

Re: Hypothetical massive spacecraft question

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2004-08/0857.html>

From: Michael Smith (smithm_at_SPAMBLOCKnetapps.com.au)

Date: 08/09/04

Date: Mon, 9 Aug 2004 10:36:12 +0100

On Mon, 09 Aug 2004 13:59:08 +1000

David Findlay <david@davsoft.com.au> wrote:

- > *Here's a hypothetical question. Assuming all the problems involved in*
- > *getting there were solved, could a team of 250+ scientists plus crew,*
- > *working in an artificial gravity environment on board a ship in orbit*
- > *of an interesting target (Jupiter, Saturn) do more/better/quicker*
- > *science, than what is currently done?*
- >
- > *Provided they had appropriate resources, working in shifts 24/7, with*
- > *probes and shuttles that could be sent to interesting locations. The*
- > *robot exploration people always say that robotic missions can do*
- > *better than human manned missions. Maybe they're correct at the*
- > *moment, but would such a mission as describe above perform better?*
- > *Thanks,*

As long as the money is available, and assuming that your crew don't mind working in a risky environment, the science return from humans on the spot will always be better than that from robots.

If you can afford to wait longer for your results, and appreciate a much lower cost, then robots are the way to go.

--

Michael Smith
Network Applications
www.netapps.com.au | +61 (0) 416 062 898
Web Hosting | Internet Services