

Re: H2 burner

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy.hydrogen/2008-06/msg00084.html>

- *From:* Williamknowsbest <William.Mook@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 14 Jun 2008 17:53:00 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Jun 14, 6:51 pm, Monkey Clumps <spacebrai...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jun 13, 10:31 pm, Williamknowsbest <William.M...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jun 12, 8:59 am, Monkey Clumps <spacebrai...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jun 11, 9:55 am, Williamknowsbest
<William.M...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jun 11, 12:02 am, "Spaceman"
<space...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

"Williamknowsbest"
<William.M...@xxxxxxxxxx>
wrote in message

news:ebe75388-e9d6-466f-a157-e0c8a403b07e@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Anyone
who visits
my web site
and fills out
the contact

Re: H2 burner

information
may request
information
including
such
photos.
<http://www.usoal.com>

Nice business.
Must be raking in money.
:)

--
James M Driscoll Jr
Spaceman

Its highly leveraged at present – so, like
Churchill I find I must
rely on allies I don't particularly trust or like!
lol. But we will
prevail, that's for sure.

Hey William, have you seen this paper?

<http://www.hionsolar.com/n-hion96.htm>

Please check out a more reliable source

http://gcep.stanford.edu/pdfs/hydrogen_workshop/Schultz.pdf

Thanks. Thats a very interesting link.

And accurate.

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

They describe a direct-thermal solar to hydrogen process where they achieved 1 to 2% efficiency.

Interesting. Thermal cycles using nuclear or solar sources have demonstrated over 60% efficiency. I have a hybrid cycle using sulfide/sulfate – that is 55% efficient.

The interesting part was the section near the end talking about efficiencies of various methods.

The Stanford paper is a more reliable source of information.

Probably more up to date. I don't remember seeing a date on the one I posted a link to, but apparently the state of the art has progressed since.

Obviously.

Apparently, the solar-to-hydrogen efficiency obtained using silicon photovoltaic cells and an alkaline electrolyzer is about 6%.

That efficiency has been achieved certainly. Is it the highest efficiency possible? No. As I said, I have a hybrid system that is 55% efficient, which is less than the peak of 60% – however, my system is the lowest cost per watt.

The conversion efficiency for a solar dish Stirling generator combined with an alkaline electrolyzer is 19%.

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

Stanford and General Atomics report 60% efficiency – my system is only 55% efficient, but has the lowest cost per watt of any other system.

The long term solar-to-hydrogen efficiency goal established by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory is 25%.

This was true 20 years ago. That value has been exceeded recently by more than double.

Now you come along and say you can achieve 55% thermodynamic efficiency

Yes. Its a hybrid cycle – involving BOTH eletrolytic process and heat with a sulfide/sulfate process.

with a device that is relatively inexpensive to boot.

Yes. The MEMs PV/Electrolysis 'dot' unit is 0.775 cents per square millimeter (\$547 per 300 mm wafer) and operates at 2500x solar intensity –which means a square meter of collector contains 400 sq mm and adds \$3.10 per square meter to panel system cost.

How much precision do you need to get the 2500X light beam to hit right on the little dot?

I'm at about 16% of the limit for this material.

How much precision is possible with a PET hot press molded shape?

Well, one can go through the relevant optical calculations, but since we can't even get heat engines right, around here, lets take another

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

route.

Consider a hot press molded package, or a blow molded water bottle. They're both very shiny, and smooth and attractive as packaging material because of that. PET is a preferred packaging material because of its optical qualities. This derives from their optically smooth surface. Plain polyethylene is dull by comparison – that's because the surface is not optically smooth. Obviously, they're precise enough.

I don't know the answer but that sounds like a potential design challenge.

Because you don't know, you can't really say – you are merely looking for roadblocks in an effort to sound smart – as a consequence you reveal your ignorance. On the positive side, you openly admit your ignorance which makes you easier to take than others who don't admit such, or worse yet, aren't even aware of what they do not know.

The lenses consist of 2 sheets of 100 micron thick PET hot press molded into lens shapes – and bonded together in a water bath to encase water – which is the lens medium. The focal point is inside the lens medium. The water also reacts at the dot when illuminated.

A square meter of two PET films each 100 microns thick contains 200 cc of PET massing 350 grams costing 0.15 cents per gram totalling \$0.53 per square meter. Water cost is nil. Total cost is \$3.63 per square meter. At 1,000 watts per square meter solar influx, and 55% efficiency, this generates 550 watts for \$3.63 – which 0.726 cents per peak watt.

This is just the cost of the solar panel. The entire system – runs on average \$0.07 per peak watt – which is expected to drop to \$0.02 per peak watt as volume increases.

Your efficiency is more than double the long term goal.

Long term goal 20 years ago has been doubled recently – you are absolutely right. I would suggest you read a more current, and more

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

reliable source of information – such as Stanford and General Atomics and current DOE literature.

This seems like a
huge breakthrough.

It builds on a number of improvements.

As long as you have your designs protected by patents, why don't you publish some results in a peer-reviewed journal?

They already have been published as you can see in my reference.

You say you don't like the allies you have to rely on.

They're the best ones I have – hell, sometimes, I don't even like my kids – that doesn't mean I don't love them and cherish them.

If
this breakthrough is real

Fuck you.

Easy killer.

No, fuck you for gratuitously calling me a liar. I have given you quality references and valid logic for every step along the way I have published in patent form much of my work and you out of the blue call me a liar. The only appropriate response to someone who gratuitously calls me a liar is fuck you – I mean you don't have evidence what I say isn't real. You feel discomforted by my claims. That's

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

understandable. That's your problem not mine.

You haven't provided any third party confirmation that your claims are true.

I have patents. How is the USPTO not a third party?

All we have is you saying that you invented this device that can do these things,

I have patents. Go to the USPTO web site type in Mook and Solar and see.

but there are no photos,

go to <http://www.usoal.com> and fill out the contact information and ask for photos I will send you some.

no test results,

I will send these, or you can review my patents which include test results of test units.

no articles anywhere.

<http://www.mitrais.com/mining/miningNews060818.asp>

Please see the 7th article from the top – I don't know why news organizations ignore me while giving obvious charlatans top billing – that's not my problem, and fortunately, I'm not dependent on publicity to fund my projects.

I would be a fool not to be somewhat skeptical.

You worry about being made out to be a fool – this is a common concern when dealing with new ideas. This is your problem, not mine.

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

That said, I *hope* your claims are true.

I understand, but just because you lack the innate capacity to figure this out for yourself does not give you the right to call me a liar.

you should be sharing the news of it with the world.

I have – the world has uniformly ignored it in the West. Not so in Asia.

People and politicians are hungry for this sort of technical breakthrough.

Yes. But not the major energy companies – which fund most of the research and direct most of the capital in the world.

I find it hard to imagine that the DOE wouldn't take interest in your invention.

They have. Sarah Kurtz came out about 10 years ago to my lab, and interviewed me, she offered me an SBIR grant for \$250,000 – I said I was spending \$250,000 per month – and didn't need that kind of money. She did set up the first CPV conference after talking with me – that only created a half dozen competitors – it didn't do much for me.

I would think that after a demonstration they would be throwing money at you.

Money is not an issue for me. Projects are.

The money DOE has to throw at me is very inadequate to my needs. Since I am pretty well off due to other inventions of mine (computer based cash register, sporting products, etc.) I really can't use the amounts of money they have to spend. I am at a point now where I am

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

sponsoring major energy projects overseas – which will result in the sort of business structure I seek.

If you want allies you need to let people know and convince them that this is real.

What would you suggest? I have done as you suggest.

No you haven't.

Yes I have.

Here is what I suggest: Post some photos and test results of the device on your website.

No, I have posted information in my patents – anyone who wants more must fill out contact information and I will send them information in response to such requests.

Demonstrate a prototype to some journalists

Why?

and get the story written up.

Why? When I invented my golf ball that changed color, I sent a single press release to the major newspapers, and the New York Times and Wall Street Journal and USA Today ALL published articles about it. When I signed a \$600 million deal in Indonesia creating the world's largest solar energy project to make oil from coal with zero emissions – every newspaper in Asia published it – NO ONE in the USA published anything. A reporter from the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal interviewed me for two days when I was in New York to talk to Chase about \$70 million loan against the project, and stories were written. Guess what? Both stories got pulled before they ran – much to the chagrin of the reporters who spent a few days interviewing

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

me.

What's up with that?

No one knows. No one has published anything about my efforts since then.

I find it hard to believe that something that could potentially be an important solution to the worlds energy problems would not attract the attention of western journalists.

I understand, but your beliefs are your problem, not mine, and not a sound basis to call me a liar.

Your claim that you have been uniformly ignored in the West only seems possible if you don't really have anything real to show them.

That's not true, obvious charlatans get half hour specials on the Science Channel – while my projects and programs get no mention at all. Obviously, workability is not a criterion for publicity. Plainly, painting everyone with an alternative idea as a crackpot or too expensive feathers the interests of major oil producers – while showing a feasible serious sober low-cost alternative obviously does not.

Hence my skepticism.

Your skepticism is based on your inabilities, so they're your problem. They don't give you a right to call me a liar.

A usenet newsgroup is probably not the most efficient forum to spread the word.–
Hide quoted text –

I am not here to spread the word – I am here for other reasons. One for example is to guage the level of ignorance among people who THINK they are up to date – people like yourself – before learning this is money meetings.

Re: H2 burner

10

Re: H2 burner

Funny, I never remember claiming that I was up to date.

So, you knowingly quoted figures you KNEW were out of date just to make it SEEM like my claims were outrageous? Wow. Now I know the kind of guy I'm dealing with.

I'm following
this stuff as a hobby in my spare time.

Your level of knowledge is on par with most people who are not expert in the field, but what I would call an intelligent layman. Investors, banks, and so forth, have similar concerns – they don't want to be made a fool of – and so, they come up with very similar objections. Objections I can't think of, but which you can. Answering your objections helps me answer serious objections that are equally ill informed. See?

I'm not claiming to have any
cutting edge knowledge of it.

Again, you waxed poetic about how impossibly highly efficient my system was compared to any reasonable efficiencies you've EVER heard of. That's pretty damning of me. It doesn't leave you much wiggle room. I mean, you NEVER even hinted that you might be wrong or that the information was out of date.

Obviously, 55% is less than the best thermo–electro–chemical water decomposition unit out there, and my claims of achieving it, are not impossibly high.

If you want to get people excited,

I don't want to attract negative attention from the majors. I spoke with Ed Rendell, Governor of Pennsylvania about a factory I was building in his State – employing 690 people. He got all excited by my vision of US energy independence. He flew to Washington to talk to the Democratic leadership about my vision. I was conferenced in on some very exciting calls. The very next day Lee Raymond, then CEO of Exxon went on Nightline and said this recent talk in Washington of the USA being independent of foreign sources of energy was poppycock! The USA doesn't have the resources to be independent at any reasonable cost – and the sooner the politicians in Washington understand that the better off we'll all be! Governor Rendell wanted to know what I

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

thought of this? I said if I owned 10 billion barrels of oil in the Middle East I would have the same advice for America. The question leaders have to ask themselves, is should we believe Lee Raymond's advice? In the following months from July through November, a large number of articles appeared in Forbes, everywhere, detailing all the 'reasonable' alternatives and why anything other than oil from the Middle East was ludicrous. Support evaporated.

I work with Accenture, they felt at that time that I had gotten just the faintest 'negative attention' of the majors. They helped arrange meetings with CEOs of Exxon, BP, Shell ... and their boards, and technical committees.. This resulted in ultimately me being invited to the White House and Capitol Hill. In the end, they're very concerned with market stability and the value of existing reserves to their stockholders. Fact is, the ability to convert 5.5 billion tons of coal and 1.2 billion tons of natural gas to 53 billion barrels of oil each year – to add to the 28.3 billion barrels of extracted oil each year – has the potential to undermine the value of the 900 billion barrels of oil reserves world wide knocking prices back to MY cost of production – which is \$8.57 per barrel. My cost since its higher than the cost of pumping oil out of the ground.

Now, at \$100 per barrel – 900 billion barrels remaining have a value of about \$90 trillion. At \$10 per barrel this oil has a value of about \$9 trillion. this \$87 trillion differential is subtracted from the CREDIT RATING of the oil rich kingdoms – and the major oil companies.

Their debt to equity ratio ranges from 30% to 70% – reducing the value of their asset base to 10% to 20% – would BANKRUPT ALL OF THEM IMMEDIATELY.

This concerns them and our government.

It is also a big stick our government could wield to get oil prices in line – hence the basis of what I urged the Congress and the White House to do back in 2004.

show
your invention and demonstrate to the public

Please read my patents

or the media

The Western media attended my press conference in Jakarta – they

Re: H2 burner

merely failed to publish it.

that it
works.

I am sponsoring 8 projects – I will be doing something this year that should garner some publicity.

Just you writing about it isn't enough.– Hide quoted text –

You misapprehend why I write here. I understand you'd like to believe and you feel foolish if I'm trying to fool you – but please understand that is your problem – I have no problems.

– Show quoted text — Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text — Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –