

Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2005-10/msg00066.html>

- *From:* simberg.interglobal@xxxxxxxxxx (Rand Simberg)
 - *Date:* Sun, 02 Oct 2005 03:54:54 GMT
-

On Sat, 01 Oct 2005 19:24:10 -0500, in a place far, far away, Pat Flannery <flanner@xxxxxxxxxx> made the phosphor on my monitor glow in such a way as to indicate that:

>Paul F. Dietz wrote:

>

>>

>> Even three is too few. If the project isn't self-terminating, you will
>> have extended production of all the modules; just make another if
>> necessary.

>> Also, the ratio of number of extra of each module needed (to reduce the
>> chance of running out of any of them below some constant threshold)
>> divided by the total number of missions goes to zero as the number
>> of missions increases.

>

>

>Nice concept, and completely beyond our budget.

No, just beyond out thinking.

>We'll be lucky to get one manned Mars mission, much less three.

>Your concept appears to be aimed toward colonizing the planet- that is
>not in any way, shape, or form what NASA is proposing with its current
>effort.

Which is why, like Apollo, it is doomed to failure.

.

• *References:*

- ◆ **[Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05](#)**
 ◇ *From:* Josh Hill
- ◆ **[Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05](#)**
 ◇ *From:* Rand Simberg
- ◆ **[Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05](#)**
 ◇ *From:* Josh Hill
- ◆ **[Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05](#)**
 ◇ *From:* Rand Simberg

Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05

- ◆ **Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05**
 - ◇ From: Pat Flannery
- ◆ **Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05**
 - ◇ From: Paul F. Dietz
- ◆ **Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05**
 - ◇ From: Pat Flannery

- Prev by Date: **Re: Griffin Calls STS, ISS "Mistakes"**
- Next by Date: **Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05**
- Next by thread: **Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**