

## Re: Northrup Grumman – CEV Prime

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2004-12/1021.html>

---

**From:** Ed Kyle ([edkyle99\\_at\\_hotmail.com](mailto:edkyle99_at_hotmail.com))

**Date:** 11/28/04

Date: 27 Nov 2004 22:02:49 -0800

Edward Wright wrote:

> "Ed Kyle" <[edkyle99@hotmail.com](mailto:edkyle99@hotmail.com)> wrote in message  
news:<1101537386.174529.203210@f14g2000cwb.googlegroups.com>...

>

> > *Musk's Falcon can launch a Gemini-class capsule.*

> >

> > *No it can't. The only flight-rated Falcon that SpaceX has  
> > completed (and that it has not yet attempted to fly) is rated  
> > to orbit less than 1/5th of the mass of a typical Gemini.*

>

> *I suggest you read the SpaceX web site.*

I did. It says Falcon can do 660 kg to a 200 km orbit  
from Canaveral. Gemini mass was 3850 kg. You do the  
math.

> > *There is talk of a bigger Falcon launcher, but I've seen no  
> > assembled hardware. Have you?*

>

> *So, that means it will never be built? You have some very strange  
> logic.*

No. It means that it hasn't been built. Which means  
that it might not ever be built. Do you believe  
everything that a venture capitalist says will happen,  
will happen?

> *Do you think computers still cost millions of dollars because that's  
> what UNIVAC cost?*

Some basic advances in technology (transistors and  
integrated circuits) allowed that to happen. No  
similar breakthrough advances in rocketry's base  
technology have occurred.

> *Let's see. Montgomery Wards went bankrupt. So, you must think all  
> department stores will go bankrupt, right? Therefore, unless NASA  
> builds a department store, all department store shopping in the US*

> *will come to an end?*

You've been shopping again, haven't you? :)

> > *The history of such private space program efforts is pretty*  
> > *consistent and can be summed up in one word: Failure. Failure*  
> > *on a scale that far outpaces NASA's failure rates.*  
>  
> *You must live in an alternative universe. When did private*  
> *enterprise*  
> *spend tens of billions of dollars trying to develop a Shuttle*  
> *replacement, with nothing to show for it?*

I don't know about "tens-of-billions", but regardless,  
at least you're noting that it is NASA, not private  
enterprise, that has a human orbital space launch  
capability to begin with. Fourth generation too.  
Private enterprise is on generation zero.

> *Why is SpaceShip One a failure? Because it didn't confirm your*  
> *preconceived notion that only governments can do it?*  
SpaceShipOne is not an orbital spacecraft.

– Ed Kyle