

Re: Space Policy Sucks, while there's Life on Venus

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2005-01/2312.html>

From: Brad Guth (bradguth_at_yahoo.com)

Date: 01/24/05

Date: Mon, 24 Jan 2005 22:25:59 +0000 (UTC)

Speaking about things that suck;

This time I'd much rather the "Bush Administration Kills Hubble Space Telescope" than having that certified warlord moron running us amuck after more of those stealth WMD. Of course, the necessary infrastructure and their usual internal bogus accounting that would have sustained and/or R&D upon replacement shuttles can now be quietly diverted into the task of global energy domination. At least in this way we're not publicly pissing off half the world by way of blowing everything in sight, nor are we knowingly polluting mother Earth into another fairlywell by having to launch yet another spendy and seriously astronaut risky mission in order to polish those Hubble mirrors.

Bagging the likes of Hubble as well as for those pathetic Osprey V-22 fiasco death-trap flying machines will likely save or at least spare countless lives and prevent absolute thousands of tonnes of artificial CO2 pollution from impacting our global warming world, not to mention allowing those billions of dollars/euros that can be better invested along with their associated talents upon something that'll actually matter to humanity. If you can't think of anything, I do believe that I have a small list of a thousand or so better things to be doing with our resources and supposed talents.

Perhaps instead of sustaining the likes of Hubble, ISS or Ospreys that can't seem to manage a flight without getting someone or several killed, possibly 10% of those funds and thus 10% of the talents associated should go into the 'relocating ISS to the moon' or perhaps into the required R&D of actually having to provide for the scientific community with an actual fly-by-rocket lander (manned or robotic) that'll safely deploy something/anything useful onto our moon, thereby without having everything vaporised in the process.

At this point, it seem that our stash of conventional weapons are nearly at the limits of inventory as well as deployment capability, and that leaves us with the rather nasty prospects of using tactical and perhaps not so tactical nuclear items against those insisting upon living in spite of the fact that we want all of their oil, or at least we're

sci.space.history: Re: Space Policy Sucks, while there's Life on Venus

focused upon keeping the price of such oil so darn artificially high that only the absolute wealthiest of nations need apply, whereas all others can suck another egg, except I think we either want that egg as well or, else we want that egg to cost a hundred dollars/euros.

Focusing upo