

Re: Are politicians averse to leaving LEO?

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2009-01/msg00451.html>

- *From:* "Martha Adams" <mhada@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 16 Jan 2009 05:47:56 GMT
-

"Fred J. McCall" <fjmccall@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:altvm4dmctppak3obd30lt3t189om34nu@xxxxxxxxxxx

Ian Parker <ianparker2@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

:On 15 Jan, 14:55, Fred J. McCall <fjmcc...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

:> Ian Parker <ianpark...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

:>

:> :On 14 Jan, 15:06, Fred J. McCall <fjmcc...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

:> :> Ian Parker <ianpark...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

:> :>

:> :> :On 13 Jan, 21:47, nebu...@xxxxxxxxxxx (Joseph Nebus) wrote:

:> :> :> Michael Gallagher <mikejo...@xxxxxxxxxxx> writes:

:> :> :> >Sticker shock is one possibility, but why would politicians who shelve

:> :> :> >ouy \$1 trillion in bailouts shirk at \$50 billion or \$500 billion

:> :> :> >spread out over decades to actually go someplace in space? Is there

:> :> :> >something else going on, some psychological aversion to goint to far

:> :> :> >from "mother Earth"? Did they just watch ALIEN a few times too many?

:> :> :> >What?

:> :> :>

:> :> :> Assume that a Mission To Mars works right. I'll even give you

:> :> :> it coming in on time and within range of the original budget estimates,

:> :> :> even though those traits have not been among those that past major

:> :> :> space projects have been renowned for. How many people benefit, and

:> :> :> how much do they benefit? How soon do these benefits arrive? Do these

:> :> :> benefits outweigh the costs? What of these benefits could be achieved

:> :> :> with a lesser expense? How inconvenient would it be it to wait for

:> :> :> these benefits?

:> :> :

:> :> :Yes, but if you do "public works" people will get employed whatever

:> :> :you do. You opnly get Keynesian benefits if what you have gone into

:> :> :debt for earns you money.

:> :> :

:> :>

:> :> Wrong.

:> :>

:> :> :

:> :> :A manned expedition to Mars is unlikely to

:> :> :earn any money.

Re: Are politicians averse to leaving LEO?

:> :> :
:> :>
:> :> Perhaps not directly, but there will be spin offs.
:> :>
:> :> :
:> :> :The sort of project you want from the stand–point of Keynes is a big
:> :> :construction project. Like the Hoover dam.
:> :> :
:> :>
:> :> Keynes doesn't care what government spends the money on. You
:> :> obviously fail to understand basic economics, as you fail to
:> :> understand SO many things.
:> :>
:> :> <snip A.S.S. meandering>
:> :>
:> :> :
:> :> :You have to use the resources of space, you have to mine robotically.
:> :> :
:> :>
:> :> Why? We don't have to mine robotically here on Earth. Why do you
:> :> think space is different?
:> :>
:> :> :
:> :> :You simply cannot afford to send astronauts to the Asteroid belt, or
:> :> :at least not in significant numbers.
:> :> :
:> :>
:> :> Then you simply cannot afford to develop robotic mining ships and send
:> :> them to the asteroid belt in significant numbers, either.
:> :>
:> :> :
:> :> :If you are going to get benefits
:> :> :from space they will be technological benefits.
:> :> :
:> :>
:> :> Why? Sudbury, Canada, already gets huge benefits from the use of
:> :> space resources.
:> :>
:> :> :
:> :> :What benefits would be
:> :> :be looking for? Benefits in robotics would be high on the list.
:> :> :
:> :>
:> :> Only if we follow your circular logic.
:> :>
:> :> :
:> :> :In
:> :> :point of fact a lot of work is being done with no space applications
:> :> :in mind.
:> :> :
:> :> :People in the group seem to want to persuade us that there are no

Re: Are politicians averse to leaving LEO?

>> :benefits in that direction. One might ask, what benefits are there in
>> :any direction.
>> :
>> :On the Apollo project a minicomputer was used when Apollo was on the
>> :dark side of the Moon. This did give a stimulus to minicomputer
>> :development. As I said everyone seems to be trying to persuade us that
>> :no benefits of that kind would accrue.
>> :
>> :
>> : Yet you gibber on about how manned space flight will provide no
>> :benefits.
>> :
>> : Hint: You're not supposed to start with your conclusion and then
>> :reason backward....
>> :
>> : --
>> : "Some people get lost in thought because it's such unfamiliar
>> :territory."
>> : --G. Behn
>> :
>> : No my degree is in Theoretical Physics and I regard myself as
>> :primarily a mathematician. Lots of mathematicians work on Wall Street.
>> :
>> :
>> : Well, no. They don't.
>> :
>> : Oh, I have a degree in Mathematics, too. Also Computer Science. Now
>> :you know why I treat your loony ideas about AI with such derision.
>> :
>> :
>> : OK – look at the mess! Well that mess is not a fault of the
>> :algorithms. Iraq has had a lot to do with it. That is a case of
>> :spectacular expenditure with nothing at the end.
>> :
>> :
>> : Iraq has ZERO to do with it.
>> :
>> : You really don't have a clue about any of this stuff, do you?
>> :
>> :
>> : How is it that you get elementary dynamics wrong?
>> :
>> :

I don't. As usual, you make shit up and then believe it yourself.

You're nuts, Ian. Seek help.

--

"Ordinarily he is insane. But he has lucid moments when he is only stupid."

Re: Are politicians averse to leaving LEO?

— Heinrich Heine

=====

That's a lot of discussion up in this thread, but it misses a key point. The idea of an orbiting supply station has been around for a long time and I cannot believe anyone lost it before thinking of today's ISS. Yet the ISS is placed 1) in such a low orbit that if not reboosted frequently, it will come down shortly ("re-enter") and 2) in an orbit very inclined from the Solar System's orbital plane so that *you cannot* launch from the ISS out to the rest of the System except by extravagant fuel usage to correct the bad velocity vector you have from the ISS orbit.

That this would be the case, would be clear enough to any highschool student interested in space travel; and so there must be *some reason* the ISS is in such a useless orbit. Since the basic physics is so plain and obvious, I think it's reasonable to believe the reason ISS is in such an orbit is *just so* that it cannot be used for a System travel launch resource. My guess is that the reason for doing this is to be found in Washington's religious/ideological character: they thought, if we don't do this now that's progress toward *never* doing it.

(Yes, I've heard the reasons that were given for this orbit, so far out of the ecliptic. Isn't PR a useful resource for covering-up things? My guess is some Big Names wanted that space money kept here, available for coming wars.)

What this actually accomplished can be summed up nicely by a question I see around space-oriented cyberspace text, once in a while: "When the Solar System is settled, will its language be English — or Mandarin?"

Titeotwawki — mha [sci.space.policy 2009 Jan 16]

.