

Re: World's First Fuel Cell–Powered Train Locomotive Slated for 2008

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.energy.hydrogen/2004–08/0612.html>

From: daestrom (daestrom_at_NO_SPAM_HEREtwny.rr.com)

Date: 08/19/04

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 17:20:20 GMT

"Ian St. John" <istjohn@noemail.ca> wrote in message
news:31UUc.17753\$Z11.794323@news20.bellglobal.com...

> daestrom wrote:

>> "Ian St. John" <istjohn@noemail.ca> wrote in message

>> news:1PdUc.7972\$Z11.365730@news20.bellglobal.com...

> <snip>

>>

>> HSR just expands the radius of service territory somewhat by putting

>> more territory within an 'acceptable' travel time. But even then, it

>> cannot provide 'acceptable' travel time cross–continent, or even

>> half–way across the continent.

>

> Acutally that is theoretically possible with an evacuated or

> hydrogen/helium filled underground tunnels running trains at mach 9.

>

>> So a second infrastructure (wide

>> spread air travel) is needed for cross–continental travel.

>

> So your delusion is that air travel can make a cross country commute

> possible? Not even with the SST..

Jumping to all sorts of conclusions aren't you? I didn't say anything about daily *commuting* cross–continent. And what fool runs a HSR train for a commute of 30 miles? HSR merely expands the radius of service territory for passenger rail service. But not enough to be a viable transportation scheme on a continental scale.

It might have been interesting, if Europe wasn't divided after WWII would it still have chosen to develop its transportation structure the way it did.

If Europe was unified such that national borders with customs and travel restrictions hadn't been there, would rail service still have been the choice?

>

>> And with

- > > *that second infrastructure in place, HSR becomes redundant and falls*
- > > *into obscurity.*
- >
- > *The obscurity is your mental disease which seems to prevent any ideas*
- taking
- > *root. Very common in 'Rust Belt' America.*

Just like your arrogance prevents any new ideas from entering your mind. Like some details about how different conditions lead to different transportation infrastructures. But you'd rather just assume you're right and 'know it all' about a continent half a world away.

- >
- > >
- > > *If you study what happened to passenger rail service in the US in the*
- > > *'50's and '60's, you will understand more about service in the US.*
- > > *Look past some of the minor issues of union feather–bedding and*
- > > *antiquainted operating rules and examine *why* passengers started*
- > > *flying and driving instead of taking the train. What does HSR do to*
- > > *aliviate any of those issues? Nothing.*
- >
- > *Sure. I wasn't limiting my critique of the U.S. to mere ignorance and*
- > *arrogance. There is certainly a lot of corruption and political*
- sandbagging.
- >

Corruption and political sandbagging were not the major downfall of passenger service. That is why I told you to "Look *past*" those issues. But your closed up mind has already got an idea as to what caused passenger rail failure in the US and you can't possibly be wrong. So you can't even comprehend what I wrote.

- > >
- > > *Rail right–of–ways were well established before air travel. But with*
- > > *lots of cheap land for airports, the US airline infrastructure has*
- > > *been able to saturate the same geography.*
- >
- > *Mainly because U.S. trains had establihsed themselves as slow, noisy and*
- > *with no fixed schedule. Given the lack of progress in train technology,*
- > *being 'leapfrogged' by air is logical.*
- >

Nope. You are so mis–informed it's incredible. You're putting the 'cart before the horse'. The passenger service of the 40's and 50's was clean, reliable, on–time and comfortable. It only fell into disrepair and poor scheduling when passenger sales had *already* dropped off to air. Only *after* passenger–miles and revenue sharply declined did the passenger rail service become the shoddy system you describe.

Early airlines had to compete against quality rail service. They had speed on their side already. They added stewardesses to serve complimentary meals

and refreshments as an inducement. By adding 'creature comforts', they instilled the image that air travel was almost as comfortable as rail, only faster. The public preferred the speed over the more comfortable rail. Of course, if some government puppet had decided to go ahead with rail anyway, how would that serve the public better?

> > *As an example, I can drive*
> > *about the same distance to get to either a passenger rail station, or*
> > *a major US airport. From the airport, my choices of destination are*
> > *many more than from the rail station. So even if the rail were HSR*
> > *(with electric equipment), it would not be the preferred*
> > *transportation.*
>
> *non–sequitor. The same access pertains to the both. There is no need for*
> *'exclusivity' which is just your red herring. And comparing travel, the*
taxi
> *times are much shorter for trains(stations within the city vs airport way*
> *outside) and more comfortable.*

Perhaps in Europe. Perhaps if you live in the downtown area of the city. Again, your local experience is misleading you. Most US travelers do *not* live in the heart of the city. They are out in the suburbs. 'Taxi times' to rail station vs. airport is *not* 'much shorter' in the US.

If air can supply short and long distance transportation needs (where 'short' is 300 miles and 'long' is 2000 miles), while HSR can only supply about 800 miles (assume four hour travel at 200 mph), why maintain a vast network of railroad?

A comparison of a New York(Empire State
> *Building) to Washington DC (White House) came down to 10 minutes*
difference
> *in over three hours of travel using the current slow speed Acela trains.*
> *With real HSR the train would have won.*

Fine, now you have *one* corridor that is competitive with air. Problem is, we would need thousands of such corridors. With air travel, the cost goes up with each airport. But with rail, the cost goes up with each mile serviced.

Maintain a hundred expensive airports, –or– maintain a hundred less–expensive stations *plus* thousands of miles of track *plus* thousands of interchanges to allow trains to route through intermediate tracks. I suppose some country that pays for all that through the general tax fund would think the rail system is somehow 'better' while hiding the costs.

daestrom