

## Re: Ares vs DIRECT

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2007-12/msg00111.html>

---

- *From:* "Jeff Findley" <[jeff.findley@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jeff.findley@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 5 Dec 2007 07:19:02 -0500
- 

"Fred J. McCall" <[fmccall@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:fmccall@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:n06cl3ti8ostg7gno7kmgbasv4lll4io0h@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:n06cl3ti8ostg7gno7kmgbasv4lll4io0h@xxxxxxxxxxx)

As long as we keep Shuttle-derived vehicles we will keep the Shuttle  
'standing army' and the costs will stay high.

This is the best argument against any shuttle derived launch vehicle. A  
shuttle derived vehicle locks NASA into a system that has very little  
potential for future cost savings.

Jeff

--

A clever person solves a problem.  
A wise person avoids it. -- Einstein