

Re: Establish demand

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2007-02/msg00935.html>

- *From:* "Ian Parker" <ianparker2@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 25 Feb 2007 08:11:01 -0800
-

On 25 Feb, 15:34, Fred J. McCall <fmcc...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"Ian Parker" <ianpark...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

:Probably what we would come up
:with would be Proton/Soyuz technology, some purchasing of complete
:systems and some licensing. Anyway that is what the management would
:have to decide. Private enterprise would also cater for the global
:market.

In other words, your 'free market' will pick a vehicle that was
created under socialism.

This in fact happens all the time. A company is mismanaged, goes broke
and its assets are then sold off. The Proton is certainly an asset.
Let it be sold.

:Why do we insist that space is developed by socialism? Why doesn't the
:US do what it constantly nags third world countries to do and have a
:genuinely open market?

Because there isn't enough demand to support a real 'open market'.

Nonsense. Demand will always find its own level. If there id no demand
why talk about new launcher facilities. IT JUST DOESNT MAKE SENSE.

:There is no need for new technology such as hypersonic aircraft to
:reduce launch costs. These would come down anyway with the demise of
:Socialism.

No, they'd go up. Everyone goes broke but Proton/Soyuz. Then they
jack up the price on you once everyone else has destroyed their
tooling.

Take a look at the Russian behaviour toward Europe with regard to

energy...

The argument about monopoly is always present in a capitalist system. In fact what I would advocate is the purchase of complete Soyuz/Proton systems. In that way Russian bureaucracy would be circumvented. It would be preferable from this viewpoint to have a private enterprise company launching payloads, rather than purchase it from Russia on a per kg basis. I am not in favor of getting rid of drawings, you always need the ability to compete.

What I would be in favor of is this. Remove all space launchers from national bureaucracies – Have 2 private companies purchasing IPR rights. This might be of the form of one lump payment or a per launch/kg basis. Then let competition start. The companies involved could decide on their policies. Proton/Soyuz/Long March are clearly cheaper than anything else. This might be better technology or simply reflect low labor costs. If the latter it might be an idea to build Ariane in Russia or China just as tea shirts are made there.

Companies would then have to think how they could expand their business. Attention to the customer is key to most situations. I am told that although Ariane is more expensive than Soyuz/Long March the bureaucratic restrictions are less. This is another characteristic of socialism, the lack of attention to the customer. Arianespace could be one company. Possibly Virgin Galactic could be another I don't know. If space tourism is viable it should be marketed. Private enterprise markets and tries to attract customers.

As far as energy is concerned Russia is charging the market rate. The thing to do is to reduce dependence on imported energy. Space is of course not like this. In energy you have a large market and a definite international price. In space governments and socialism have inflated market assessments. Socialism, I call NASA socialist and all the astronauts are good socialists in this regard, does not attempt to market, it does not have to stake its shirt on getting accurate market forecasts.

Your posting in fact convinces me even more of the truth of what I am saying. Space is not national virility, it is no different from any other business. If NASA cannot do a proper market forecast its bureaucracy should forfeit their shirts as they would anywhere else.

– Ian Parker

.