

## Re: Size of the proposed "new" space vehicle?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.shuttle/2005-10/msg00138.html>

---

- *From:* "Mike Dennis" <[mapson@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:mapson@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 08 Oct 2005 13:10:45 GMT
- 

"tomcat" <[jlavine@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jlavine@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1128724193.036712.137300@xx](mailto:news:1128724193.036712.137300@xx)  
> Jeff Findley wrote:  
>> You're horribly delusional. Try looking at the X-33 program and tell us  
>> again how quick and easy it would be to build a "triangle spaceplane".  
>> Part  
>> of the problem with such a design is the shape of the fuel tanks, which  
>> is  
>> exactly where X-33 had some serious problems. More time and money might  
>> have fixed those issues, but the program was cancelled because of the  
>> reluctance to throw good money after bad.  
>>  
>> Jeff  
>  
>  
>  
> Delta Clipper had a problem with the fuel tanks, one that could easily  
> have been solved if NASA had tried.  
>  
> Let's not make building a spaceplane out to be more than what it is.  
> The hard R&D work has been done with the Space Shuttle.  
>  
> The Shuttle proved the waverider concept, the H<sub>2</sub>/lox SSME, glideslope  
> technology, crew adaptability to space, and general space engineering.  
>  
> When SSTO HTOL's were first being designed, during the 70's, everything  
> was up in the air. So, financial backing was lacking. These SSTO HTOL  
> designs didn't fail — they were never built.  
>  
> Was hypersonic plasma really hot? Will waveriders really ride the  
> wave? Can rocket engines be relied on? Should jets, scram jets, and  
> then rockets be used sequentially? Can pilots really fly hypersonic  
> vehicles? Will there be surprises in Outer Space?  
>  
> In addition a lot of technology was lacking in the 70's. Titanium  
> could not be easily worked or machined. Computers were crude by  
> today's standard. (In fact, the apollo capsules used coded paper tape  
> instead of computers to save weight.) Composite was unheard of outside  
> classroom speculation. Fly by wire technology didn't exist until the

Re: Size of the proposed "new" space vehicle?

> F-16.

>

>

> Today, we can build everything except the surface skin using tried and  
> true off-the-shelf technology. Not a small advantage over the 70's!  
> And, with regard to surface skin, we can always fall back on ballistic  
> nose cone technology: Corelle on top of reinforced carbon carbon, over  
> metal plate. Add a vacuum bottle design, a little cryogenic cooling  
> with a nomex interior and the heat problem should be solved.

>

> There are several things going on at NASA and elsewhere in the  
> government that muddies up the water. The 'rocket people' are fighting  
> the 'aircraft people'. The 'military people' are fighting the 'NASA  
> civilians'. And, everyone wants to keep their jobs.

>

> Some view NASA as a spectator sport like baseball and football. They  
> believe people want to watch the roman candles lift off from gantrys,  
> not take off from runways. Most influential people don't see  
> interplanetary voyages, or even Moon missions, as practical. Just so  
> much showmanship to be kept at a slow, economical pace.

>

> Then you have the 'Deep Black' Generals hidden deep within mountain  
> bunkers, separating America's 'real' technology from the . . . NASA  
> circus acts.

>

> Controlling technology so great that even Aliens shake and shiver,  
> these 'shadow czars' rule with an iron fist, slowly turning America  
> into a double country: the Eloi, and the Morlocks. The Eloi dance  
> around in innocence while morlocks lurk beneath the surface making all  
> manner of . . . deals.

>

> Heaven forbid you ever meet these shadows. You might offend one and  
> burst into flames, leaving only a stain on the concrete. Note: See  
> "Men In Black" by Steven Spielberg.

>

> What is true here and what is fiction I don't know. But the  
> performance of the X-33 doesn't mean diddly, or say anything about  
> America's technology. Best to use good common sense.

>

> If you can build something with off-the-shelf tried and true parts ---  
> then go ahead and build it because it is bound to work.

>

OK, dude. You've had your chance. This isn't the space fantasy group.  
\*\*plonk\*\* (Another bites the dust...)

.

Re: Size of the proposed "new" space vehicle?

- **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **Re: Size of the proposed "new" space vehicle?**  
◇ From: tomcat

- **References:**

- ◆ **Re: Size of the proposed "new" space vehicle?**  
◇ From: Mike Dennis
- ◆ **Re: Size of the proposed "new" space vehicle?**  
◇ From: tomcat
- ◆ **Re: Size of the proposed "new" space vehicle?**  
◇ From: Jeff Findley
- ◆ **Re: Size of the proposed "new" space vehicle?**  
◇ From: tomcat

- Prev by Date: **Re: NASA Administrator Agrees With What Many Critics Have Been Saying for Years**
- Next by Date: **Re: How many times did space shuttles retrieve satellites from orbit?**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Size of the proposed "new" space vehicle?**
- Next by thread: **Re: Size of the proposed "new" space vehicle?**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **Date**
  - ◆ **Thread**