

Re: XCOR engines

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2005-10/msg01071.html>

- *From:* gregg <saville@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 25 Oct 2005 20:53:56 -0400
-

Rüdiger Klaehn wrote:

> gregg wrote:
>
> [snip]
>> I see no problem with lots of engine manufacturers at the "start". Yu can
>> get lots of good ideas that way. You'r emore apt to get good ideas form
>> many different manufacturers instead of just a very few.
>>
>> In time, market forces will weed out the list.
>>
> That is right. But I would prefer to see less half-baked engine
> development programs and more flying vehicles.
>
> I think there is much more room for innovation at the vehicle level
> than at the engine level. There are some decent engines available today
> (mostly russian ones though). But there are a lot of vehicle
> configurations that have never been tried yet that deserve a try.

Gotta have half-baked ideas in order to also have baked ones. No reason to throttle creativity.

No reason you can't have both engine and vehicle innovation.

Gregg

Replicas of 15th-19th century nautical navigational instruments,
Restoration of my 1919 Herreshoff S-Boat sailboat, and
Steambending FAQ with photos:

<http://home.comcast.net/~saville/index.html>

- *References:*
 - ◆ *XCOR engines*
 - ◇ *From:* Pete Lynn
 - ◆ *Re: XCOR engines*

Re: XCOR engines

◇ *From:* Rüdiger Klaehn

◆ ***Re: XCOR engines***

◇ *From:* gregg

◆ ***Re: XCOR engines***

◇ *From:* Rüdiger Klaehn

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Is Crew Launch Vehicle Too Big?***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: XCOR engines***
- Next by thread: ***Re: XCOR engines***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***