

Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2005–03/3003.html>

From: Eric Chomko (*echomko_at__at_polaris.umuc.edu*)

Date: 03/24/05

Date: Thu, 24 Mar 2005 19:25:28 +0000 (UTC)

US wrote:

: On Wed, 23 Mar 2005 21:25:29 +0000 (UTC), echomko_at__at_polaris.umuc.edu (Eric Chomko)
: wrote:

: >...Could you be wrong?

: You certainly haven't refuted any of the facts I've stated.

No, I challenged your beliefs, yet you cling to them like a baby does a blanket.

: >I guess I should stop voting then?

: Bad guess: you can act to promote clean elections, unless
: you're too incompetent/lazy/frightened.

Promoting clean elections is bad for Republicans, why do you support the Democrats and claim to be a Republican?

: >Are you ...

: I'm not the subject. Are you going to figure out what
: it happens to be anytime soon, or will your fallacies
: preoccupy you entirely?

So I can't say 'Are you...', yet you can?! How totalitarian of you!

Again, it must be tough being you. Atlas and Sisyphus had it easy compared to you.

Eric

: On Wed, 23 Mar 2005 18:40:03 +0000 (UTC), echomko_at__at_polaris.umuc.edu (Eric Chomko)
: wrote:

: >You have stated your opinion ...

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

: Actually, I've referred to salient facts.

: >I voted for Kerry.

: Your vote will never really count again, as long as
: paperless DRE voting systems are in use.

: On Wed, 23 Mar 2005 04:31:56 +0000 (UTC), echomko_at_@polaris.umuc.edu (Eric Chomko)
: wrote:

: >Well it does differ from your undefined definition.

: You are mistaken: I am comparing your inappropriate
: usage to the standard denotation of the term.

: >I believe your [sic] mistaken given your understanding of the terms.

: You are mistaken. I have posted only substantiated
: and factual responses to your baseless claims.

: >So, you don't support the conservative Republican in office?

: Real conservatives support fiscal responsibility and
: preservation of the environment. Bush is not a real
: conservative at all.

: His family hasn't been on the same side as the USA
: for generations, now.

: They've been siding with the Nazis and other enemies
: of the USA, for fun and profit, ever since they made a
: fortune helping Hitler kill Americans all through WWII.

: >To some degree yes, but to a larger degree no.

: My statement stands: your air, water, and food are all
: polluted, and with toxins which diminish the quality of
: neural functions.

: >Get resources and it will serve as a more economical means.

: Why would anyone believe that you'd get more from
: space than you'd have to expend getting there?

: >Again, it will happend [sic] despite ...

: Despite your fuhrer Bush bankrupting your country
: to pad his pockets?

: Reality is your friend: I suggest you do whatever it
: takes to become better acquainted with it.

Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

: On Tue, 22 Mar 2005 20:38:38 +0000 (UTC), echomko_at_polaris.umuc.edu (Eric Chomko)
: wrote:

: >... we have evolved in the last 500 years.

: You seem to have no comprehension of the meaning
: of the word "evolved".

: >Your belief again. We have managed to survive as a species and get into
: >space. That is ALL that is needed to continue forward despite naysayers
: >like you.

: You're not seeing the entire picture: you will never be
: able to achieve terraforming or ecopoiesis when you
: never learn how to survive sustainably.

: >Learn how the human body reacts in space.

: It asphyxiates and freezes to death rather promptly.

: I already knew that, though, no need to waste a pile
: of resources confirming it.

: >manufacturing will exist to make things that cannot be a [sic] pure as made on
: >earth.

: You're already manufacturing pure horseshit, and
: you don't even need the horse.

: >Ask the Germans ...

: They say we're repeating their big mistake by
: letting a follower of their fuhrer into the
: White House.

: >... the
: >nature of agriculture in the 20th and 21st centuries.

: It's unsustainable because it wastes resources
: including potable water and topsoil.

: >soiled and damaged.

: Your air, water, soil, and food are all polluted.

: Some of those pollutants damage neural functions.

: Thanks for serving as an example.

: >... when in-space manufacturing begins we will actually
: >be able to 'mine' space.

Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

: For what? At what cost?

: >... You cannot have zero atmosphere or microgravity
: >on earth. Not possible!

: So what?

: Those are simulable anyway.

: >... one can really only
: >speak for themself [sic] ...

: When you do so, you prove repeatedly that
: you're not sufficiently educated.

: >... to be closeminded ...

: If you weren't, you'd learn why current trends
: in agriculture aren't sustainable. Then you might
: even realize the implications wrt space colonization ...

: On Thu, 17 Mar 2005 19:44:58 +0000 (UTC), echomko_at_@polaris.umuc.edu (Eric Chomko)
: wrote:

: >Yep, just like Columbus brought everything from Europe.

: Actually, he found humans who fed him when he arrived.

: Perhaps you imagine there would be Martians waiting to
: teach you how to grow Mars–maize.

: >The word is "yet".

: You have "yet" to figure out how to exist sustainably
: here on Earth, and until and unless you do so, you
: have no business trying to take your show on the road.

: >Actually, we have used mircogravity [sic] and no atmosphere
: >in several experiments (See IML Spacelab missions), which is a resource
: >inherently NOT from Earth.

: To what useful purpose?

: <crickets>

: >Why do you say that?

: You can't grow food in locations where food won't grow.

: >Yes we can!

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

: You have never even attempted to support yourself with
: a garden, and you couldn't do so if you tried.

: >...closemindedness.

: You're afraid to deal with your soiled and damaged home.

: >How do you know that?

: What resources would you return from space, and what
: would you claim it'd cost to retrieve them from there?

: >I can do two: micorgravity[sic], no atmoshere [sic].

: Those things are available on Earth.

: >We have been farming for millennia.

: You are not farming sustainably. You're destroying
: resources at such a rate that in a smaller ecosystem
: you'd be starved in a short while.

: >...depression ...

: If you get well from that perhaps you'll be able to
: do better with living where you are.

: >Says you!

: I've learned from the knowledgeable, and you've
: failed to refute what they've taught me.

: On Thu, 17 Mar 2005 11:18:27 -0600, Joe Strout <joe@strout.net> wrote:

: >...No more food ...

: You couldn't even sustain yourself here,
: and you want to believe you could farm
: on Mars.

: Tsk.

: On Thu, 17 Mar 2005 18:06:43 GMT, simberg.interglobal@org.trash (Rand Simberg) wrote:

: >... the troll...

: You are lying: I'm not trolling. I'm pointing out that
: the only valid basis for you to move to another home
: is to have taken proper care of your present abode,
: and you just can't stand that fact.

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

: > particularly
: >annoying

: It's your own doing that you get annoyed rather than
: do any learning.

: >... spamming...

: There's yet another word you don't understand, because
: in your cowardice and dishonesty you'd rather try to call
: names than deal with the subject.

: I have in no way done any spamming, or trolling, whatsoever.

: Your continuing errors are again noted. If you can't do any
: better than that, there's no way good taxpayer dollars should
: be wasted on your escapist fantasies, of course.

: On Thu, 17 Mar 2005 09:00:39 -0600, Joe Strout <joe@strout.net> wrote:

: >... Just Plain Wrong. Astoundingly wrong. Amazingly,
: >inconceivably, stupidly wrong ...

: If you weren't, you could refute the facts I state.

: >1. Oxygen...

: Yet no astronaut has ever used oxygen that didn't
: originate on Earth, and you can't cite any form of
: technology that'd make that reality obsolete.

: Moreover, to generate that technology will obviously
: require that more resources be removed from Earth.

: >2. Titanium, iron, magnesium, silicon, calcium, and other useful
: >elements...

: Yet no astronaut has ever used any such that didn't
: originate on Earth, and you can't cite any form of
: technology that'd make that reality obsolete.

: Moreover, to generate that technology will obviously
: require that more resources be removed from Earth.

: >3. Hydrogen.

: Yet no astronaut has ever used hydrogen that didn't
: originate on Earth, and you can't cite any form of
: technology that'd make that reality obsolete.

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

: Moreover, to generate that technology will obviously
: require that more resources be removed from Earth.

: >These are extremely valuable raw materials in their own right

: Yet not a one of them could keep an astronaut alive
: without extensive additional resources being brought
: along from Earth.

: >.. there's no point in bothering
: >with ...

: You are so afraid of the reality that you can't go into
: space because you've failed so severely here that you're
: going to run and hide.

: No surprise there.

: On Wed, 16 Mar 2005 22:01:45 -0600, Joe Strout <joe@strout.net> wrote:

: >What nonsense.

: I've stated the fact that every physical object the astronauts need
: they must take with them from Earth.

: You can't refute that, and it distresses you so much you're forced
: to try to lie about it.

: >The Earth is one tiny little planet; it is dwarfed by
: >the total resources of the solar system.

: Yet you're unable to utilize any of those resources without using
: those from Earth.

: >Of *course* early colonies will be dependent on Earth for many of their
: >supplies.

: Actually, it'd be all of them.

: You can't even support yourself with a garden here on Earth.

: You merely remain unable to acknowledge your total dependency.

: >Anything that can be produced on Earth can be produced in
: >space.

: Yet the cost in Earth's resources is far higher than the return on
: that investment in such artificially-supplied resources.

: > (Though the reverse is not necessarily true; space offers many
: >environments that are difficult or impossible to simulate on Earth,

Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

: >providing the opportunity for new production processes and therefore new
: >products.)

: Name one.

: >You *will* find food for colonists in space, as soon as someone builds a
: >farm there.

: You can't even farm here, and you're trying to claim you could do
: so in space.

: It is to laugh, except that it's a sad situation for you to be so ignorant
: of the realities involved.

: > That may be 20 or 30 years, maybe less, maybe more. But it
: >will certainly happen. Part of me hopes you'll still be around to eat a
: >nice helping of space-grown crow. But the rest of me hopes you'll have
: >long since disappeared, with your displays of closed-minded ignorance.

: Of course you hope I'd go away, because I expose your cluelessness.

: If you don't wise up, in another couple decades you'll be too bankrupt
: to eat anything here on Earth.

: On Wed, 16 Mar 2005 20:51:10 +0000 (UTC), echomko_at_@polaris.umuc.edu (Eric Chomko)
: wrote:

: >Do you honestly believe that going into space is taking away resources
: >from others that need it? Please spell out thoughts on this?

: Do you honestly believe otherwise?

: It's not as if you find food for astronauts out there.
: Everything they need and use has to be brought with
: them and originates here on Earth.

: On Wed, 16 Mar 2005 19:24:00 GMT, simberg.interglobal@org.trash (Rand Simberg) wrote:

: >The amount of which is arbitrary, and it doesn't include other
: >benefits, such as food stamps, other forms of assistance, etc.

: Yet even if it were arbitrary, or the amounts of other forms
: of aid were relatively substantial (they're not), the fact remains
: that more people are being forced to get by with less.

: You don't solve that problem by stealing resources from them
: to joyride around in space.

: >And yet, they're still better off than in the past.

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

: That's not substantiated. I've pointed out that many of them
: don't live at all, and those who do are positioned in greater
: proximity to severely–damaging pollutants, with lesser access
: to healthcare for the illnesses which result from that and the
: increasingly non–nourishing sustenance available to them.

: >What a stupid statement.

: I've stated only facts. It's a real shame for you that you
: consider reality to be 'stupid', but it's quite predictable,
: considering the concept of projection.

: <http://www.organicconsumers.org/school/poverty100504.cfm>

: There's some more reality ...

: >You're obviously unfamiliar with the state of the air and water in
: >London a couple centuries ago.

: While some pollution has been alleviated, other forms of
: pollution have in fact worsened.

: <http://www.debate-central.org/topics/2003/LINKS/Pollution/Pollution-Significant/>

: >Cancer rates are up because people are living long enough to get
: >cancer,

: So why do you claim they're up among wildlife?

: You figure they'd be increasing their life spans, too?

: How do you care to explain the increases in human childhood cancers?

: "Since 1971 acute lymphocytic leukemia has increased by 62 percent,
: brain cancer by 50 percent, and the incidence of bone cancer is up by
: 40 percent. Testicular cancer, particularly in young men, has increased
: 300 percent. Breast cancer rates are an epidemic..."

: <http://www.cancer-articles.com/cancer/cancer-articles/brain-cancer/brain-cancer-article-6853.html>

: > instead of dying of all of the things for which we've come up
: >with cures.

: Such as AIDS?

: > Unfortunately, as you so amply demonstrate, we've not yet
: >come up with a cure for ignorance and stupidity.

: Yes, I have this bad habit of repeatedly pointing out the places
: wherein you have demonstrated your uncured ignorance and
: stupidity, including a brief mention of your employment of

Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

: the ad hominem fallacy above.

: >...health-care plan simply didn't cover it.

: Perhaps if anyone cared they'd start a fund-drive for you.

: >...spammed the newsgroup ...I've ...

: You've been caught chock full 'o mistakes and you're not
: honest or brave enough to deal well with being corrected.

: No doubt you make all that noise as you run away.

: >*plonk*

: QED.

: On Wed, 16 Mar 2005 18:33:27 GMT, simberg.interglobal@org.trash (Rand Simberg) wrote:

: >Because it's true?

: Is it? If it were, no doubt you could substantiate it.

: Here's a space reserved for you to do just that:

: [empty]

: >Only if you arbitrarily define poverty to make that the case true.

: Nonsense: the definition of poverty isn't arbitrary,
: it's a specific dollar amount for a specific number
: of people in a household.

: <http://www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/povmeas/papers/orshansky.html>

: There are also more people going without healthcare
: in the USA now, too, as a percentage of the population.

: >People at all levels are living much better than they did a few
: >decades ago.

: I've already supplied links which would help you dispel
: your erroneous notions, were you sufficiently confident
: to have a look at them.

: It's obviously untrue for the many in the USA who are
: forced into bankruptcy for medical problems, for but
: one example.

: Those many whose jobs have been outsourced also
: don't qualify as "living much better", either.

Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

: >People in "poverty" in America live better than royalty
: >a few hundred years ago.

: Actually, many of the poor don't live at all.

: <http://www.europaworld.org/week195/poor81004.htm>

: Those who do survive are subjected to pollution of a
: nature never before seen in history:

: http://www.foe.co.uk/campaigns/sustainable_development/pollution_and_poverty/

: Cancer rates are up, and less treatment is available to
: those who don't have healthcare, too.

: >By your idiot logic, heavier-than-air flight is impossible because
: >Samual Langley's aerodrome failed.

: That's just your strawman, and not anything I've said.

: I've never ignored, much less disputed, the models of
: scientific thought here.

: You, however, have. You want to believe you could
: somehow create sustenance from materials which are
: not shown to be useful toward that purpose.

: >...wasted bandwidth ...
: >... cowardly illogical troll ...

: Obviously you want to do all that namecalling because
: you're afraid to deal with your own ignorance as has
: been exposed by my relevant, ontopic articles.

: On Wed, 16 Mar 2005 17:24:02 GMT, simberg.interglobal@org.trash (Rand Simberg) wrote:

: >...nutbaggery ...

: That's all you have, when you try to pretend humans
: should colonize extra-terrestrial locations.

: >... it's only because there are more people
: >now. The percentage of the population in that state is the lowest
: >it's ever been in the history of the world.

: Why would anyone believe that?

: Hint: the percentage of Americans in poverty is
: increasing, as a matter of fact.

: That right there blows your claim out of the water.

Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

: >Which has zero relevance to anything in particular.

: Actually, the fact that the Biosphere projects didn't
: work here on Earth is quite relevant to the fact that
: there's no way they'd suddenly work on the moon,
: or anywhere else.

: >Since few people think ...

: That's why so many are careless about throwing away
: the resources we should sustain here on Earth.

: >When there was a single attempt and a single failure

: That's not the case with the Biosphere projects. Why
: do you feel compelled to attempt to expound on a
: subject of which you are ignorant?

: >We do know how to do it properly here.

: Why would anyone imagine that?

: The term "properly" doesn't include wastage of resources
: which are irreplaceable, nor pollution of the environment.

: >... illogical nutbaggery ...

: What a shame that's all you have.

: On Tue, 15 Mar 2005 21:27:05 -0600, Joe Strout <joe@strout.net> wrote:

: >No, you know nothing of the kind. Life has been surviving "properly"
: >for four billion years

: Give or take a few mass extinctions ...

: >and humans have been surviving just fine since

: Not considering that we're becoming more diseased
: and wasting more of our resources just to maintain
: a substandard quality of life for most of our population ...

: >...We're

: >continuing to survive just fine.

: Actually, we're throwing away topsoil, and, more critically,
: potable water that we can't afford to lose in the long term.

: More people are poor, hungry, and diseased now.

: <http://www.anotherperspective.org/advoc325.html>

Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

: >Now, if you want to make an argument that we're at risk of *not*
: >surviving the next century or two, that would be at least a sensible
: >argument to have. But to argue that we *can't* survive "properly"
: >(whatever that means) is either an empty statement, or an obviously
: >>false one.

: I've already mentioned that the Biosphere projects failed.

: Those who want to believe that we can just throw the
: Earth away and do without are the ones who aren't
: doing the thinking they should.

: >... Indeed, it may well be learning to live and
: >work in space, and manage our artificial biospheres there, that enables
: >us to best steward the Earth's ecosystem (or economy or whatever else it
: >is you feel we're not doing "properly" for our survival here).

: When you can't do a biosphere here, there's no logical
: reason to believe you'd suddenly manage to do one
: in space, though.

: >... Living and thriving in space does not require planets, let
: >alone the sort of planets I think you mean by "suitable."

: Why would anyone believe that?

: >It requires
: >raw materials (various elements in easily-accessed forms and locations,
: >ideally not at the bottom of a steep gravity well) and energy. Both are
: >abundant in the solar system.

: It requires more than that – without, for example, green
: plants, there's nothing for humans to eat, and they starve.

: >...First, nobody advocating space colonization supports "throwing
: >your home away."

: In reality, we're throwing it away regardless of the idea
: of space colonization, wrt soil and water supplies.

: When it becomes too contaminated to support our life,
: that's throwing it away, too.

: >The Earth will be here for billions of years, will
: >most likely always have billions of people on it for millenia to come,
: >and will hopefully always have a vibrant ecosystem.

: Nice fantasy – ever done anything toward making it real,
: besides waste scarce resources and create pollution?

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

- : > Indeed, many space
- : >enthusiasts are environmentalists who recognize that development of
- : >off–world resources is the best way to reduce the strain of humanity on
- : >the Earth.

- : Name one.

- : >Second, nobody's looking for a replacement for Earth, or advocating the
- : >wholesale exodus of humanity from Earth to some other place. That idea
- : >would be ridiculous.

- : That's been done right here on the Usenet, but I grant that
- : if you've not been around long you wouldn't know it.

- : >Rather, what's needed is a spreading out, so that
- : >we don't have all of humanity in one all–to–easily extinguished place.
- : >This is just simple common sense.

- : What's really needed is the ability to make do properly with
- : less waste and spread.

- : It helps avoid slaughtering off the indigenous cultures, too.

- : http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/health/2002047307_sprawl27.html

- : >You are making unsupportable assertions which are, in fact, quite false.

- : Correction: every assertion I make is already supported by
- : known facts.

- : >It is very possible to do it sustainable elsewhere. There's nothing
- : >magical about recycling or growing crops.

- : On the moon? On Mars?

- : >...Humans couldn't colonize high latitudes of Earth
- : >until they'd developed the technology of clothing. Humans couldn't
- : >colonize space until they'd developed the technology of air recycling.
- : >We now have that technology (along with others that are needed), so we
- : >can now colonize space just as we can (thanks to clothing) colonize the
- : >tundra.

- : That's a non sequitur, but you won't know why.

- : There's more to extra–terrestrial survival than that.

- : >Sure there is. "Suitable" is defined as one in which we can live, given
- : >the technology available. Northern latitudes were not suitable to
- : >humans running around naked with wooden spears. Space is not suitable
- : >to humans lacking the technology to travel and live in space. We have
- : >that technology now; so space is now a suitable environment for us.

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

: Why would anyone believe that we'd have the
: 'technology' to produce air, water, or food, in
: space, when we don't even know how to do
: that properly here, where it's so much easier?

: On Tue, 15 Mar 2005 20:58:44 +0000 (UTC), echomko_at_@polaris.umuc.edu (Eric Chomko)
: wrote:

: >You are the modern day version of the Wright Bros critics, "if man were
: >meant to fly, then God would have given him wings".

: No, I'm not. I don't doubt that you could spend
: more than you can afford to play in space.

: I know for a fact that you can't survive properly
: here, and that you won't be able to do so on any
: other planet if you don't learn how on the one
: that spawned you.

: You, in fact, are the one clipping your own wings.
: You're insisting that sustainable life can't be done.
: You want to keep using up resources when if you
: had some sense you'd sustain your lifestyle.

: >As someone else stated, not expanding our habitat off the earth is
: >suicide.

: Actually, the expectation that another suitable planet
: awaits is ludicrous.

: You can't even deal properly with this one, and that's
: your suicide.

: >In short, to survive, it **MUST** be done...

: You are mistaken. To survive, you'll need to quit
: throwing your home away as you pretend there'd
: somehow be a replacement waiting.

: On Mon, 14 Mar 2005 14:44:26 GMT, "glbrad01" <glbrad01@insightbb.com> wrote:

: > Breathable "air" is not separate from its atomic makeup. Nor is any
: >environment separate from its atomic makeup. We can already manipulate the
: >atomic, now, and we will do it on much grander scales in outer space. We've
: >done it for thousands of years to some degree, raising that degree by many
: >orders of magnitude in the last little more than half a century. In getting
: >so far into the micro-universe as we have we'd better get into the
: >macro-universe for a balance weight (so to speak). Believing we can
: >maintain, and even evolve and grow, the imbalance in place is sheer suicidal
: >arrogance on our part.
: >

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

: >Brad

: Do you have any idea what's required to provide air, water, and food to humans?

: We don't even do that particularly well or efficiently here.

: You have no possible way of doing it sustainably elsewhere.

: On Mon, 14 Mar 2005 02:29:31 GMT, simberg.interglobal@org.trash (Rand Simberg) wrote:

: >...People could just wander up from Africa, into a glacial

: >period or up into the tundra, with no technology ...

: Wow, another straw man. Even the coldest tundra
: has air humans can breathe, or hadn't you noticed?

: On Sun, 13 Mar 2005 22:09:01 GMT, Fred J. McCall <fmccall@earthlink.net> wrote:

: >This explains so much. You think ...

: Why don't you?

: In the 'cave' example, in each case there's a suitable
: environment awaiting. In that of space, there isn't.

: On Sun, 13 Mar 2005 00:20:14 GMT, "glbrad01" <glbrad01@insightbb.com> wrote:

: > You shouldn't leave a cave until you've first figured out how to live
: >properly inside the cave into perpetuity. You should never leave an
: >island.... You should never a room.... You should never leave an area.....

: You don't know why that's just a straw man, do you.

: If your species is hellbent on destroying its environment
: rather than preserving it, it doesn't deserve to have any
: other environments to damage.

: > ...Minds are growing
: >more puny by the minute. People are growing less discerning, more
: >thoughtless, more stupid, more unwise, and more suicidal, by the minute.

: Speak for yourself. Those of us who are not suffering
: from the impairments you have know that we must learn
: how to live properly here before we have any business
: going anywhere else.

: On Sat, 12 Mar 2005 18:12:43 GMT, Roy Stogner <roystgnrNO@SPAMices.utexas.edu> wrote:

: >Are you posting from near Olduvai Gorge?

: No, but that'd still beat posting from "Planet Pollyanna".

Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

sci.space.policy: Re: Spacey Ambitions – They're KIDDING, Right ?

: >... it's [sic] biological homelands.

: You realize that you can't get even the 'biosphere' idea to work, don't you?

: Apparently not ...

: >... to expand to new territories ...

: You really shouldn't try to go to places which won't sustain your life
: when you can't figure out how to manage in places which would.

: >... I think ...

: Not if you don't realize that you can't begin to afford your 'Star-Trek'
: fantasies, you don't ...

: On 11 Mar 2005 16:38:30 -0800, "Jordan" <JSBassior2001@yahoo.com> wrote:

: >... to colonize the Solar System...

: How very silly: humans haven't even figured out
: how to live properly on earth, the one planet
: that tends to favor their existence.