

Re: Paper on early space programs

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2005-02/0323.html>

From: Pat Flannery (*flanner_at_daktel.com*)

Date: 02/03/05

Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2005 12:37:36 -0600

OM wrote:

>...Drat. I was also hoping you'd have proof for my long-held theory
>that the reason dipshits like Proxmire and Mondale were able to
>successfully lobby enough to kill off Apollo was that they were
>secretly Commie plants ;-(
>
>

Little pinko pansies, not doubt. ;-(

Wasn't the general consensus that after Apollo 13, NASA was aware of the fact that given enough missions they were going to lose a crew, and it was better to go out on a high note than that way...so that they weren't completely heartbroken when it ended?

Although, having built up all the infrastructure to do it, further flights would have been comparatively cheap to do, compared to the overall program cost.

If nothing else, we should have built a decent sized space station with the remaining Saturn Vs.

That was just a waste.

Of course we've thrown away all those Shuttle ETs also, and even five or ten of those in a modified form would have also built a good-sized station. Hell, even one would dwarf Skylab's internal volume.

What ever became of the planned shuttle Aft Cargo Container that was supposed to go on the back end of the ET? That could have been converted into a docking/airlock assembly for a ET-derived station.

Pat