

gaetanomarano's FAST-SLV is not original

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2007-12/msg00496.html>

- *From:* behlingjo@xxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Thu, 20 Dec 2007 23:12:13 -0800 (PST)
-

On Dec 5, 7:17 pm, gaetanomarano <m...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 6 Dic, 00:03, behlin...@xxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Dec 5, 4:25 pm, gaetanomarano <m...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
That is where you completely wrong. The internet is not the only
place where ideas are published. Direct existed before your idea, it
was in the ESAS.

NOT TRUE AND NOT NOW
OFTEN, DOCUMENTS BORN FIRST ON PAPER, BUT, EVERYTHING PRINTED,
GOES ON
THE WEB IN A MATTER OF HOURS/DAYS
SO, THE WEB COULD NOT BE THE FIRST SOURCE BUT IS ALWAYS PRETTY
CLOSE
TO THE DATE THINGS ARE INVENTED/PRINTED

Boeing's refueling station existed long before you and Boeing put it on the
internet.

I HAVE THE EVIDENCE THAT I WAS THE FIRST AND MY EVIDENCE HAS 100%
VALUE UNTIL OTHERS GIVE THE EVIDENCE THAT I'M WRONG ... WITHOUT
ANY
EVIDENCE, MY PROPOSAL WAS/IS THE FIRST AND YOUR CLAIM ONLY A GUESS

Stumpy existed before it got on the internet

AGAIN, I'VE THE CLEAR EVIDENCE THAT I'M RIGHT AND I WAIT TO SEE
EVIDENCES, NOT GUESS, THAT I'M WRONG

Many studies never make it to the internet.

IF A STUDY IS NOT PUBLISHED ON THE WEB OR FIRST ON PAPER AND AFTER
ON
THE WEB IT DON'T EXIST
IF WE APPLY YOUR PRINCIPLE, ANYONE CAN SAY TO BE THE INVENTOR OF
THE
TRANSISTOR, THE PC, THE SHUTTLE, ETC.
PEOPLES THAT INVENTS IDEAS PUBLISH THEM, TALK OF THEM OR PATENT
THEM
(IF PATENTABLE) NOT ONLY "THINK" THEM
AGAIN, GIVE US CREDIBLE EVIDENCE OF WHAT YOU SAY

Publishing on the internet is not the same as copyrighting.

WRONG, PUBLISH ON THE WEB ACTUALLY IS COPYRIGHT OF TEXTS, IMAGES,
PROPOSALS, ETC. BUT IT'S NOT A PATENT
ALSO, IDEAS CAN'T BE PATENTED BUT THOSE WHO INVENTED FIRST
THOUSANDS
THINGS ARE WELL KNOWN

ABOUT "DIRECT" I POST HERE A TEXT THAT I'VE PUBLISHED ON THE DISCUSS
PAGES OF WIKIPEDIA BUT DELETED BY UNKNOWN USERS

DESPITE I DON'T KNOW THE PEOPLES THAT HAVE DELETED MY LINKS AND
DISCUSSIONS ON WIKIPEDIA, IT'S EASY TO UNDERSTAND THEIR GOALS AND
INTERESTS

A FEW DAYS AGO, I'VE UPDATED THE ARES-1 PAGE WITH THE LATEST NASA
SPECS OF THE ROCKET FROM MY ARES-1 ARTICLE

THIS IS THE LINK:<http://www.ghostnasa.com/posts/IMAGES/012ares.jpg>

THERE IS NOTHING ABOUT MY BLOG ON THE IMAGE, BUT "SOMEONE" HAS
DELETED
IT SINCE HOSTED ON MY BLOG

IF YOU WORK FOR SPACE COMPANIES, ROCKETS-LOBBYES, AEROSPACE
MAGAZINES
AND FORUMS YOU CAN SIMPLY WRITE MANY ARTICLES FOR WIKI (THEY
NEED FREE
WRITERS TO EXIST) THEN, SOON, YPU BECOME MODERATORS WITH THE
POWER TO
PUT HUNDREDS LINKS TO SOME WELL KNOWN COMMERCIAL MAGAZINES
AND FORUMS,
SUPPORT YOUR POINT OF VIEW AND THE POINT OF VIEW OF YOUR FRIENDS
AND
DELETE ALL THE CRITICS OR PEOPLES YOU DON'T LIKE SINCE SAY THINGS
YOU
DON'T WANT

THAT'S WHY "SOMEONE" HAVE DELETED ALL THE LINKS TO MY ARTICLES,
MY
CRITICS ON THE DISCUSS PAGE, THE TRUTH ABOUT THE GOOGLE X PRIZE

DIRECT IS NOT AN OFFICIAL NASA PROJECT NOR A REAL ROCKET BUT ONLY A
WORD&PHOTOSHOP PROPOSAL BUT, FROM OVER A YEAR, IT HAS A FULL
ARTICLE
AND SEVERAL LINKS ON WIKI AND NO ONE OF THE "INDEPENDENT" WIKI
"MODERATORS" HAVE DELETED THE ARTICLE ABOUT THIS PRIVATE, NOT
REAL,
NOT EXISTING, NOT NASA, NOT OFFICIAL CONCEPT

HERE THE DELETED WIKI DISCUSSIONS' TEXT (ALSO) ABOUT DIRECT:

==The "underside-LAS"==

"A SERIOUS EPISODE OF VANDALISM: SOMEONE HAS CUT THIS ENTIRE
SECTION
ABOUT THE ORION'S LAS"

this is an interesting alternative LAS design (the "underside-LAS")
that has several advantages (mainly "less mass") vs. the standard
tower-LAS and whose link (I think) should be added in the main
article:

<http://www.gaetanomarano.it/articles/020newLAS.html>

[[User:Gaetanomarano|Gaetanomarano]] 23:30, 14 August 2007 (UTC)

:no it should not, you have copied it from Klipper, see :
:<http://www.russianspaceweb.com/kliper.html>
:http://www.russianspaceweb.com/kliper_history.html
:Please stop spamming Wikipedia with your crappy website

"answer to the brave anonymous Wikipedia reader's question:"

"NO", the early Kliper design had a "SIDE"-mounted LAS like
those proposed in a NASA study and a Griffin's sketch you can see in
this NSF image:

<http://forum.nasaspaceflight.com/forums/get-attachment-big.asp?action...>

and discussed in this BAUT thread:

<http://www.bautforum.com/914200-post40.html>

while the last version of the (now deleted) Kliper had an Apollo-like
tower-LAS called ""SAS"" as clearly shown in the first image of the
link ""YOU"" posted:

http://www.russianspaceweb.com/kliper_history.html

my ""underside-LAS"" is a completely ""NEW"" concept (""NEVER"" proposed nor used in a spacecraft) that works like all rockets work and has many advantages (first of all: ""LESS WEIGHT"")

PS – if you want to see something that ""REALLY SPAMS"" the web and Wikipedia, just see the (non-NASA, non-official, unexisting, "Word & Photoshop", "cents & website") ""COMMERCIAL-ADVERTISING"" "Direct Launcher" ""FULL"" Wikipedia article + ""LOTS"" of texts and links in several Wiki space articles (that no one has ""DELETED"" so far...)

[[User:Gaetanomarano|Gaetanomarano]] 16:02, 15 August 2007 (UTC)
:Sorry but ""your"" proposals are "Word & Photoshop", there are no technical, concerning DIRECT you may have a look on August AIAA issue here<http://www.aiaa-houston.org/horizons>, where are your article on serious publication ? You're just jealous because your proposals looks awful and amateur compared to DIRECT ...

again, no signature nor IP address in your reply... how can that happen on Wiki? ...however...

1. both my "FAST-SLV" and the (similar but FOUR months LATER) "DIRECT" actually ARE "Word & Photoshop" proposals (like ALL "concepts" are) and Direct is not more "technical" just since it has some (non-NASA, non-official, non-tested) hobby-made calculations about thrust, Isp, payload, etc.

2. sorry, but, nobody can be "jealous" of a "Direct" since that (FOUR months LATER) concept has ZERO chances of success (I've no time, nor is this the right place, to explain you WHY) but I find not correct nor honest that some (self defined "independent", "free" and "authoritative") sources ALWAYS "forgot" to talk, review and post links about my (FOUR months PREVIOUS Direct) concept, as I've explained in this Google.Groups.Space thread:

http://groups.google.it/group/sci.space.policy/browse_thread/thread/5...

3. about the large press/forums/websites coverage of the (FOUR months LATER) "Direct" vs. the deleted links to my proposals and the insults I receive, that's why I've NOT a FAST-SLV lobby, while "Direct" actually ""IS"" a lobby that (recently) has (also) made "coming out" on a NSF thread:

<http://forum.nasaspaceflight.com/forums/thread-view.asp?tid=9367&post...>

[[User:Gaetanomarano|Gaetanomarano]] 11:42, 17 August 2007 (UTC)
:Again where is your article on serious publications like AIAA or SpaceReview ? About your awful "FAST-SLV", so the DIRECT guys have stolen your idea ? That's funny, your behavior is pathetic, you're just jealous because DIRECT is much more serious. BTW DIRECT is

gaetanomarano's FAST-SLV is not original

LV24/25 from ESAS NASA report, did NASA steal also your ideas ?

my dear (brave) anonymous "friend"...

"Q:" where is your article on serious publications like AIAA or SpaceReview?

"A:" while (in general) I doubt we can call "serious" all publications that HIDE some (disliked) sources about new ideas... if and when I'll have my own lobby, you'll see "LOTS" of "serious publications" about my proposals... :)

"Q:" the DIRECT guys have stolen your idea?

"A:" clearly there is no evidence of that and I don't know (exactly) how that happened, but everyone can judge by himself... :)

"Q:" you're just jealous because DIRECT is much more serious

"A:" again... nobody can be "jealous" of a proposal that has "ZERO" chances of success... :)

[[User:Gaetanomarano|Gaetanomarano]] 14:03, 17 August 2007 (UTC)
:you have forgotten the question about NASA ESAS' LV 24/25

my answer to the anonymous user's question:

in the past years NASA has evaluated (and rejected) DOZENS different (liquid, solid, shuttle-derived, EELV-derived, etc.) rockets for the ESAS plan

the rockets you refer (LV24/25) are two of a series of NEW "shuttle-derived" rockets to be designed from ZERO (exactly like the Ares-I and V) while my "FAST-SLV" actually IS a "shuttle rocket" since built with the SAME hardware of the Space Shuttle (standard SRB, ET, SSME, etc.) and WORKS exactly like a Space Shuttle (with a similar flight profile and payload mass) to allows a GIANT saving of time and money

that's why I've called it "F-A-S-T" SLV... and why in the article's title I've written "On The Moon in 2012" !!!

http://www.gaetanomarano.it/articles/005_SLVnow.html

it's clear that you don't like my proposals but you must actually read my articles to understand them

also, my proposal has a big advantage vs. (both) Direct and LV24/25 since in the same article (that clearly you have not read) I suggest to "resize the lunar mission" to launch it with a SINGLE rocket (to DOUBLE the number of lunar missions from two to FOUR per year!) while, if two FAST-SLVs will be used, each mission will be very "hardware

gaetanomarano's FAST-SLV is not original

rich" since the total payload of two FAST-SLVs should be around 180–200 mT

I think that you must ask the LV24/25 question to your "Direct Launcher" friends since "their" rocket has NOT the advantages of my FAST-SLV

but (most important) if they think that "Direct" is ONLY an "LV24/25–derived" rocket, WHY they call it "Direct"???

why they don't (simply) call it "the NASA LV24/25 rocket"???

why have they given a NEW name ("Direct") to a 100% NASA design that ALREADY has a name???

why have they "calculated" rockets parameters that NASA has ALREADY calculated and published in the ESAS plan???

why have they started a website called "www.directlauncher.com" instead of "www.NASAdesigned-LV24/25.com"???

why have they opened forums' threads with the "Direct" or "Direct 2.0" titles instead of "NASA LV24/25"???

why Direct-guys and its supporters talk EVERYWHERE of a "new" Direct Launcher instead of an OLD ...

Here is proof that "FAST-SLV" May 12, 2006 (http://www.gaetanomarano.it/articles/005_SLVnow.html) was not first.

http://pdf.aiaa.org/preview/CDReadyMJPC200...PV2005_3816.pdf

http://pdf.aiaa.org/preview/CDReadyMSPA03...PV2003_6411.pdf

http://pdf.aiaa.org/preview/CDReadyMSPACE0...PV2005_6666.pdf

The dates are from 2003 to 2005. Way before May 12, 2006

the full reports can be purchased

.