

Re:Question? Have They Found a Reason to go 'To the Moon and Mars' Yet???

Re:Question? Have They Found a Reason to go 'To the Moon and Mars' Yet???

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2006-04/msg00267.html>

- *From:* "Scott Hedrick" <diespammers-dinehm@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 10 Apr 2006 16:37:23 -0400
-

"Jeff Findley" <jeff.findley@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:c4126\\$443ab707\\$927a2cf9\\$29033@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:c4126$443ab707$927a2cf9$29033@xxxxxxxxxxxx)

As for your first two steps, we're already doing both on Mars. I think that either we're not doing enough of these on the moon, or the moon really isn't as interesting as Mars. If it's the former, then the unmanned missions are scouting the wrong destination. If it's the latter, the manned mission planners are looking at the wrong body for their next destination.

Which is **exactly** why, in order to maximize science for the dollar, you send both machines **and** people.

Sending people is what convinces the public to spend money. But you first need to send machines in order to do the prospecting, to find the spot most likely to provide the greatest return. Then send people. People can accomplish far more than machines, but supporting them costs so much more as well. By concentrating the use of people in those areas which most need the resources that people can apply, and use machines to fill in the details, the maximum value for the science dollar is obtained. This is a no-brainer, which should make it easy for "Ordovery" to understand.

.