Subject: U.S. Building new nukes
Posted by Doitle on Wed, 09 Feb 2005 03:56:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I am not a barber,
I split no hairs.

You said 5 seconds so I think we're talking about liftoff here. Earlier we did mention it exploding high in the air. I didn't know exploding high in the air was a totally unique topic from exploding kinda high in the air.

Now, the shuttle is a completely different situation. The shuttle comes in very shallow because eventually it has to land on a run way lol. Airplanes don't come straight down and nose dive into a run way, but missiles do.

If a rocket explodes in mid air the debris come down according to the angle the rocket was traveling in. It's pretty much parabolic if the thrust is lost either through a fuel explosion or a seperation of thrust from the main rocket body. Now these diagrams assume no wind. The wind can only adjust the final ground distance by a bit however the results will in general be as follows. Now you'll notice I did a steep angle launch and a shallow angle launch. The steep angle launch would be what would be employed. A shallow angle launch is really more similar to an airplane take off which is what you encounter in the space shuttle disaster. Essentially it exploded while setting up for an airplane style landing. Our nuclear missiles will not be making 3 point landings so we should not have to worry about any shallow angle physics on them

Now,

You will notice that the rocket explodes and begins to decend, Accordingly that the explosion is at or near the peak of the parabolic flight path the same time to the peak will be taken to reach the ground. You will also notice the ground path traced is relatively small. There is nothing to compare this with other than perhaps the size of the rocket but the y axis is horribly trunctated... lol Assume this is a bit into the flight. It goes up, kablammo and down.

Now the next example,

You will notice in this example the path along the ground is noticeably longer. This would be the situation in a shallow angle launch. Similar to your Space shuttle analogy. However in the space shuttle example the shuttle would have been coming in on a relatively straight trajectory before the exposion. Upon the explosion the trend of a parabolic decent holds true. You will notice that because of the shallower angle there is a much longer ground path. This is how you get the swatch crossing texas in your picture.

If the shuttle had been coming in at a very shallow angle like a rocket on launch the pattern would have been something like as follows

http://www.n00bstories.com/image.fetch.php?id=1165075491

Now however, this would not be the case in one of these proposed launches. I was just trying to establish a basis so even if I can't convince, which I hope isn't true, but as a contingency on the basis that I can't convince you there is no spray of debris in the event of a failure of a launch.

It's actually no small feat to detonate a nuclear device. The atoms do not like being split and they hold onto their energy like a fat kid holds onto cake. Now, if a nuclear device were to be launched in the middle of a big prarie just outside YOUR TOWN, USA... *Bum bum bum*, what do you think would happen? There would be an explosion no doubt, a plume of fire from the remaining propellent, burning grass, a large crater from the force of the impact. Deep within your crater prolly actually lodged in the Earth, would be a pod. This is your war head. Without being Armed, you have a depleted uranium bullet without the depletion... It would sit lodged in the ground and do nothing to no one. Uranium is mad crazy hard and that is why we use it as a slug in the A-10. No body is going to build a missile with the uranium hanging out the side waving at school children. They build these things into their own little pod. Not only so the war head can easily be removed and replaced like how they build engines on fighter aircraft, but for safety. Nobody wants a big chunk of Gamma death sitting on a table in a lab, in the air or on the ground. That's why they put these things into containment devices. I'm sure you've driven alongside one of these in the back of an unmarked white semi truck or watching containers roll by on a rail way. Especially you Blazer being that you live in the Southwest. All Radioactive Routes lead to New Mexico and Nevada, and your 1/4th of the 4 corners right with New Mexico right? Your also right next door to Nevada.

Now when this device is to explode somewhere in mid flight. We will see a huge fire column of the propellent, we will see a hulk of metal and plastic come flying down and probably propelled by the explosion we'll see this little black luggage looking thing just sailing along. That is your war head. It could be dangerous if it lands on someone as that would surely be fatal. It would also probably wreck a house or car much like a tiny tiny asteroid. It would not spell nuclear death for half of Texas. The situation would be similar to if you've ever seen a Top Fuel Dragster crash. The fiber glass body breaks off, the wheels break off, and you are left with 2 things flying down the track, a human pod in a roll cage, and a 300MPH chunk of metal, the engine. The entire engine is set to rip away from the car and get far away. If you've ever seen it it's pretty cool, you see this thousand pound chunk of metal BOUNCING along the road surface because it has so much force. This is exactly what you have, a flying Engine block. lol... I hope I've quelled your fears for the destruction of our race by attempting to progress weapons technology.

This has been a Doitle production.

With NO THANKS TO THE CHUB GROUP... Way to bail on me guys...
