

Re: energy need to produce one litre of hydrogen?

## Re: energy need to produce one litre of hydrogen?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy.hydrogen/2008-07/msg00003.html>

---

- *From:* [hhc314@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:hhc314@xxxxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* Tue, 1 Jul 2008 12:47:56 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Jul 1, 2:23 pm, DB <a...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

hhc...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Jun 29, 11:13 pm, Robert Adsett <s...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article <54b51682-4c0e-4391-9a9c-4bda0e1c2893@

I won't defend the original poster. You are posting through Google groups I'll let you research it. It is in this thread, you can take it up with them. I merely quoted it as an indication that the question that was asked was indeed answered explicitly more than once.

Bob, please explain the connections that exists between posting through Google to Usenet Newsgroups has anything at all to do with reseraching a subject? You lost me with that statement. (First, realize that sci.energy.hydrogen is not a "Usenet Newsgroup".

Huh? How do you figure? I'm posting through my news.provider server. From here, true google groups are inaccessible to me.

Me Bad!

I was in a hurry. andsomehow I accidently inverted the meaning of what I was attempting to post. Thanks for that correction. since readers should be aware that all of the so called "Big 8" hierachies (rec/biz/gov/sci/mil...etc are Usenet Newsgroup hierarchies, not Google Groups. You can read and post to Usenet Newsgroup using the

Re: energy need to produce one litre of hydrogen?

## Re: energy need to produce one litre of hydrogen?

Google newsreader, but Google Groups are quite a separate thing.

I will agree with you that the Google newsreader is not the best possible way to read and post to Usenet newsgroups, and in particular there are some very bad features associated with posting to Usenet via Google. I chose it when TIAC, my original ISP, discontinued operation of their once very good news server, and Unix Shell Accounts. If you are old enough to recall the pre-Web days, you remember the technology in use during those years and how it operated without Netscape or Windows Explorer, and the only things that were required were ASCII access to New Server, and a computer that could run tin, trn, or the popular newsreaders that were in use during those years.

The technological changes improved some things, but diminished others. Good news servers became increasingly difficult to find, and while the cost associated with good 80,000 or so (I've lost count on the current total number of Usenet Newsgroups), with the transition of the Internet to non-technical users in the general market, the News Servers became, for the most part, unprofitable to commercially operate.

Now Google has an interesting history, and some of it is mysterious as to how they have pulled off what they have since the days when the Google search engine appeared. As best I remember, DEC (Digital Equipment Corporation) began archiving posts to primary Usenet Newsgroups (I stand to be corrected, but IIRC it was called "Deja-News"). It attracted very little popular attention or use, since who wanted to read stale Newsgroup posts from a limited number of Newsgroups years after they had been posted and long since timed out on the News Servers of that day? So, without going into the gory and somewhat mysterious financial details of the transaction, Google acquired Deja-News and based the Google archive site on this technology. Within a short time, Google managed to corner the Newsgroup archive marketplace, and by this time ... Not to belabor the point, other than to say that while the Google people are not great technological innovators themselves, they have a pure genius in business.

You cannot argue with success, but some of the Google etchics appear to push the envelope of acceptability. By that, I mean it is comparable to Al Gore's proclamation that he invented the Internet! :-) Google Groups are an example, where they are generating thousand of local groups at week, and working to make them indistinguishable to newcomers to the Internet from their archiving of Usenet posts. Like everything I have seen Google do over the past 10 years or so, it is sometimes difficult to perceive how they make a financial profit from each individual step in their evolutionary progress, but they do, and don't even share their secrets with their shareholders. As a shareholder in Google, I wonder what is coming next, but don't question the results.

I will say this about Google, except for their long term profit

Re: energy need to produce one litre of hydrogen?

Re: energy need to produce one litre of hydrogen?

motivations, I bet that Usenet would have vanished about 5 years ago. The fact that it hasn't is not a bad thing in my mind, because it is arguably the first and last Internet service in which individual ideas can be expressed, and dialogues exist, in science, politics, and you name it. Opinions flare on Usenet, because it is the only remaining global communications medium that allows it. In this respect, Google helps maintain it.

Interesting thing about Usenet is that while politicians employ it, they hate it equally to those confidence artists that promote scams. They hate it because on Usenet they cannot outshout some bright guy posting from some little home, who is otherwise of no consequence, and they hate Usenet because only here can a person shout: "The King Has No Clothes", and be listened to.

Blogs can be censored, but Usenet cannot.

A bit off topic I realize, but posted as food for thought plus a little history about the evolution of Usenet, and possibly a bit of educational awakening for the newby participants in the newsgroup.

Harry C.

.