

Re: NASA@50

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2008-10/msg00026.html>

- *From:* Quadibloc <jsavard@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 2 Oct 2008 04:49:22 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Oct 2, 5:25 am, Quadibloc <jsav...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Actually, there is one flaw; one area where one size doesn't fit all. You do want to be able to vary one critical parameter – the size of the tanks, the mass of the fuel, relative to the size of the engine.

One could also suggest a hexagonal pattern, rather than a square pattern, for putting the boosters together – and the boosters themselves should have round, not hexagonal or square, walls for maximum strength with minimum mass. So the result would look less like OTRAG and more like the first stage of a Saturn 1-B.

Of course, what with concerns like...

rocket launches being meant to display a nation's technical competence,

space rockets also being missiles, and thus one not wanting to subsidize a potential adversary's military capabilities,

the difficulty of consistently carrying through, at all levels in a company, policies of product quality in a country where most people are desperately poor,

the fact that cost savings from cheap imports, although real to private individuals, are illusory on a national level, since the choice is between spending the scarce resource of foreign exchange versus the common resource of workers in one's own country who might otherwise be unemployed...

one can't **maximize** the cost savings of mass production by having the rocket engines for all American, Russian, French, and Japanese launches made by the same plant in China. Or even move down one step, and mass produce America's rocket engines in a plant in Mexico, because some of the objections still apply.

Re: NASA@50

John Savard

.