

## Re: LA-4541-MS

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2008-04/msg00269.html>

---

- *From:* BradGuth <[bradguth@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:bradguth@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 9 Apr 2008 08:31:01 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Apr 8, 10:01 pm, Willie.Moo...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

I said elsewhere that a tether gets you about 42% advantage when using chemical oxygen systems. Tethers don't make a lot of sense when you have really high specific impulses at high thrusts, as in nuclear pulse rockets like the one I've described here.

Does that mean tethers are useless? Not really, because there are scenarios where tethers make a big difference.

For example,

Say using nuclear pulse rockets you bring an asteroid to Earth orbit, put up a tele-robotic factory and build the tether and all the fixins on the asteroid, fragment left after processing and use it as a counterway. You then use nuclear pulse rockets to take the whole shebang to the moon, and lower it to the surface.

Now what?

The moon seems nearly devoid of water. So, we go to the asteroid belt again, and get an icy asteroid of an appropriate size, and send it to L1. We then dismantle the ice, and send it to the surface, then provide water for the lunar inhabitants and industry. It's a way to get MASSIVE quantities brought in at LOW gee down to the moon, that you don't want crashing into the moon, or find impracticably large to land on the moon.

Earth has more water than we know what to do with, so why bother with investing hundreds of billions and taking decades in order to bring an icy asteroid to the moon, or even into orbiting at any one of the L1, L2, L3 or L4 options?

Using any one of your energy efficient forms of a nuclear pulse rocket could deliver as many thousand tonnes of terrestrial salty water to our moon as needed, and according to your superior rant about using such nuclear pulse technology, as such it's all rather dirt cheap and 100% failsafe to boot.

Re: LA-4541-MS

.. – Brad Guth

.