

Re: NASA's vision lost on Web generation

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.shuttle/2007-01/msg00035.html>

- *From:* "Jim" <me@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 2 Jan 2007 22:04:59 -0600
-

"Paul F. Dietz" <dietz@xxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:q66dnaurbJIm9gfYnZ2dnUVZ_sWdnZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxx

Jim wrote:

Yes, the shuttle was oversold; so what?

Your great concern for the taxpayers is noted.

I am a taxpayer. I am concerned. I am also a proponent of the space program.

Has it not contributed to the greater good?

Wasting resources doesn't contribute to the greater good.

What resources were wasted? I know for a fact that microgravity research has contributed to resourced management. Medical research has furthered earthbound medical research. Other benefits have been garnered from the program as well.

Could we have built the ISS without it?

What makes you think ISS was a good thing? It's primary accomplishment is to make (by comparison) the shuttle seem like a model of good policy.

Oh? What about Soyuz? What about ESA? Japan? Other international partners as well use the station for research. Soyuz spacecraft have been docked to the station constantly.

Re: NASA's vision lost on Web generation

Keep in mind when NASA realized that the shuttle could not live up to expectations billions of dollars had been spent.

NASA managers knew they were lying from the get go. They cooked the books to make the case for shuttle.

Proof? Citations?

Eventhough it fell short, it could meet some of the demands.

Shuttle had no chance of being economically rational. Its purpose was to keep the iron ricebowl filled at NASA and the contractors.

Again proof? You think that the only reason the shuttle was engineered was to produce financial gain? Then the same must be true for Meceruy, Gemini, and Apollo. What about Voyager? Pioneer? New Horizons? The mars rovers? And the others.

Who determined that the shuttle was oversold? It was the Rodgers and Gehman (I lilely misspelled that) commissons that limited the shuttles effectiveness. Those commissons determined the eventual demise of the STS program. (another discussion thread).

Who determined? Anyone who compared the promises to the actual performance.

And, no, the commissions did not make it fail, they merely recognized its failure. It could not fly at a rate that would allow it to achieve

Then why are not 737's grounded when one crashes. Why are not airline's management practices scrutinized. NTSB airline crash reports rarely mention schedule pressure, and management style as contributing causes, when, in fact, the Delta crash at DFW (the L1011 the crashed due to microburst in a thunderstorm) was due to the pilot continuing into a storm to minimize hold time (management pressure to conserve fuel costs and minimize schedule delays). Delta flights were not grounded for 2 years while a Presidential comission scrutinized everything from maintainence to management. Airline deaths exceed the number of americans lost in the Iraqi war. NASA deaths in spacecraft number 17.

competitive operational costs, much less pay back the development cost.

Competivie? Only recently have ELVs come online that can match the shuttles payload capability. But the ELVs don't have humans who can go outside and

Re: NASA's vision lost on Web generation

make repairs. Reference retracting the P6 solar panels.

BTW, it was a public admission of programmatic failure when they capped the initial production of orbiters at four. This long preceded any of the accidents.

How do you arrive at that conclusion?

Also, what is so wrong in keeping jobs?

Ah, the plaintive bleat of the tax-fattened parasite. What's wrong is that the taxpayers should keep their money, not pay for useless makework.

Do you revert to name calling to make your point? Or are you just insecure?

Paul

Jim