

Exploring the Plausibility of a Lunar Base using First Principles Physics



Logan Gruss
Brandeis University
B.S. Physics 2027
April 5, 2026

Abstract

...For the focus of this paper, I analyze whether a permanent lunar base is physically and economically plausible if I approach the problem from first principles. I separate the idea into four scales being a small robotic outpost, a small human-tended research base, a permanently crewed scientific base, and a large industrial settlement. With almost all endeavors it's crucial to approach this analysis with the potential of different scales. As a project scales up or down, we often see the new scale does not follow uniformly with all others. I then examine the governing constraints which are launch energy, Δv , lunar gravity, radiation, thermal control, solar power, energy storage, pressurized habitat loads, regolith (damaging, top layer dust) shielding, life-support mass flow, build timeline, and delivered cost. First, I show that the Moon is close enough to be reachable in a serious engineering sense (which may seem trivial but not enough to omit from a first principles perspective), but still expensive enough that every unnecessary kilogram matters. Next, I show that the Moon's low gravity helps with construction and local transport, but does not remove the hardest problems, which are radiation protection, thermal survival through the long lunar night, and the mass penalty of keeping humans alive in vacuum. After that, I compare Earth-supplied construction with regolith-based shielding and demonstrate why replacement of local material for construction is not optional for any meaningful long-duration base. I then estimate solar array area and storage mass for representative base sizes and show why polar sites with high illumination are most attractive. Finally, I argue that a Moon base is physically plausible in the near to medium term at small scientific scales, constrained at permanent scientific scale in the medium term, and not economically plausible as a large industrial settlement until local materials, local shielding, and power distribution architectures reduce delivered mass sharply. My final conjecture is that the most realistic early lunar architecture is not a single self-contained base, but a split polar system in which power generation and habitation are separated geographically to beat the storage problem.

1. Introduction

...As demand for off-world activity increases, the Moon keeps returning as the first serious candidate for a durable human foothold beyond Earth. Although Mars was looked upon for a brief stint, quickly those attending to that endeavor shifted focus back to our familiar Lunar friend. It is close enough that a mission reaches it in days rather than months, but harsh enough that any romantic picture disappears the moment I start counting kilograms, watts, and shielding depth. In simple terms, the Moon is not far away in a science-fiction sense. It is far away in a logistics sense. That distinction matters.

...To answer whether a moon base is plausible, I follow the same general method I used in my earlier analysis of space-based data centers found on my website (grussworks.com). I reduce the problem to physical laws first, and only then move into architecture and cost. The real question is not just whether engineers can assemble structures on the Moon. The real question is whether the lunar environment gives enough physical advantages to offset the penalties of transport, vacuum, radiation, temperature extremes, and life support. If the math says yes at one scale and no at another, I want the article to reflect that honestly.

...I also need to be precise about what I mean by a moon base. A robotic science station, a short-stay outpost, a permanently crewed base, and a large industrial settlement are not the same problem. They differ by orders of magnitude in mass, power, risk, and cost. Therefore, again, any useful conclusion has to be scale-dependent rather than universal.

...In the sections that follow, I begin with the Moon itself; its gravity, day-night cycle, temperature environment, and radiation exposure. After that, I move into launch energy, landing energetics, habitat pressure loads, shielding mass, power generation, and life-support burden. Only then do I discuss cost, build timeline, and whether the Moon is actually the right first target compared with orbiting stations or Mars.

2. What Counts as a “Moon Base”?

...Before I decide whether a moon base is plausible, I need to define the size of the thing I am discussing. Otherwise, the discussion becomes misleading and leans more towards fictitious. A ten-ton robotic installation and a five-thousand-ton industrial settlement do not belong in the same sentence unless I label the scale clearly. Therefore, refer to the table below to get a more defined picture about the size of each scenario’s infrastructure we’ll be looking at:

Scale	Representative Delivered Mass	Representative Continuous Power	Crew Status	What It Can Realistically Do
Small robotic outpost (SRO)	10-20 t	10-20 kW	Uncrewed	Geology, communications relay, site prep, robotic excavation, technology demonstration
Human-tended research base (HRB)	50-100 t	50-100 kW	Short visits	Short scientific campaigns, local construction tests, limited ISRU, emergency shelter
Permanent scientific base (PSB)	300-800 t	100-500 kW	Continuous crew	Continuous science, drilling, astronomy, polar ice work, field mobility, shielded habitation
Industrial settlement (IS)	3,000-10,000+ t	1-10 MW	Permanent crew	Bulk materials processing, propellant production, construction export, large-scale manufacturing

...These mass and power values are not mission proposals. They are working scales that let me separate what is plausible now from what only becomes plausible after local construction and local shielding exist.

3. The Physical Setting of the Moon

3.1 Gravity, Vacuum, and the Long Lunar Day

...The Moon's average surface gravitational acceleration is about 1.62 m/s^2 , which is about 0.165 of Earth's gravity (NASA Glenn, 2025). The Moon also has no appreciable atmosphere, so there is essentially no aerodynamic drag, no weather, no convective cooling, and no atmospheric radiation

shielding (NASA Glenn, 2025). A mean lunar solar day is 29.5306 Earth days, so one period of daylight or darkness is roughly two Earth weeks long rather than twelve hours long (NASA SVS, 2017).

...In plain English, the Moon gives us two gifts here, coupled with one punishment immediately. The gifts are low gravity and vacuum. The punishment is overwhelming darkness for long periods of time. Day lasts a very long time, and night lasts a very long time. That means I cannot think in terms of normal terrestrial cycles, 12-hour periods. Surviving one lunar night is not like getting through an evening; it is like getting through half a month with no sunrise.

...The lunar surface temperature range is correspondingly severe, as well. NASA's Lunar Trailblazer thermal mapper was designed to map temperatures from about -163 C to $+127\text{ C}$ on the Moon, which captures the broad thermal extremes that lunar hardware must survive (NASA JPL, 2023).

3.2 Why Low Gravity Helps but Does Not Solve the Problem

...Low gravity reduces weight but not mass. That matters because weight is what drives many structural loads, while mass is what we still have to accelerate during launch, landing, and transport. For a payload of mass m , the gravitational load is:

$$F = mg [N]$$

...On Earth, a 10,000 kg habitat module has weight:

$$F_E = (10,000\text{ kg})(9.81\text{ m/s}^2) = 98,100\text{ N}$$

...On the Moon, the same module has weight

$$F_M = (10,000\text{ kg})(1.62\text{ m/s}^2) = 16,200\text{ N}$$

So the static weight load falls by a factor of about 6.1.

...That is a real structural advantage. It means cranes, legs, foundations, and structural members can often be lighter for the same supported mass. But it does not remove the need to deliver the module in the first place. The launch rocket still cares about mass, not lunar weight. So low gravity helps after arrival, but in no way before arrival.

4. Launch, Transfer, and Lunar Landing Physics

4.1 The Ideal Specific Energy Scale

...The first question is how much energy it takes to move one kilogram from Earth toward the Moon. I begin with the ideal lower-bound energetics, not because rockets achieve this bound, but because it tells me about the physical floor behind the engineering.

...The gravitational potential energy per unit mass in a central field is:

$$U_g = -\frac{\mu}{r}$$

where $\mu = GM$. For Earth, $\mu_E \approx (3.986)(10^{14}) \text{ m}^3/\text{s}^2$. The specific energy needed to go from rest at Earth's surface to escape is therefore:

$$\Delta U_{\text{escape}} = \frac{\mu_E}{R_E}$$

...We use this equation because I am calculating the minimum specific energy required to move 1 kilogram of mass from Earth's surface to infinitely far away, where Earth's gravity no longer holds it bound. Since gravitational potential energy per unit mass in a spherical gravitational field is:

$$U(r) = -\frac{\mu_E}{r}$$

the object begins at Earth's surface with potential energy

$$U(R_E) = -\frac{\mu_E}{R_E}$$

and at infinity, where Earth's gravitational field no longer effects the object, the potential energy approaches:

$$U(\infty) = 0$$

So, the energy that must be added per unit mass is the change in gravitational potential energy:

$$\Delta U_{escape} = U(\infty) - U(R_E) = 0 - \left(-\frac{\mu_E}{R_E}\right) = \frac{\mu_E}{R_E}$$

Therefore,

$$\Delta U_{escape} = \frac{\mu_E}{R_E}$$

...In plain terms, this equation is being used because escape is not about reaching a certain height, but about overcoming Earth's entire gravitational well. Therefore, $\frac{\mu_E}{R_E}$ gives the absolute minimum energy per kilogram needed to go from rest, $v_0 = 0 \text{ m/s}$, at Earth's surface to the point where Earth can no longer pull the object back.

...Using $R_E = 6.371 \times 10^6 \text{ m}$ gives:

$$\Delta U_{escape} = \frac{3.986 \times 10^{14}}{6.371 \times 10^6} = 6.25 \times 10^7 \left[\frac{J}{kg} \right]$$

...This is the ideal minimum just to escape Earth's gravity well from the surface, ignoring atmosphere, gravity losses, and rocket inefficiency. From a qualitative perspective, one kilogram has to be given an enormous amount of energy before it is even allowed to leave Earth's neighborhood in a serious way.

...For a circular low-Earth orbit at about 200 km altitude, the ideal orbital specific energy relative to the surface is lower. Using the circular orbit relation and the change in potential energy, I can write:

$$\Delta E_{LEO} = \frac{\mu_E}{R_E} - \frac{\mu_E}{[2(R_E + h)]}$$

With $h = 2.0 \times 10^5 \text{ m}$:

$$\Delta E_{LEO} = 3.22 \times 10^7 \left[\frac{J}{kg} \right]$$

...So even just reaching LEO already costs on the order of thirty megajoules per kilogram in ideal mechanical energy. A translunar mission sits above that floor, not below it.

...From LEO, a translunar injection burn is typically on the order of 3.2 km/s . The ideal kinetic energy increment associated with that burn is:

$$\Delta E_{TLI} \approx \frac{(\Delta v)^2}{2} = \frac{\left(3200 \frac{m}{s}\right)^2}{2} = 5.12 \left[\frac{MJ}{kg} \right]$$

...The exact mission energy bookkeeping is more subtle than this because the burn is applied in orbit, but this quick estimate gives the right scale, getting from LEO onto a Moon-reaching trajectory costs several more megajoules per kilogram even before lunar capture and landing.

...Once at the Moon, local motion is much cheaper. The Moon's escape speed is about 2.38 km/s (NASA JSC poster data, archived by NASA, 2016), which corresponds to a characteristic energy scale:

$$E_{M,escape} \approx \frac{v_{escape}^2}{2} = \frac{\left(2380 \frac{m}{s}\right)^2}{2} = 2.83 \left[\frac{MJ}{kg} \right]$$

...That is the key contrast. Leaving Earth is brutally expensive. Moving around once I am already in the Moon's gravity field is far cheaper by comparison.

4.2 Delta-v Budget and What It Means Operationally

...A practical transportation discussion is usually expressed in Δv rather than pure energy. A representative architecture gives roughly:

Earth surface → LEO: about 9.4 km/s
LEO → translunar injection: about 3.2 km/s
Lunar orbit insertion: about 0.8 to 1.0 km/s
Lunar descent and landing: about 1.6 km/s

...Adding those terms gives a representative total mission Δv near 15 km/s from Earth surface to lunar surface, depending on architecture and margins. In simple terms, each kilogram I want on the lunar surface must survive one deep climb out of Earth's well, one precise transfer, one capture, and one propulsive landing. That is why cargo repetition, not just one heroic landing, is the real challenge for a base.

...Because the Moon has no atmosphere, landers cannot bleed off speed aerodynamically. Every kilogram of final descent propellant must either be brought from Earth or produced locally. That is one reason lunar industrialization eventually points toward local propellant production if the settlement ever tries to grow past the scientific scale.

5. The Main Physical Advantages of the Moon

5.1 Proximity Compared with Other Deep-Space Targets

...The Moon's biggest advantage is simply that it is close. Not close in the sense of convenience, but close in the sense that missions take days, communications are near-real-time on a human scale, and resupply or rescue is at least imaginable. That makes the Moon a much better laboratory for learning how to live off-world than Mars, even if Mars may ultimately be more attractive for long-term biospheric reasons.

5.2 Low Gravity Helps Construction and Surface Mobility

...As I showed earlier, weight falls by a factor of about 6 on the Moon. That means excavators can move large masses of regolith locally with lower traction loads, structures need less static support against self-weight, and lifting equipment can handle larger masses for the same local force capability. This is especially useful if the base uses regolith berms or buried habitats, because shielding operations are fundamentally a bulk-material problem.

5.3 Vacuum, Astronomy, and Local Material Use

...The lunar vacuum is inconvenient for humans but useful for certain infrastructure. It naturally supports vacuum metallurgy, cryogenic storage in shadowed regions, and astronomical observations free from atmosphere. More importantly for settlement, the surface is covered in regolith that can potentially serve as shielding mass, landing pad material, berm fill, road base, and eventually feedstock for oxygen extraction or construction products. The bulk lunar regolith density is commonly around 1.5 g/cm^3 , or about 1500 kg/m^3 (Walton, 2007). That number becomes important later when I turn shielding thickness into delivered mass.

6. The Main Physical Disadvantages of the Moon

6.1 Radiation Is the Dominant Human Obstacle

...The first direct measurements of lunar surface radiation from the Chang'e-4 Lunar Lander Neutrons and Dosimetry experiment found an average dose equivalent of $1369 \frac{\mu\text{Sv}}{\text{day}}$ on the Moon's surface (Zhang et al., 2020). News summaries from the same study described this as roughly 200 times the average daily background on Earth and substantially higher than the daily exposure aboard the ISS during the comparison interval (Science News, 2020; CGTN summary of the paper, 2020).

...In plainer terms, the Moon is not merely a place with more radiation than Earth. It is a place where unshielded long-duration living is unacceptable. Short visits are one thing. Permanent habitation in shirtsleeves without heavy shielding is not a serious option.

6.2 The Long Night Is a Power and Survival Problem

...A lunar solar day lasts $29.5306 \text{ Earth days}$ (NASA SVS, 2017). Away from specially illuminated polar sites, that means about 14.75 Earth days of darkness. If the base relies on solar power, it must either survive half a month with stored energy or move to a location where

illumination is much more persistent. That is why the lunar poles matter so much in logical discussions.

6.3 Dust, Vacuum, and Reliability

...Lunar dust is not normal dirt. It is abrasive, electrostatically troublesome, and mechanically persistent. Walton's NASA review notes a bulk fine gray soil with many very fine particles and strong adhesive behavior in vacuum (Walton, 2007). The layman's version is simple, if a moon base depends on seals, joints, bearings, optics, suits, and radiators, then dust is not a side annoyance. It is a system-wide reliability problem.

7. Detailed Physics of Shielding, Thermal Control, Power, and Mass

7.1 Radiation Shielding by Regolith

...NASA radiation-protection guidance for lunar scenarios emphasizes two useful scale numbers. First, around 20 g/cm^2 of shielding is a reasonable design target for areas where astronauts spend substantial time (Clowdsley, 2021). Second, earlier NASA mission-scenario work noted that 10 g/cm^2 of shielding, roughly 3.7 cm of aluminum, is not enough for very long surface missions even if it may support shorter ones (Clowdsley et al., 2005).

If I convert the more protective 20 g/cm^2 target into area density, I simply get:

$$20 \text{ g/cm}^2 = 200 \text{ kg/m}^2$$

Using regolith with bulk density $\rho_{reg} \approx 1500 \text{ kg/m}^3$, the equivalent thickness is:

$$t = (200 \text{ kg/m}^2) / (1500 \text{ kg/m}^3) = 0.133 \text{ m}$$

...So about 13 cm of regolith gives the same areal density as 20 g/cm^2 . However, the same NASA guidance also notes that if one chooses to add large amounts of surface material, one quickly enters the regime of “meters of shielding” for a buried habitat concept rather than thin-wall vehicle shielding (Clowdsley, 2021).

...That is physically sensible. Thin shielding helps, but thick regolith cover is what begins to turn a habitat into something Earth-like in radiation exposure. For example, if I consider an 0.8 m regolith cover, the areal density is:

$$\frac{m}{A} = \rho_{reg,t} = (1500)(0.8) = 1200 \text{ kg/m}^2 = 120 \text{ g/cm}^2$$

...That is six times the 20 g/cm^2 design target. Therefore, burying the habitat is the only way to get truly serious protection without launching absurd masses of metal shielding from Earth.

...Now consider the mass consequence. If the habitat roof footprint is 100 m^2 , then an 0.8 m regolith cover has mass:

$$M_{shield} = (1200 \text{ kg/m}^2)(100 \text{ m}^2) = 120,000 \text{ kg}$$

...That is 120 metric tons of shielding mass. If we had to deliver that from Earth, it would be devastating economically. If we can move it locally with robots, it becomes plausible. This single computation is one of the strongest arguments for local construction material.

7.2 Thermal Control in Vacuum

...Because the Moon has no significant atmosphere, there is no useful convective heat rejection. A habitat rejects heat mostly through radiation. The Stefan-Boltzmann law gives:

$$P = \epsilon \sigma A T^4$$

where ϵ is emissivity, $\sigma = 5.67 \times 10^{-8} \text{ [W m}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-4}]$, A is radiator area, and T is radiator temperature.

...Suppose a habitat must reject 100 kW of waste heat and can operate a radiator near 300 K with emissivity $\epsilon = 0.9$. Then:

$$A = \frac{P}{\epsilon \sigma T^4}$$

$$A = \frac{100,000}{[0.9(5.67 \times 10^{-8})(300^4)]}$$

$$A \approx 242 \text{ m}^2$$

...So, a 100 kW base needs on the order of a couple hundred square meters of radiator area if it rejects heat near room temperature. That is manageable. The harder problem is not rejecting heat during operation. The harder problem is maintaining warmth during the night when incoming solar energy vanishes for roughly two weeks at a time. The Moon is thermally unforgiving in both directions.

7.3 Solar Power and the Night-Storage Penalty

...Above Earth's atmosphere, the total solar irradiance is about 1361.6 W/m^2 at solar minimum according to NASA's TSIS-1 measurements (NASA GSFC, 2026). The Moon receives essentially that same order of incident flux, the raw solar power arriving per unit area before any conversion losses, when illuminated because it has no atmosphere to attenuate it.

...If I assume 30% efficient solar arrays, then the peak electrical power per square meter at normal incidence is:

$$\frac{P}{A} = \eta S = (0.30)(1361.6) = 408 \text{ W/m}^2$$

...Real systems need margin for cosine losses, dust, temperature, power electronics, and non-normal Sun angles, so I will use a more conservative effective output of about 70% of that peak for a well-oriented polar system:

$$\frac{P}{A_{\text{effective}}} \approx 0.7(408) \approx 286 \text{ W/m}^2$$

...For a 100 kW continuously powered scientific base, the required active array area is then:

$$A_{\text{array}} = \frac{100,000}{286} \approx 350 \text{ m}^2$$

...That is not bad at all. The array area is not the true problem. The storage problem is. If the site instead experiences a full 14.75-day night, the stored energy needed for a continuous 100 kW load is:

$$E_{\text{store}} = Pt = (100 \text{ kW})(14.75)(24 \text{ h}) = 35,400 \text{ kWh} = 35.4 \text{ MWh}$$

...If I imagine an optimistic battery specific energy of 250 Wh/kg, the battery mass becomes:

$$M_{\text{batt}} = 35,400,000 \text{ Wh} / (250 \text{ Wh/kg}) = 141,600 \text{ kg}$$

...That is about 142 metric tons of batteries just to ride through one lunar night at 100 kW, with no reserve and no degradation margin. In short, equatorial solar power plus batteries is a very punishing architecture for a permanent base.

...The same calculation scales poorly. A 500 kW industrial precursor would need about 708 metric tons of batteries under the same assumptions. That is why polar illumination matters more than people sometimes realize.

7.4 Pressurized Habitat Loads

...People do not live in a vacuum. The habitat must contain internal pressure, and that creates large outward structural loads. The basic relation is:

$$F = PA$$

...Suppose I use a reduced internal pressure of 70 kPa , and suppose one circular bulkhead has radius $r = 4 \text{ m}$. Its area is:

$$A = \pi r^2 = \pi(4 \text{ m})^2 = 50.3 \text{ m}^2$$

The outward force on that endcap is then:

$$F = (70,000 \text{ Pa})(50.3 \text{ m}^2) = 3.52 \times 10^6 \text{ N}$$

...That is about 3.5 meganewtons pushing outward on one end. A layman way to picture that is this; the structure is not merely keeping air in gently. It is constantly fighting a very large tendency to burst apart. This is why spherical, cylindrical, and buried shell-like forms make so much more sense than ordinary boxy buildings. Cube-like structures are less structurally sound in this situation because internal pressure concentrates larger bending stresses and force peaks at flat panels, edges, and corners, whereas curved shapes will spread that load more evenly.

7.5 Life Support as a Mass-Flow Problem

...Long-term habitation is not just a shelter problem. It is a daily flow problem. NASA's human-centered ECLSS (Environmental Control and Life Support System) technical brief states that astronauts need about 2.5 L of potable water for hydration per crewmember per day, while NASA's ECLSS statistics also note that one person needs about 1.83 lb of oxygen per day, which is about 0.83 kg/day (NASA OCHMO, 2023; NASA ECLSS stats, 2020).

...For a crew of four, the irreducible daily hydration and oxygen demand alone is therefore:

$$\text{Water}_{\text{hydration}} = (4)(2.5 \text{ kg/day}) = 10 \text{ kg/day}$$

$$\text{Oxygen} = (4)(0.83 \text{ kg/day}) = 3.32 \text{ kg/day}$$

Over a 180-day mission, that becomes:

$$\text{Water}_{180 \text{ days}} = (10 \text{ kg/day})(180) = 1800 \text{ kg}$$

$$\text{Oxygen}_{180 \text{ days}} = (3.32 \text{ kg/day})(180) \approx 598 \text{ kg}$$

...And this still excludes food, hygiene water, leakage, suit losses, reserve margin, and system failures. NASA's own brief emphasizes that water launch mass is prohibitive and that recycling is

therefore vital beyond low-Earth orbit (NASA OCHMO, 2023). Therefore, a moon base that does not close loops aggressively becomes a shipping exercise, not a true settlement.

8. Construction Strategy and Why Local Material Use Is Not Optional

...At very small scales, we can ship nearly everything from Earth. At large scales, that strategy collapses. The reason is not ideological. It can be understood mathematically.

...Suppose I want 120 metric tons of shielding mass over a 100 m^2 habitat roof, as I computed above. If I use a rough near-term delivered lunar surface transport cost model of \$10,000 to \$20,000 per kilogram, then shipping that shielding from Earth would cost:

$$\text{let cost} = \$10,000, \quad C_{\text{shield},10k} = (120,000\text{ kg})(\$10,000/\text{kg}) = \$1.2\text{ billion}$$

$$\text{let cost} = \$20,000, \quad C_{\text{shield},20k} = (120,000\text{ kg})(\$20,000/\text{kg}) = \$2.4\text{ billion}$$

...That is for the shielding of one modest habitat footprint. It does not include the habitat itself, the landing craft, the power system, or the crew support systems. So, any serious moon base that remains above ground and Earth-supplied must remain “small” for a very long time. Regolith moving is not a luxury add-on. It is the hurdle from flags and footprints to real infrastructure.

...The same logic applies to landing pads, berms (piles of lunar material for protection), roads, trenching, and thermal mass. Robotic excavation and regolith handling are therefore, among the highest-leverage early capabilities a lunar program can develop.

9. Launch and Cost Scaling

...SpaceX's current capabilities document lists Falcon 9 at \$74 million for up to 22,000 kg to low-Earth orbit, which corresponds to a nominal list-price floor near \$3360/kg to LEO before translunar transport and landing hardware are added (SpaceX, 2026). A lunar surface delivery mission is not just a Falcon 9 to LEO, so I will not pretend otherwise. Instead, I use that published LEO figure as a floor and construct a rough engineering model of \$10,000 to \$20,000 per delivered kilogram to the lunar surface for near-term systems. That is not a vendor quote. It is a scaling assumption intended to capture the added cost of transfer stages, landing crafts, margins, and low cadence.

Scale	Working Mass	Transport Cost at \$10k/kg	Transport Cost at \$20k/kg
Small robotic outpost	20 t	\$200 million	\$400 million
Human-tended research base	80 t	\$800 million	\$1.6 billion
Permanent scientific base	500 t	\$5 billion	\$10 billion
Industrial settlement	5,000 t	\$50 billion	\$100 billion

...These numbers should not be read as precise program bids. They are order-of-magnitude transport burdens. The trend is more important than their exact value. The small robotic and early scientific scales are expensive but imaginable. The industrial scale is not impossible physically, but it remains economically extreme until local materials displace most imported mass.

...This is why I think discussions of a hundred thousand-person Moon infrastructure are often premature in the near term. The physics does not forbid it. The logistics punish it.

10. Build Timeline and Construction Phases

...Phase 1 is robotic reconnaissance and infrastructure seeding. This includes site mapping, communications, small power systems, dust measurements, excavation tests, and landing pad preparation. A 10-20 ton robotic outpost is physically plausible in the near term because it avoids the mass-flow catastrophe of human life support while still preparing the site.

...Phase 2 is a human-tended base. This means short-duration crews visiting hardware that is mostly predeployed. Power levels around 50-100 kW, shielding by bermed regolith rather than launch-delivered metal, and a clear emergency shelter are enough to make the concept plausible in the near to medium term.

...Phase 3 is a permanently crewed scientific base. This is where the architecture must become serious. Continuous crew means true radiation protection, reliable closed-loop life support, spare parts, repair capability, field mobility, and either polar illumination or non-battery energy storage. I think this scale is physically plausible in the medium term, but only if the base transitions from landed modules to buried infrastructure and active regolith handling.

...Phase 4 is industrial settlement. This is the point where the Moon stops being just a place people visit and becomes a place that exports value through materials, propellant, scientific products, or manufacturing. I do not think this is forbidden by physics. I do think it is economically implausible until local construction, local oxygen extraction, and local shielding are mature enough to crush imported mass per person.

11. Is the Moon the Right First Settlement Target?

...Compared with orbiting stations, the Moon is harder to access because landing and ascent are propulsive, and surface operations involve dust, terrain, and day-night extremes. Orbiting stations win on simple logistics and probably on early commercial usefulness. However, orbiting stations cannot offer the same access to large local shielding mass, geology, or resource use. In orbit, every kilogram of shielding is still a launched kilogram.

...Compared with Mars, the Moon is far easier for building an infrastructure. The transport time is short, the communications delay is slight, and rescue or resupply is at least within the same broad operational culture as cislunar space. Mars has its own attractions, especially a more Earth-like day length and an atmosphere that helps with entry, descent, and landing, but it is much farther and much less forgiving of mistakes. So, if the purpose is to learn how to build durable off-world infrastructure step by step, the Moon remains the better option even if it is not the easiest place to live permanently, nor gives the more “remarkable” environment to research, relative to Mars.

12. Discussion and Conclusion

...My overall conclusion is mixed, but it is much clearer now than it was at the beginning. A moon base is physically plausible. The Moon does not violate the engineering in some mysterious way. Low gravity, vacuum operations, short travel time relative to other planetary targets, access to regolith, and strong sunlight during the illuminated period all support serious lunar infrastructure.

...However, my calculations above also show that the Moon is not forgiving. Radiation is high enough that long-term habitation requires heavy shielding. The two-week lunar night makes energy storage brutally expensive for solar architectures away from highly illuminated polar terrain. Pressurized habitats carry large structural loads. Life support becomes a continuous mass-flow and reliability problem the moment humans remain for long durations. Most importantly, every kilogram landed from Earth carries a large transport penalty, so any architecture that keeps importing bulk shielding and bulk construction mass will stall early.

...Because of that, I think the answer depends on timescale and scale. A small robotic outpost is plausible now. A small human-tended scientific base is plausible in the near term if it is power-limited, shield-aware, and logistically conservative. A permanently crewed scientific base is plausible in the medium term if it uses aggressive recycling, regolith shielding, and a power architecture designed specifically around polar illumination. A large industrial settlement is physically plausible but not economically plausible until local materials replace most imported mass.

...The key point I am trying to make is the question is **not** whether humans can stand on the Moon again. The question is whether they can gradually turn a place that kills them by default into a place that supports them by design. That transformation is possible, but only when the base stops behaving like a campsite and starts behaving like infrastructure.

13. An Original Conjecture: The Split Polar Base

...I think the wrong early question is, “Where should I put the moon base?” The better question is, “Why assume the base is one object at all?” My conjecture is that the most plausible early lunar base is a split polar system in which habitation and power generation are deliberately separated.

...Near the poles, some ridges receive unusually persistent sunlight, while nearby craters and shadowed depressions offer thermal advantages and potentially easier access to cold-trap volatiles. Instead of forcing one site to do everything, I can place solar arrays on a highly illuminated ridge and bury the crew habitat in a more shieldable location some distance away. The real question then becomes whether transmission mass beats storage mass.

...Consider a 100 kW base located 10 km from its solar farm. If I transmit power at 5 kV DC, the line current is:

$$I = \frac{P}{V} = \frac{100,000}{5000} = 20 \text{ A}$$

...Suppose I allow 5% line loss, so $P_{loss} = 5 \text{ kW}$. Since $P_{loss} = I^2 R$, the total circuit resistance can be:

$$R_{total} = \frac{P_{loss}}{I^2} = \frac{5000}{20^2} = 12.5 \Omega$$

...Using aluminum with resistivity $\rho = 2.82 \times 10^{-8} \Omega m$ and a round-trip conductor length of 20 km, the required conductor cross-section is:

$$A = \frac{\rho L}{R} = \frac{(2.82 \times 10^{-8})(10,000)}{6.25} = 4.51 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2$$

...That is about 45 mm² per conductor. The mass of a two-conductor 10 km aluminum line is then approximately:

$$M_{line} = \rho_{material} A L (2) = (2700)(4.51 \times 10^{-5})(10,000)(2) \approx 2436 \text{ kg}$$

...So, I can move 100 kW over 10 km with only a few metric tons of conductor mass, while the battery mass needed to ride through a 14.75-day night at the same load was about 142 metric tons. Even allowing for supports, insulation, converters, redundancy, and routing penalties, the cable architecture is still lighter by a huge factor.

...This means the early lunar power problem may not be solved mainly by bigger batteries. It may be solved by geography. A split polar base could use light-rich ridges for generation and separately optimized buried habitats for human safety. Mathematically, that looks far more plausible than assuming one compact base must survive the full night on stored energy.

...That is my final idea, the first serious moon base should not be a single settlement module dropped onto the surface. It should be a distributed infrastructure system whose pieces are placed where the local physics favors them most.

References

- Cloudsley, M., et al. (2005). Radiation Protection for Lunar Mission Scenarios. NASA conference paper. Notes that the lunar surface radiation field is slightly more than half of free space and discusses 10 g/cm^2 shielding for surface habitats.
- Cloudsley, M. (2021). Protecting Astronauts from Space Radiation on the Lunar Surface. NASA presentation. Recommends trying to ensure astronauts are surrounded by about 20 g/cm^2 of shielding in habitat areas.
- NASA ECLSS statistics (2020). Environmental Control & Life Support Systems. NASA. Reports that one person needs about 1.83 pounds of oxygen per day.
- NASA Glenn Research Center (2025). Moon. Reports lunar surface gravity of 1.62 m/s^2 and emphasizes the lack of appreciable atmosphere and resulting surface extremes.
- NASA Goddard Space Flight Center (2026). Solar Irradiance Science. Reports a TSIS-1 total solar irradiance value of $1361.6 \pm 0.3 \text{ W/m}^2$ at the 2019 solar minimum.
- NASA JPL (2023). Lunar Trailblazer's Thermal Mapper Has Arrived at Lockheed Martin. Notes planned lunar thermal mapping from about -163 C to $+127 \text{ C}$.
- NASA OCHMO (2023). Environmental Control & Life Support System: Human-Centered Approach. States that astronauts need approximately 2.5 L of potable water for hydration per crewmember per day and emphasizes water recycling for exploration beyond low-Earth orbit.
- NASA SVS (2017). 100 Lunar Days - Parts I and II. Gives a mean lunar solar day of 29.5306 Earth days.
- SpaceX (2026). Capabilities & Services. Lists Falcon 9 at \$74 million for up to 22,000 kg to low-Earth orbit under the standard payment plan through 2026.
- Walton, O. (2007). Adhesion of Lunar Dust. NASA technical report. Notes bulk lunar regolith density near 1.5 g/cm^3 and discusses fine-particle adhesive behavior.
- Zhang, S., et al. (2020). First measurements of the radiation dose on the lunar surface. Science Advances. Reports an average dose equivalent of $1369 \text{ } \mu\text{Sv/day}$ from the Chang'e-4 lunar surface measurements.