

Re: We can meet all our needs through space development

Re: We can meet all our needs through space development

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2008-01/msg01019.html>

- *From:* Willie.Mookie@xxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Wed, 30 Jan 2008 12:08:16 -0800 (PST)
-

On Jan 30, 9:44 am, Ian Parker <ianpark...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 30 Jan, 12:18, Einar <eina...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jan 29, 2:13 pm, "Mike Combs"

<mikeco...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"Einar" <eina...@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:b8db2464-6d7e-47c1-b641-870a89468e4e@xx

This sounds more like one would hope that
the world at 2099
might be like.

Write a schy fy book on this, a suggestion.

It will most certainly remain a very-distant
science-fiction-y concept for
as long as we choose to view it as such.

Re: We can meet all our needs through space development

Regards,
Mike Combs

By all that you hold dear on this good Earth
I bid you stand, Men of the West!
Aragorn

Now, SpaceX is still struggling with their rocket, Ares is in development problems...and yet those are a lot less ambitious than what is suggested here something with 500 ton LEO capability.

It's plans like these with everything assumed to go right that aren't believable.

I don't understand Ares. How is it that almost 40 years ago Armstrong and Aldrin went to the Moon on top of a Saturn 5? In what respects is Ares "better" than Saturn? Certainly not in \$/Kg.

– Ian Parker– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

Its a function of the amount of money spent and how wisely it is spent.

I have given you my ideas here. Einar says they're not believable and compares what I have proposed with something on a whole different order – apples and oranges.

Saturn V cost \$9 billion and 6 years to develop – using results of DOD programs on the E1/F1 and J2 engines with 13 vehicles built and flown.

I propose taking an ET sized airframe propelled by an annular aerospike engine, with an RS-68 pumpset (3) in each engine – to produce a ET sized booster– stretched 40% – massing 1,000 tons at lift off, creating 1,400 tons thrust at lift off – operating 7 at a time to create a three stage operation to loft 500 tons to LEO. They will have an advanced thermal protection system and be fully recoverable with downrange tow planes picking up the pieces.

I estimate that this program will cost \$6 billion to complete in 4 years and result in 4 vehicles that put 500 metric tons into orbit each launch at a cost of \$70 million (\$10 million per element per

Re: We can meet all our needs through space development

Re: We can meet all our needs through space development

flight)

Why does this seem infeasible? What specifically is infeasible about it?

.