

Re: Cost of slowing down?

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.shuttle/2005-10/msg00440.html>

- *From:* "Mike Dennis" <mapson@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 24 Oct 2005 23:49:50 GMT
-

"George Evans" <georgee3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:BF8184A1.B8F%georgee3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
> in article 42gn111deqe6dclfdc4si0d0drff0ludsq@xxxxxxx, Monte Davis at
> monte.davis@xxxxxxxxxxx wrote on 10/23/05 9:58 AM:
>
>> "Brian Gaff" <Briang1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>>
>>> I was wondering why the CEV was a larger version of Apollo type re-entry
>>> techniques. I eventually realised that it is in fact lighter and
>>> cheaper on
>>> all sorts of fronts.
>>>
>>> To get a Shuttle style heat dissipation working for the higher speeds
>>> of
>>> coming in from the moon, would be not only more difficult, but heavier,
>>> cost
>>> more to launch in the first place because of that, and presumably more
>>> vulnerable, as it will be exposed throughout the flight.
>>
>> Careful -- that line of thought might lead you toward the conclusion that
>> the
>> Shuttle was a "failure" not because of this or that design choice, but
>> because
>> bringing a sizeable vehicle rather than a capsule back safely even from
>> LEO is
>> *hard* and *expensive* -- much more so than we thought in 1969-1972, or
>> than
>> most have been willing to admit ever since.
>
> The concept of a flying reentry is a good one IMHO. While studying
> Columbia's ill fated reentry I realized, from an aviation perspective, how
> smooth and low stress a shuttle reentry *normally* is. It seems to be much
> more comfortable than a capsule reentry.
>
> A scaled down version of the shuttle, say of the size and weight of a CEV,
> seems ideal and I wouldn't be surprised if that is where things end up.
>
> The shuttle has been very useful. In science and engineering, failures are
> as useful as successes.

>

We have a winner! Very well said!

The funny thing is, if the shuttle had never have been built, all of the people bashing it here would be clamoring for it—promising the very same things it never delivered! It's easy to be a contrarian.

• *Follow-Ups:*

◆ *Re: Cost of slowing down?*

◇ *From:* tomcat

• *References:*

◆ *Cost of slowing down?*

◇ *From:* Brian Gaff

◆ *Re: Cost of slowing down?*

◇ *From:* Monte Davis

◆ *Re: Cost of slowing down?*

◇ *From:* George Evans

- Prev by Date: *Re: Cost of slowing down?*
- Next by Date: *Re: CEV a Step Backwards*
- Previous by thread: *Re: Cost of slowing down?*
- Next by thread: *Re: Cost of slowing down?*
- Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*