

Re: LM first design

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2004-07/0038.html>

From: Bruce Palmer (bp201_at_optonline.net)

Date: 06/30/04

Date: Wed, 30 Jun 2004 20:30:42 GMT

Henry Spencer wrote:

- > *In article <dHqEc.47661\$OT6.19381855@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>,*
- > *Bruce Palmer <BrucePalmerNOSPAM@gmail_dot_com.INVALID> wrote:*
- >
- >>*I mean, what has changed with regard to the actual requirements for a*
- >>*trip to and landing on the moon?*
- >
- > *A requirement for prolonged surface stays and establishment of a permanent*
- > *base is likely. That's a big change, actually.*

What I meant to say was that on that Astronautix page you can find design proposals that address that requirement as well.

- >>*what's wrong with the basic Apollo designs?*
- >
- > *Apollo was optimized for a short surface visit as a digression from a*
- > *(relatively) lengthy in-space voyage. Looked at closely, the whole LOR*
- > *mission plan is fundamentally based on the assumption that the surface*
- > *stay is a relatively minor part of the trip.*

True enough, but some of the early design proposals took into account the possibilities of extended missions and semi-permanent habitats.

- > *There are also a number of things about the Apollo design that weren't*
- > *really right even for that requirement -- things that Apollo's designers*
- > *themselves would have done differently, had they known in 1961 what they*
- > *knew in 1969 (or even 1965).*

All true, Henry. Right now is the time when proposals are being solicited for concepts related to returning to the moon and establishing a long-term presence there. The focus seems to be on extensibility and evolvability which leads me to believe that the first steps taken will be very simple ones. Without throwing oodles of money at the problem, a la Apollo, those designs, with some refinements, are well suited to accomplishing the task at hand.

--

bp

Proud Member of the Human O-Ring Society Since 2003

Re: LM first design