

Re: SPACE PRIZE

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2004-07/2828.html>

From: Charles Buckley (*rijrunner_at_frii.com*)

Date: 07/25/04

Date: Sun, 25 Jul 2004 17:38:21 -0600

Renee Keller wrote:

> *"Greg D. Moore (Strider)" <mooregr_deleteth1s@greenms.com> wrote in message*
> *news:nkVMc.95019\$iJ4.34305@twister.nyroc.rr.com...*

>

>>

>>*BFD. What people really want is to get into space. If you limit the*
>>*possibilities you're only hurting yourself.*

>>

>

>

>

> *I don't know why you have trouble understanding this. Comercial Sea Planes*
> *have existed as long as comercial land planes. But you don't see nearly as*
> *many passangers for seaplanes. That is for a number of reasons. Nobody*
> *wants to have to drive to a lake or the ocean to take a plane. A Land based*
> *system has proven to be much more popular. It is also more popular for*
> *cargo. That is because of convience. If planes only developed in water, we*
> *would be as advanced as we are because it would be too costly to get*
> *landlocked stuff overseas. Now if we lived in the water, it might be a*
> *better way, but we live on land, so it must be close. Even if a water*
> *recovery craft did better, eventually it would have to be land based. The*
> *goal is to make that leap in technology NOW, not later.*

>

>

>

The point you are missing is that the driver here is **cost**, not technology. Why SSTO? Why HTHL? Why not TSTO RLV?

Who cares **how** the tech works as long as it is cheap?