

Re: Hubble is ancient history

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-10/5684.html>

From: Matt Giwer (jull43_at_tampabay.rr.RoMeVE.com)

Date: 10/20/04

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 05:23:58 GMT

Gregory L. Hansen wrote:

> In article <3z4dd.19404\$yZ5.8734@tornado.tampabay.rr.com>,

> Matt Giwer <jull43@tampabay.rr.RoMeVE.com> wrote:

>

>>Victor wrote:

>>

>>>Pierre wrote:

>>

>>>>Don't forget Bush wants the end of Hubble and want s to deicde what's

>>>>good in science...

>>>Actually it is NASA Administrator Sean O'Keefe who decided that fixing

>>>Hubble is not worth an astronaut's life or losing another shuttle. A

>>>board of investigation was set up to determine the risks involved. I

>>>personally think the risk is not that high and that a human service

>>>mission should go ahead as planned.

>> Hubble is a sentimental thing.

>> At least once a year for the last five years I have read of a new

>>telescope coming on line that advertises having a better resolution

>>than Hubble.

>> I thought the reason was scientific investigation not sentimentality.

>>We are getting better resolution than Hubble. We do not have launchers

>>which can put a large enough mirror in orbit to compete with the earth

>>telescopes.

>> Is there a rational reason for saving Hubble? In fact, is there a

>>rational reason for continuing work on its replacement in orbit? Can

>>the same dollars produce even better earth based telescopes?

>> Resources are finite and NASA has them for space telescopes. THE

>>money does not transfer to earth telescopes so it is not a tradeoff.

> Infrared, ultraviolet, and x-rays don't get through the Earth's atmosphere

> very well. (Why do you think visible light is visible?)

sci.physics: Re: Hubble is ancient history

And the Hubble replacement planned to go up in 5–6 years will be designed to maximize IR and UV. And there is a new either X or Gamma ray one going up before that if I remember correctly.

When Hubble went up there was nothing on earth to compare. Now there are scopes on earth that can do better.

And not just the cost of one more Hubble mission to get a few more years out of it. Its replacement will be in orbit before it wears out one last time. NASA has to double its ground station equipment and personnel to operator both at the same time. Hubble's frequencies are not free so more are needed for the replacement, meaning more receivers and antennas to talk to both of them. Rationally Hubble is dumped the minute the new one is operational BUT you can't bring the new one on line while still operating Hubble for the same frequencies, antennas and manpower problem.

You can make an argument for keeping Hubble as backup if the new one fails or is delayed or whatever. But in the real world everything gets shifted to the replacement as soon as it is in orbit else doubling everything for a very few years.

--
Hodie decimo tertio Kalendas Octobres MMIV est
-- The Ferric Webceasar