

Re: What else could you do with the Stick?

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2005-11/msg00096.html>

- *From:* liform1@xxxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 5 Nov 2005 13:44:08 -0800
-

Brian Thorn wrote:

> On 4 Nov 2005 21:01:07 -0800, liform1@xxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:
>
>>> >Wow, Russia : our international space partners, no less!
>>>
>>> ...who still won't tell us what the hell happened on Soyuz TMA-6...
>>> who announced that our astronaut on ISS doesn't have a ride home
>>> unless America pays up... who haven't bent metal for any of their
>>> promised Space Station modules since Piers... and of yes, proclaim
>>> they fully support Iran's nuclear program. Don't ya just love 'em?
>>
>>I fail to see the relevance to launch costs and ISS life support.
>
> Demonstrates that reliance on Atlas 5 (which in turn relies on the
> Russians) may not be the smartest move.

I was referring to your comments, which offer nothing but opinion.

>>>> Delta IV:
>
>>> ...and Boeing manage to get funded only because they stole LockMart
>>> pricing data to "win" the government contract, and can't sell a one of
>>> 'em today except to said government, which is only buying it because
>>> they don't dare be dependent on the Russians for space access.
>>
>>I also fail to see any relevance to launch vehicle performance.
>
> Straight to the point: Its a lousy rocket. Overpriced and underpowered
> with launch preparation history (delays, delays, delays...) more
> reminiscent of the Titan IV than its namesake Delta.

More opinions, based on a few launches of a brand new rocket.

You have lost your credibility with me.

>>> Hoo boy! Now THAT's a testimonial!
>>
>>Whatever it is, it isn't rocket science.

Re: What else could you do with the Stick?

- >
- > It's rocket engineering, and bad engineering at that.
- >
- >>> There's only one Stick variant, and yes it uses SSME. If you have that
- >>> basic premise wrong, why again should I accept your assertions about
- >>> it?
- >>
- >>It comes with I program I fully intend to actively get cancelled.
- >
- > You may get your wish, but you'll need to demonstrate a stronger
- > command of the facts if you seek to be taken seriously.

Rocket science isn't about facts, nor is it about your opinions.

I suggest you go back to square one :

<http://www.av8n.com/physics/scientific-methods.htm>

The only facts that exist are in your simpleton mind.

- >>No, I have nothing against the SSME, I fully intend to fly them well
- >>into the future, it's the throwing away and shipping all the way to
- >>UTAH thing I have against the ESAS.
- >
- > Why, exactly? Freight trains are relatively cheap and dependable. Why
- > spend a small fortune to build a rocket factory at the Cape?

To reduce launch costs. I said nothing about a 'factory', just building them onsite.

- > EELVs are
- > built in Colorado and Alabama, not Cape Canaveral. Labor is cheaper in
- > Utah than in Florida.

Florida is overrun with tourists who have more of an appreciation for space and rocket science and methods than you apparently do.

- >>I generally think SRBs are
- >>primitive ape man technology, and certainly their continued use won't
- >>improve reliability, launch costs or technology.
- >
- > "Generally" is right.

Glad you agree.

- > The Shuttle SRB is no ordinary solid booster.

What, it uses extraordinary solid fuels, does it.

- > It is a highly sophisticated rocket, complete with thrust vectoring
- > and with thrust which varies throughout the flight profile. And by the

Re: What else could you do with the Stick?

Re: What else could you do with the Stick?

- > way, it has worked perfectly the last 176 times it was used in flight
- > (88 Shuttle flights, each with 2 SRBs since Challenger.)

Once an ape man and an ignorant american redneck, always ...

- > You're the one demanding we not throw away what works. SRB works.

Sure, if you like to get less than half way to orbit.

- > > I prefer the boat. It would be even better to manufacture the rockets
- > > at the launch site.
- >
- > Then you'd need two manufacturing sites... one for Vandenberg and one
- > for the Cape.

I'm not planning on building another Delta IV manufacturing plant, I'm just proposing to fly the hell out of the one that Boeing already has, like an airline, for instance. Boeing supplies the vehicles for me, I fly them. I'm planning on building an entirely new SSTO. I just need the Delta IV Medium for the experience building process, and to facilitate an orderly transition from STS, ISS, EELV to SSTO without completely destroying the expensive infrastructure that we have already created. Every passing day my job becomes more difficult, by the time this completely corrupt and fraudulent administration becomes history, the damage they have inflicted on my country will have become extreme, but I'll keep trying anyway, without your assistance, because it's the right thing to do. Meanwhile, you'll keep posting nonsense on the usenet for many years to come.

- > > > That will surely reduce launch costs in the future!
- > > >
- > > > Yeah, like EELV has done so much in that effort. Two! Two EELVs for
- > > > the price of... er, the two LVs they replaced.
- > >
- > > They're better than the shuttle, and I have a lot of missions I need to
- > > fly on the shuttle.
- >
- > Actually, every time someone tries to come up with an EELV-based
- > replacement for the Shuttle, the numbers end up showing the Shuttle is
- > better, at least for the ISS support mission. That isn't surprising,
- > since Space Station support is what Shuttle was originally designed
- > for.

The shuttle has several intractable design flaws. I'm just proposing flying it out to finish the ISS without dissing our international space partners, to finish the ISS for space tourism and life sciences (plants, not humans), and in support of SSTO and RLV demonstration.

- >
- > > No, VSE and ESAS is the end of spaceflight, in America, at least.
- >
- > Why? Which part of it, exactly, is impossible with existing technology

Re: What else could you do with the Stick?

Re: What else could you do with the Stick?

> and budgets?

None of it is impossible, just foolish.

> And what part of VSE makes SpaceShipTwo and its brethren
> impossible?

Nothing, except the complete cessation of manned orbital spaceflight
that it will cause.

You have nothing credible of offer but opinions <plonk>. God, that felt
good. I need to get shitheads like you with your shitty ass opinions
out of my life. How long have you been posting on sci.space.policy?
What exactly have you accomplished?

• **References:**

◆ **What else could you do with the Stick?**

◇ *From:* Allen Thomson

◆ **Re: What else could you do with the Stick?**

◇ *From:* lifeform1

◆ **Re: What else could you do with the Stick?**

◇ *From:* Brian Thorn

• Prev by Date: **Re: What else could you do with the Stick?**

• Next by Date: **Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05**

• Previous by thread: **Re: What else could you do with the Stick?**

• Next by thread: **Re: What else could you do with the Stick?**

• Index(es):

◆ **Date**

◆ **Thread**