
>> >>  
>> >> *Incorrect. The majority of the funding for the new program through*  
>> >> *2009 comes from cancelling SLI and OSP, and drastically reducing*  
>> >> *SLEP.*  
>> >

>> > *Which pretty much supports what I just said– the plan as proposed,  
>> > takes money from existing programs, such as the ones you just  
>> > named. Thank you for your support.*  
>>  
>> *You said it took its funding from science and aviation. You are  
>> wrong.*  
>  
> *To the contrary, that's what POTUS said.*

He said that most of the funding would be re–allocated from within the existing budget, without specifying science or aviation. One more time, the majority of the re–allocated funding came from human spaceflight, not science or aviation.

>> >> *None of those  
>> >> programs are under science or aeronautics.*  
>> >  
>> > *A clear statement that ISS has nothing to do with science.*  
>>  
>> *Right. It's under the human spaceflight budget, like it's always  
>> been.*  
>  
> *I suppose that there's no science intended to be done for ISS, then?*

Of course not. Like I said (and you snipped, thank you very much), science is one of the reasons we do human spaceflight. It just isn't the \*only\* reason, or the most important.