

Re: Apollo Trivia Question

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2006-08/msg01353.html>

- *From:* "Brad Guth" <bradguth@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 20 Aug 2006 22:22:26 +0000 (UTC)
-

Apollo Trivia Question(s), instead what if's and you've got to be absolutely kidding's.

Here's the ultimate news flash: NASA Is Borrowing Ideas From the Apollo (what "News"?)

Instead of taking from Apollo, why not better to discuss taking expertise and first hand accomplishments from their spendy DC-X and DC-XA fiasco.

Unfortunately, it seems our pathetic NASA can't hardly even shine when their stuff finally/(sort of) works.

For example; their old DC-X test flights / DeltaClipper.mov
<http://media.armadilloaerospace.com/DCX/DeltaClipper.mov>
<http://www.orbitersim.com/v2/read.asp?id=19376>
<http://www.astronautix.com/lvs/dcx.htm>
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/DC-X>

With 24,000+ kgf, it had actually worked with energy and thus payload to spare, though I believe we still haven't been properly informed as to the fullest extent of their applied rocket-science, nor as to appreciating the rather excessive amount of their GLOW or of their nearly 50% inert portion thereof (that's without shielding and without live payloads of crew nor of any expedition outfitting), much less as to the 9800 kg of fuel which had been intended to last only a few minutes (I'm thinking they should have used h₂O₂/RP-1 or better yet h₂O₂/c3h₄o), nor sharing as to whatever extent they'd instead relied upon highly advanced computers plus so easily could have incorporated momentum reaction wheels. The DC-X had otherwise proven that as of three decades after our initial Apollo fiasco, in that we'd finally accomplished what it would have taken (though still representing a rather hefty sucker, flight time limited and never once drop tested) as a remote piloted and/or AI/robotic controlled fly-by-rocket capability.

Unfortunately, of having applied nearly three decades more advanced rocket-science, using loads of efficient composites, and operating under the ultimate of locally controlled conditions, they still had 7 out of 12 as failures. (not exactly a great confidence builder, especially if it was your butt headed for that physically dark and nasty moon)

Re: Apollo Trivia Question

In other words, our NASA had invested into another extremely spendy effort that can't be openly touted nor much less shared for whatever the truth it represents. As in no matters what, the public and of the international science and of the space exploration groups within are simply not allowed to realize the full potential and/or grief of whatever the spendy learning curve, nor otherwise as to learning exactly how badly snookered they have all been, as in summarily screwed, blued and tattooed for life.

The NASA Delta Clipper was their best prototype effort of any such fly-by-rocket spaceship/lander that's essentially devoid of sufficient internal specifics, whereas such need-to-know expertise remains as somewhat stealth/invisible as were those WMD in Iraq. Obviously the DC-X/DC-XA had in fact functioned, at least part of the time, though apparently they'd cheated by way of having eliminated those pesky pilot error factors by way of being so extensively AI/computerised, and otherwise as having spent their fun and games budget for the next decade on behalf of accomplishing just that much.

Of course, attempting to honestly discuss anything remotely similar as to those previous hocus-pocus NASA/Apollo fly-by-rocket landers that had to deal with those pesky lunar mascons, plus hauling a fairly good amount of live and accessory payloads, including sufficient fuel loads that was unavoidably changing their CG by the second, and otherwise having incorporated plenty of other unavoidable inert mass to deal with (such as packing along their return-home package), though officially never once having accomplished an actual prototype (reduced mass/increased thrust) test craft on behalf of any honest efforts for accomplishing the controlled task of an incoming, down-range and soft landing of their very own, certainly not as directly astronaut piloted nor even as having been remote piloted, nor much less as fully AI/robotically having accomplished squat.

Yet supposedly never a single hitch within any of those controlled deorbits from 100 km, of getting their butts safely down-range past each of those lunar mascons and then maneouvered to each of their soft landings where there wasn't hardly any depth of dust to be found, and not even all that dusty nor all that dark of terrain for as far as their EVAs and unfiltered Kodak eye could see, and all of that accomplished without benefit of their landers having the sorts of computer interfaced fly-by-wire management of flight stability via those above GC reaction thrusters, nor having any of those airframe momentum reaction wheels as likely incorporated within NASA's Delta Clipper.

It's as though all the good folks associated with those DC-X/DC-XA flights were sworn to their usual cloak and dagger and otherwise lethal nondisclosure policy (each having signed their soul to that internal policy in their own blood) because, at all cost the truth simply couldn't ever be told, much less publicly demonstrated at even a fully secured (AKA need to know) air show without spilling a few too many

Re: Apollo Trivia Question

beans, such as our not even having so much as the unreliable fly-by-rocket capability as of the Apollo era.

You folks that insist upon believing we've walked on that physically dark and nasty moon, and somehow our astronauts and their Kodak film that was near-UV and UV-a sensitive as well as easily prone to being affected by radiation, as somehow having lived entirely unscathed as to tell us about it, are either sick little puppies or you've become the very worse of collaborating minions in support of whatever your LLPOF Skull and Bones cult represents.

I for one totally agree that we need to focus our best talents and resources upon those new and improved missions as per sending off the sorts of sufficiently rad-hard robotic probes. However, what we have here is a serious priority need of kicking Usenet butt, then as to kick a few other sorry butts that have been nothing but mainstream liars and systematic intellectual bigots of the worse possible kind.

Don't suppose there's any honest Usenet intentions of these insider folks, as for their ever becoming the least bit open mindset, any more so likely than hearing from our resident LLPOF warlord(GW Bush) that his actions and of those closely associated and of a few too many before his administration were nothing short of having imposed their crimes against humanity and of otherwise continually raping our global warming environment to boot.

As to their excluding of whatever's evidence that doesn't happen to please your mainstream status quo or bust mindset, whereas the NASA/Apollo ruse of the century simply isn't working, now is it, any more so than is their perpetual denial of denial being of any further use. But then liars are in auto-default of their denial being in auto-protect denial; so what's the difference?

We need to think along the lines of the somewhat mass produced and thereby affordable and fully expendable rad-hard science for obtaining those new and improved instruments and of deploying such as robotics rather than pushing our frail DNA over the edge, along with all the necessary applied technology that we simply do not have for sustaining a mission with human crew. As of today's capability, of what micro-probes and/or of relatively small robotics can obviously survive in the most extreme of places, that are of places otherwise taboo/off-limits as to even the most advanced forms of applied technology that's intended for sustaining our frail DNA, and supposedly of returning it home as none the worse off for wear, of which thus far simply can not be accomplished.

For the old hocus-pocus Apollo gipper; Here's one more of my somewhat dyslexic alternative reviews, at considering the cosmic radiation impact upon your frail DNA while situated on or anywhere near that anticathode moon of our's, thus making my argument for having the 50t/m2 available to the CM/ISS abode as being within spec of what long-term survival at

Re: Apollo Trivia Question

even 60,000 km away from our physically dark and nasty moon has to offer, as being not such a bad idea.

According to our NASA certified science with regards to the cosmic influx of roughly one hit per second per cm², the following is merely extrapolated in order to estimate the lunar surface environment that's without benefit of having a magnetosphere, therefore by rights I'm being rather conservative, as if anything the naked moon unavoidably receives more than it's fair share of merely one cosmic hit/cm²/sec.

However, at taking on merely those 36e6 cosmic hits/m²/hr, and for using the conservative square root of that amount = 6e3 mrem or 6 rem/hr. A TBI(total body irradiation) of .06 Sv/hr is obviously survivable for several hours worth of exposure, that is if that were the one and only amount of dosage your DNA had to worry about.

Humans living with gamma and of the unavoidable hard-X-rays isn't exactly doable:

Of course, outer space and essentially that of our naked moon is not 2D, but rather 3D/cubic, whereas your 3D body and of the 3D spacecraft and/or lunar terrain surrounding it is therefore not limited to the m² worth of cosmic influx. Instead, your 3D body might be worth roughly 0.1 m³ which equals 100,000 cm³, making it into a cosmic target that's 10 fold as bad off. Therefore taking on 360e6 cosmic hits/hr, and if we're using the same conservative conversion into mrem of taking the square root makes that internal dosage of DNA trauma worthy of 19e3 mrem or 19 rem/hr.

Unfortunately, you're never alone while moonsuit walking about, whereas you're entire body and frail DNA within are continually surrounded by at least 3.14e6 m² of that physically dark and nasty lunar anticathode terrain of physical matter, that's roughly half again as dense as aluminum and otherwise better than 3 times the density of your body, and thereby unavoidably more reactive in a bad sort of way of generating those nastier forms of secondary/recoil energies of soft-gamma and hard-X-rays.

Since the lunar atmosphere is supposedly so sparse (merely a little sodium/salty by day), the amount of mass or atmospheric shield density that's between yourself and any of those surrounding 3.14e6 m² that are naturally and unavoidably being anticathode at doing their thing, of each m² emitting humanly lethal dosage, whereas this outcome is not by any means a good sign.

$3.14e6 * 0.06 \text{ Sv} = 188.4e3 \text{ Sv/hr}$, whereas if your body were only getting 0.1% of that surrounding dosage is still worth 188 Sv/hr. This is where being a rad-hard robot gets to looking as a really good idea.

Of course, if we'd ever established those interactive science probes on the lunar deck, or even having established that science platform as efficiently station-keeping itself within the interactive LL-1 zone, as

Re: Apollo Trivia Question

such these efforts would have long ago eliminated all of the swag of such speculations that myself and others have had to make do with. Thus far we're not even getting the honest science about our moon from ACE that once a month has a really good look-see, and not surprisingly our moon was even banished by our MESSENGER flyby. It's as though our moon is the most taboo/nondisclosure orb next to Venus and then Sirius, whereas any of those three items are never getting the attention they deserve, and subsequently generation after generation of students are essentially having to learn via infomercial-crapolla-science instead of the truth.

Unfortunately, each and every time I've taken the initiative upon myself, as having suggested deploying extremely low cost alternatives, for getting small/micro science probes or of those within my JAVELINs as implanted into our moon, whereas this is when all the usual mainstream status quo of their wag-thy-dogs to death of their infomercial flak started to fly. Instead of getting a productive Usenet community think-tank of folks honestly sharing in the best available science that's replicated, and of sharing upon other viable ideas and/or alternatives, instead we get MOS anti-think-tankism of their insufferable Usenet naysayism in the forms of topic/author stalking, bashings and wherever possible banishments applied, along with whatever's the evidence that's shared on behalf of our constructive arguments getting excluded if such evidence represents the least bit of whatever rocks their good ship LOLLIPOP.

If that's not bad enough, we also get to receive an extra worth of PC infecting dosage from their NOVA/GOOGLE/Usenet server accommodated gauntlet, of delivering those absolutely pesky spermware/fuckware to continually deal with, plus that of our email accounts getting trashed with further butt-loads of their worse possible infected files, and otherwise for years I've had hundreds of those pesky hang-up phone calls that are obviously intended to impose as much damage as possible by remote means, that which our cloak and dagger MI/NSA spooks have entirely at their disposal and within their intentions as to utilize every means available without spilling any of their precious nondisclosure beans (such as our perpetrated cold-wars that as of lately have produced such extensive collateral damage and carnage of the innocent).

In other words, there's apparently so much that I'm right about that it's getting a wee bit hot and nasty to be sharing whatever without involving yet another round of their status quo flak. So, if you're at all interested in our moon, Venus or our orbital association with the Sirius star/solar system, as such I'd advise being prepared for taking on the absolute worse of the worse sorts of nasty things to happen, and so much so that it could become a whole lot safer for those Venusians or visiting ETs as having existed/coexisted on Venus than it is for those of us right here on this polluted and subsequently global warming Earth that's about to go WW-III postal in order to further cover thy perpetrated cold-war butts.

Re: Apollo Trivia Question

Re: Apollo Trivia Question

As I've said this and having backed it up with physics and replicated science before;

The geothermally active surface environment of Venus is simply a whole lot safer than Earth when it comes down to the solar/cosmic levels of Sv. That toasty Venusian environment is obviously not Earth like (more or less hell like), but as such it also isn't all that humanly insurmountable if a gram of intelligent common sense gets applied (a halfwit village idiot should be more than qualified). The ESA Venus EXPRESS mission has been helping to prove this argument to be true, especially once their PFS instrument gets into action (as by rights it should), that will better map the surface of that geothermally active terrain to a much greater resolution and extent than previously obtained (as limited only by their highly elliptical polar orbit or otherwise foiled by way of our spooks interfering with their to/from command instructions and/or merely corrupting their mission data).

Venus is very much alive and kicking, along with pictures, physics and science to back that up, of depicting as to what intelligent other life that's existing/coexisting has accomplished right under your brown noses.

However, if you're officially snookered (AKA <http://www.astr.ua.edu/keel/space/>) and summarily dumbfounded (meaning perpetrated cold-war brown nosed to death); What's there to "debunk"?

In my good book there's no question that we'd robotically orbited that physically dark and nasty moon, and as such having obtained as well as having processed those terrific Kodak moments while on the fly (had to, or else lose such film obtained images due to primary and secondary radiation).

There's also no question that our rather hefty Saturn-V deployed efforts couldn't have gotten our crews nearly to LL-1 within the amount of to/from time available, with everything else proceeding on towards that moon as fully robotic (at least that's the way it happened at first). After all, it's all about those unprotected EVAs that summarily suck and blow anything except the truth.

What stars are needed within those Kodak moments of more than sufficient DR when you've got that nearby and highly albedo reflective Venus to deal with?

Sorry folks, but that unfiltered Kodak film simply could not have excluded the likes of Venus, not even if they'd tried.

It seems as though others and I've been over and over this a million times, and of no matters how hard and/or how often they care to stipulate that we've walked upon that moon, there's simply no such replicated proof (the required physics nor their supposed replicated science simply isn't there to behold), certainly not via any hocus-pocus

Re: Apollo Trivia Question

fly-by-rocket lander and especially not even via those absolutely wussy retroreflectors that at best contribute fewer identifiable/(if any) photons than any of their Apollo impact craters that's subsequently coated with the vaporised remains of whatever we'd sent to it's demise. Besides, that naked moon of ours is simply physically dark and otherwise unavoidably too anticathode gamma and hard-X-ray lethal, not to mention double-IR roasting itself by day and/or as continually pulverised enough to vaporise salt into becoming that 9r worth of a sodium atmosphere. How end-user friendly do you folks actually think the cosmic influx and of that solar wind actually is?

Do you actually think and/or want others to perceive that such warm and fuzzy solar and cosmic influx is all that passive?

Do you folks expect others to perceive the raw/unfiltered solar illumination influx is exactly as though derived from the spectrum of a xenon lamp?

Is that moon of your's really exactly like the reflective guano island of Nauru?

Can you folks bother as to explain as to how or rather why Nauru is of UN status?

At merely an average of our moon having been on the receiving end of obtaining one wussy micron layer of dust per year, as unavoidably collecting from all of that available space debris, of meteorites and of their subsequent impact generated dust, plus from whatever's subsequently contributed via those horrific secondary impact shards; just how little dust should that moon have to offer, and how otherwise fluffy or whatever clumping or otherwise compacted should that supposedly old moon and of that fluffy moon-dust that's apparently none reactive, actually be?

—

Brad Guth

—

Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server – <http://www.Mailgate.ORG>

.