

## Re: Ares alternatives? "NASA renegades"

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.shuttle/2009-01/msg00055.html>

---

- *From:* Jochem Huhmann <joh@xxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Tue, 13 Jan 2009 23:05:49 +0100
- 

"Jeff Findley" <jeff.findley@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:

But if you want to launch that on current EELV's you will deliver at most 10 to 15 tons of equipment with one launch (since every single payload will need power and engines and fuel and more). Add to this the needed crews to assemble non-trivial stuff which you also have to launch and you end up with dozens or more launches, not two or three. This is just not practical.

This is how ISS has been assembled. So ISS isn't practical? Don't you think lessons have been learned from ISS which would make in orbit assembly easier for future projects?

It was possible for the ISS, but was it practical? A heavy launcher could have launched more than the ISS with two launches, saving enormous amounts of overhead and time. And ISS is not a spacecraft and has no lander.

You'll have to launch modules that are assembled and tested on the ground and which don't need any manual work to join them.

Not true. Mir and ISS have shown otherwise.

How many years are you willing to take to assemble your spacecraft?

Jochem

—

"A designer knows he has arrived at perfection not when there is no longer anything to add, but when there is no longer anything to take away."  
– Antoine de Saint-Exupery

.