

Re: >>> the (NSF's Direct-like) new-uplink.forum's "experts" STRIKE BACK (now with "their" ARES-H) >>>

Re: >>> the (NSF's Direct-like) new-uplink.forum's "experts" STRIKE BACK (now with "their" ARES-H) >>>

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2008-08/msg00385.html>

- *From:* BradGuth <bradguth@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 24 Aug 2008 12:15:43 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Aug 24, 10:05 am, gaetanomarano <m...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

.
despite they've deleted my forums' accounts from january 2006...
(both) NSF.direct.lobby.com's and new-uplink.space forums' "self-styled experts" seems STILL look at my website and my blog for some good ideas... :)

the first was NSF with the (FAST-SLV-like but FOUR months LATER)
"Direct" launcher... as explained (with new and strong evidences) in
this article:<http://www.ghostnasa.com/posts/033directstruestory.html>

and now is the new-uplink.forum's time with "their" ARES-H concept:

<http://www.space.com/common/community/forums/?plckForumPage=ForumDisc...>

the "ARES-H" concept and launch architecture looks pretty close my
"AresX" rocket first published 15 months ago in this May 20, 2007
article:<http://www.gaetanomarano.it/articles/029aresX.html>

however, I appreciate very much the effort the uplink.forum's
"experts" made (at least) changing my "X" with an
"H"... :) :) ...and, of course, the "ARES-H" (like the died-at-birth "Direct") is just a BAD copy of my idea!

my AresX concept was (mainly but not only) suggested to SAVE very much
R&D time and money and hardware costs, developing just ONE rocket (the
bigger AresX) to carry an entire (and bigger) lunar-convoy unmanned to
LEO

then, the crew should be launched with a (very much cheaper) COTS
manned capsule (like the SpaceX's Dragon or an human-rated Orbital's
Cygnus) to fully delete the Ares-1 rocket and SAVE very much on R&D
costs!

Re: >>> the (NSF's Direct-like) new-uplink.forum's "experts" STRIKE BACK (now with "their" ARES-H) >>>

Re: >>> the (NSF's Direct-like) new-uplink.forum's "experts" STRIKE BACK (now with "their" ARES-H) >>>

while, the new-uplink.forum's "experts" suggest to still develop and build a resized Ares-L111 and use TWO Ares-L111 per lunar mission!!! ...one to launch the Orion and half the propellents, the second to launch the SM and the further half amounts of propellents!!!

that means to (at least) double the costs (the bigger Ares-H + TWO Ares-L111 for each mission!!!) and increase by 50% the risks of failure (three rockets per mission that need to have a perfect and no-delays launch, rather than two ESAS launches)

particularly useless and absurd in the "ARES L111" (why that sounds pretty much like MY "Ares 33"???) launch architecture is the SECOND Ares-L111 launch to just send a further 4 mT propellents' refuel to the Orion!

also, this twin-Ares-L111 launch architecture needs TWO Orion's SM main (Shuttles' OMS-derived) engines to work... one to move the Orion and another to move the SM while in orbit (that needs TWO orbital navigation systems, too...)

using an AresX-class (sorry... an "Ares-H"...) bigger-payload rocket, it's clearly simpler to carry that extra-propellents in small tanks put between the EDS and the Altair... like suggested in this ghostNASA article:<http://www.ghostnasa.com/posts/011orbitalrefuel.html>

of course, also the new-uplink.forum's guys (like happened on NSF's with the Direct-guys) think, believe and say that they're "experts" just because they add some "hobby-level" Delta-V calculations to "their" (original...) rockets concepts... :)

"calculations" and "experts" always debunked and demolished by NASA engineers... like happened with the Direct-concept/guys... :)

.

Clark/"Me"/Jim/Charlie/me2/

ImnotadirectguybutIloveit/"n"othernicknames' comment: "clueless and non viable" ...or... "I know that the "Ares-H/Ares-L111" concepts (like "Direct"...) was held in a secret drawer from 1997 ...but (sorry) I can't give any evidence of that..."

.

NSF and especially of the Canadian uplink.space.com sites are deathly afraid to rock that Zionist/NAZI DARPA boat, that which NASA keeps afloat with our hard earned loot.

Did you take any notice the latest two fiascos, of their "Photos of crashed Orion test capsule" as reentry via parachutes and that most recent of their NASA test rocket explodes (ATK's ALV X-1) , and as to

Re: >>> the (NSF's Direct-like) new-uplink.forum's "experts" STRIKE BACK (now with "their" ARES-H) >>>

Re: >>> the (NSF's Direct-like) new-uplink.forum's "experts" STRIKE BACK (now with "their" ARES-H) >>>

why is mainstream media not giving this kind of spectacular and spendy events full televised coverage?

Why is our mainstream media buying along with the usual DARPA/NASA provided context of damage-control?

Clearly one of the ATK's ALV X-1 flight control thrusters wasn't working, but all others seemed to be functioning. So why terminate their flight so close to the ground?

Clearly the multiple chute deployed method of performing a safe and reliable deorbit/reentry technology "Photos of crashed Orion test capsule" is simply too complicated for our NASA to cope with. But still without having a viable fly-by-rocket lander or something better than shuttle, what other as-built alternatives do we have?

btw, what's the all-inclusive cost of their latest "ATK's ALV X-1", plus payloads and collateral damage fiasco? (in billions of dollars?)

~ Brad Guth Brad_Guth Brad.Guth BradGuth

.

Re: >>> the (NSF's Direct-like) new-uplink.forum's "experts" STRIKE BACK (now with "their" ARES-H) >>>