

sci.space.policy: Re: NASA rushes plan to send humans to moon, Mars, despite doubts ...

## Re: NASA rushes plan to send humans to moon, Mars, despite doubts ...

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2005-02/2953.html>

---

**From:** Will McLean ([mclean1382\\_at\\_aol.com](mailto:mclean1382_at_aol.com))

**Date:** 02/25/05

Date: 25 Feb 2005 11:29:39 -0800

Rand Simberg wrote:

> On 25 Feb 2005 04:34:02 -0800, in a place far, far away, "Will  
McLean"  
> <[mclean1382@aol.com](mailto:mclean1382@aol.com)> made the phosphor on my monitor glow in such a  
> way as to indicate that:  
>  
>>> >If nothing else, ISS has taught us valuable  
>>> >lessons on how to, and how not to, do a big,  
>>> >manned, cooperative international space project.  
>>>  
>>> >If that is all we get, we could have learned it much faster, for  
much  
>>> >less money, and the opportunity costs of how all that time and  
money  
>>> >could have been invested to actually make some progress in space  
are  
>>> >to weep for.  
>>>  
>>  
>>> >In practice, the opportunity cost is not what you would have done  
with  
>>> >the resources instead, but what Congress would have done with the  
>>> >resources instead.  
>>>  
>>> >Sure. I was talking about theory, not practice. Even had we built  
no  
>>> >space station at all over that time period, I still think we'd be  
>>> >better off. Absent that program, with its false promises, we might  
>>> >have realized much sooner that we can't count on the government to do  
>>> >it for us.

That seems unlikely. It was pretty clear from 1986 on that space manufacturing wasn't going to amount to much commercially as long as we were limited to something like current launchers and manned spacecraft.

sci.space.policy: Re: NASA rushes plan to send humans to moon, Mars, despite doubts ...

The station only existed on paper then.

Will McLean