

## Re: Nasa's incompetent managers

**Source:** <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/sci.crypt/2003-02/1743.html>

---

**From:** DSCOTT ([daVvid\\_a\\_scott@email.com](mailto:daVvid_a_scott@email.com))

**Date:** 02/04/03

From: [daVvid\\_a\\_scott@email.com](mailto:daVvid_a_scott@email.com) (DSCOTT)

Date: 4 Feb 2003 15:24:51 GMT

[DAGwyn@null.net](mailto:DAGwyn@null.net) (Douglas A. Gwyn) wrote in [<3E3F564C.5070700@null.net>](mailto:3E3F564C.5070700@null.net):

>DSCOTT wrote:

>> I feel that the lazy managers who  
>> decided not to check for damage done to  
>> the wing of the shuttle should be fired.

>

>I suggest you wait until all the evidence is collected  
>before jumping to conclusions. Remember the white van  
>associated with the recent "Beltway sniper" incident?  
>Just because you have heard of some item at this time  
>does not mean that that item is necessarily the culprit.

>

I don't know what caused the accident. But the facts as laid out on various internet reports. Suggest the that much less attention to safety was done during this flight. It appears that when John Glen went up and there was possible minor damage they used ground based cameras to view it. I am asking directly why was this less important than when Glen went up.

>In fact early in the mission there *\*was\** a review of  
>the debris impact issue. So far no engineer involved  
>has said that it was likely to have had significant  
>effect on safety.

Though I have never seen a review at NASA I have seen so called expert reviews at my prior government work place I feel this whole so called review should be checked its quite possible it was just a bunch of managers deciding. I remember trouble at work with an encrypted database where (this makes it a tie in for this forum) was checked by so called experts. The experts where COBOL programmers with a large lack of internal UNIVAC skills. They determined it was not possible to easily break in. I had the S2K guy on base give me two such data bases and with FLIT showed how

to break the second in less than a day. Use of the term expert review could be just high level managers which know adays may not have the real engineering skill that use to be required but seem to be no longer necessary.

>  
>> *If they cared they would have checked.*  
>  
> *What do you mean, "checked"? EVA? Ground telescope?*  
> *The astronauts were not equipped with any means of*  
> *making tile repairs in any event. Further, the shuttle*  
> *can reenter safely with some missing tiles; it has done*  
> *so before.*  
>

The internet stated that such ground checks where down when Glen aboard why was not such checks done on this flight it almost seems like they didn't want to find damage. If you don't look you don't find it. I know they had no means of repair. But according to one source on the net an expert stated they could have taken a reentry oreination that would have lessened the stress on that wing. So to justafy not looking by saying there was asbsolutely nothing that could be done is a lie. You don't know till you try. They had weeks to even try sending a second shuttle.

I also don't buy they had no way them selves to check. Its possible since floating in space one may have gone out with just a rope. The point is they where never given the option. Management took that away and for that they should be fired even if the cause of crash is never found. How secure would you feel on next shuttle knowing the same guys would be in charge as the last time. I wouldn't want to be on it and I want to go to space I would not trust those currently making the desicions. I want a guy that fights for the safety of the people in space and one with a hard knockd engineering background..

This point really pisses me off. The argument the Shuttle can enter safely with missing tiles. Yes it has and it should have been treated as a warning. Meaning instead of blowing the problem off by assuming its safe. They should have listened to engineers that stated it was a dam warning sign. Yes by the grace of God it made it. They should thank there lucky stars it was not to many tiles or critical tiles that could have destroyed the craft. This time it appears it was critcal tiles. Know maybe they will fix the problme since appearantly mangagment like you pointed to fact it made it with a few missing tiles before maybe the engineers have so over designed it could make it if they all fell off. Its sad people have to die before managment can see how really serious the missing tile problem is. I suspect if nothing else the missing tile problem will get more funds

and at the very least if tiles still used not as many will fall off. It least this is my view and I suspect the view of many. I also think there will always be accidents but I hope in review process at least all involved did there very best to prevent it. And the point is again. Why did they not try to get additional data to allow a more informed desecion on damage as they appearantly did during Glens fligt. Instead of saying why bother there is nothing that could be done even if we knew the damage was major so why look. I still argue that not looking was a serious mangement failure and they should be fired even if its not the smoking gun. I still belive in my heart they didn't have cameras coving the entry since they knew it could break up and they really don't want to fing a smoking gun pointing at themselves. That my deep sad opionion.

>> *One expert even stated they could come in at an  
> > orientation that lessened heat build up on that wing.  
>  
>That is already the standard reentry profile.  
>*

WHAT ARE YOU SAYING? Are you saying they selected a profile that favored the one wing. Because the news I say said they could have if they suspected damage but they did not scince no damage was suspected.

>> *The managers didn't even have camera coverage for the  
>> entry phase.  
>  
>What, an array of cameras spread across the entire  
>reentry path? So you record a fuzzy bright dot  
>streaking past. What good would that have done?  
>*

It would give more information about the time line of trouble and the resulting break up. Surely your not arguing that less information is better?

>*"Theorizing in advance of the evidence is a capital  
>mistake."  
>*

Again I am not saying we know the cause. I am saying that not enough appeared to be done. That more could have been done is clear. They could have checked they chose not to. That hardly seems to go with the lip service "safty is job one". Again why did they not look in this case and they did look in Glens. If this is wrong that MASA should get there ducks together to explain this.

David A. Scott

sci.crypt: Re: Nasa's incompetent managers

--

My Crypto code

<http://cryptography.org/cgi-bin/crypto.cgi/Misc/scott19u.zip>

<http://cryptography.org/cgi-bin/crypto.cgi/Misc/scott16u.zip>

<http://www.jim.com/jamesd/Kong/scott19u.zip> old version

My Compression code <http://bijective.dogma.net/>

\*\*TO EMAIL ME drop the roman "five" \*\*

Disclaimer:I am in no way responsible for any of the statements  
made in the above text. For all I know I might be drugged.

As a famous person once said "any cryptograhic  
system is only as strong as its weakest link"