

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

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2005-03/3036.html>

---

*From:* Eric Chomko (*echomko\_at\_\_at\_polaris.umuc.edu*)

*Date:* 03/25/05

Date: Fri, 25 Mar 2005 03:30:09 +0000 (UTC)

\*US\* wrote:

: On Thu, 24 Mar 2005 21:40:19 +0000 (UTC), echomko\_at\_\_at\_polaris.umuc.edu (Eric Chomko)  
: wrote:

: >Please explain it to me, complete with economic aspect.

: I've already offered you more information than you can  
: handle: if you prove you are genuinely willing to deal with  
: the problems posed to ecopoiesis and terraforming by the  
: unsustainability of current agricultural practices, perhaps I'll  
: offer you more assistance. Don't distract yourself, okay?

You have stated your beliefs. There is no metric that indicates that we humans are evolving out of our habitat as you claim. Do we need to monitor our environment? Yes. Does it now preclude we shouldn't go into space? No! And there is nothing you can add that would change that. Unless you can state something. Do you have something other than beliefs?

Eric

: On Thu, 24 Mar 2005 19:27:28 +0000 (UTC), echomko\_at\_\_at\_polaris.umuc.edu (Eric Chomko)  
: wrote:

: >What does the goup bandwidth actually cost? I'll send you a check for it.

: You're making it obvious that you don't even understand  
: the technology involved with the Usenet.

: On Thu, 24 Mar 2005 00:34:37 GMT, simberg.interglobal@org.trash (Rand Simberg) wrote:

: >... the troll ...

: Apparently you have no idea what that word means,  
: or why your lame attempt at ad hominem fallacy merely  
: disgraces you publicly.

: The subject here is the fact that unsustainable survival of

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

: humans doesn't travel at all well.

: On Wed, 23 Mar 2005 21:21:26 +0000 (UTC), echomko\_at\_@polaris.umuc.edu (Eric Chomko)  
: wrote:

: >... always fail to ...

: You always fail to address what I've stated in  
: an honest or intelligent manner.

: I've deleted your ad hominem fallacies in the  
: hopes that you could discuss the issues.

: Without sustainable survival on Earth, you can  
: not hope to attain it anywhere else.

: On Wed, 23 Mar 2005 18:46:02 +0000 (UTC), echomko\_at\_@polaris.umuc.edu (Eric Chomko)  
: wrote:

: >...Total intellectual dishonesty ...

: You've used quite a bit of ad hominem fallacy.

: That's because your ignorance is showing.

: On Wed, 23 Mar 2005 04:22:06 +0000 (UTC), echomko\_at\_@polaris.umuc.edu (Eric Chomko)  
: wrote:

: >... irrelevant ...

: I can't make you post anything relevant, but  
: I've posted only what is relevant. Your lack  
: of ability to perceive as much is predictable.

: You can't function here sustainably, but that  
: is the one capability you'd have to gain for  
: terraforming or ecopoiesis to work.

: What a shame for you that you remain  
: unable to comprehend that fact.

: On Fri, 18 Mar 2005 16:12:42 GMT, simberg.interglobal@org.trash (Rand Simberg) wrote:

: >In fact, it should be possible to get much more diversity with GM  
: >crops, while still preserving the desirable traits.

: Realistically, however, the engineered products are limited  
: strains adapted to tolerate high levels of pesticides.

: >... a troll ...

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

: Fallacy noted.

: It's easier for a coward to accuse a messenger of trolling  
: than to deal with the message.

: On Fri, 18 Mar 2005 07:07:23 GMT, BlackWater <bw@barrk.net> wrote:

: > Rather depends on how you define "sustainably" doesn't it ?

: Actually, the standard denotation suffices nicely.

: > Genetic engineering WILL allow extremely sustainable food

: In fact, it makes food supplies more vulnerable.

: A huge proportion of the corn crop, for example,  
: became vulnerable to disease about thirty years ago,  
: and the one thing that solved the problem was being  
: able to go back to an old wild strain.

: >... little eco-terrorists ...

: Your little fuhrer Bush is damaging the environment  
: faster than you could ever fix it, and he's bankrupting  
: you to the point where you can't afford your fantasies.

: > "Sicker" ??? REALLY now ??? Gee ... I

: It's even the children ...

: <http://www.news.cornell.edu/releases/Sept98/ecodisease.hrs.html>

: >guess you didn't

: > notice the nearly TWOFOLD increase in life expectancy

: If you understood the relationship of infant mortality  
: rates to that, you could perhaps avoid making such  
: ridiculous references to it.

: > We're VASTLY healthier.

: No, you're not – some of the most favored toxins  
: being imposed in fact damage neural functions.

: > Got a few hundred megabucks to spare ? I've seen the previous

: As I'd mentioned, your little fuhrer Bush is busy  
: bankrupting you, so you can kiss your fantasies  
: goodbye, permanently.

: > 'biosphere' projects ...

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

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

: You're going to need to prove you can do that  
: before you'll get any rational person to believe  
: you could accomplish it extra-terrestrially.

: >... DOES seem the main  
: > thrust of your 'arguments'.

: How would you know?

: I'm saying that you can't replace nature, no matter  
: how desperate you are to worship 'science'.

: > Oh yea ... nobody is gonna fall for your trap either – the  
: > idea that we have to make things nearly "perfect" on earth

: I didn't say that – it's just your straw man.

: > before we bother to go elsewhere. We're GONNA go elsewhere

: You wish. There is no viable elsewhere, because  
: you can't even make your existence viable here.

: > even if things remain CRAPPY on earth.

: So you support damaging this place because you  
: imagine you'd be able to abandon it.

: > Luddites will be bypassed by the flow of history.

: You've already been left behind by real scientists.

: You just don't realize it, yet, and may never do so.

: On Thu, 17 Mar 2005 22:00:23 GMT, bw@barrk.net (BlackWater) wrote:

: > Initially, yes. Later on though ...

: You can't produce sustenance sustainably  
: on Earth, you can't do so elsewhere.

: > We're surviving quite nicely on earth.

: Only if you don't consider the reality that  
: we're sicker and that our supply of essential  
: resources is being destroyed not sustained.

: > and the life-expencancy ;sic]

: It's not what you'd imagine, even if you  
: knew the word.

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

: Get back to me when you can get any form  
: of a biosphere–type project to work ...

: On Thu, 17 Mar 2005 11:17:07 –0600, Joe Strout <joe@strout.net> wrote:

: >I certainly \*can\* cite such technology — look up "ore refinement"

: Why don't you realize you'd need to use resources  
: from Earth to do that anywhere else?

: >...s "it's never been done before,  
: >therefore it's impossible"

: Why do you say that? Oh, it's your straw man.

: I said nothing of the sort, of course: I've merely  
: pointed out that it's not feasible for you to make  
: a go of survival anywhere else when you're still  
: incapable of doing so on Earth.

: It's time for you to skulk off in fear and defeat now.

: >Plonk!

: QED.

: 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.

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

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

: >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.

: 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.

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

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

: 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,  
: >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.

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

: 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.

: 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?

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

: > 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  
: 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.

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

: 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.

: >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/](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.

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

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

: 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.

: >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.

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

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

: 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>

: >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.

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

: >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?

: > 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](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.

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

: 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.

: 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

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

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

: >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.  
: >  
: >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

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

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

: 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".

: >... 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.