

Re: H2 burner

## Re: H2 burner

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy.hydrogen/2008-06/msg00097.html>

---

- *From:* Monkey Clumps <spacebrain71@xxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Sun, 15 Jun 2008 12:26:31 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Jun 14, 8:53 pm, Williamknowsbest <William.M...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

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@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:ebe75388-e9d6-466f-a157-e0c8a403b07e@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Re: H2 burner

Anyone  
who  
visits  
my  
web  
site  
and  
fills  
out  
the  
contact  
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?

Re: H2 burner

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

Please check out a more reliable source

[http://gcep.stanford.edu/pdfs/hydrogen\\_workshop/Schultz.pdf](http://gcep.stanford.edu/pdfs/hydrogen_workshop/Schultz.pdf)

Thanks. Thats a very interesting link.

And accurate.

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.

Re: H2 burner

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%.

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

Re: H2 burner

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 route.

This isn't an optics issue its a manufacturing issue. What kind of tolerances do you need and what kind of tolerances can the process provide with mass production.

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 polyethelyne is dull by comparison – that's because the surface is not optically smooth. Obviously, they're precise enough.

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

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.

Re: H2 burner

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

Re: H2 burner

Easy killer.

No, fuck you for gratuitously calling me a liar.

Bill what crawled up your ass? Qualifying my statement with an "if" is not calling you a liar. It is just reflecting the fact that you have \*not\* provided proof that what you invented is real. Calling you a liar would be stating that I \*know\* you did not invent what you say you did. I am not making that statement. If you can't see that then you are just a belligerent ass who is sorely lacking in people skills. Starting in with the "fuck you" is pretty damn immature and does not help make your case.

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 understandable. That's your problem not mine.

I like your claims. They would make the world a better place. It nice to see that someone has the vision and skills to pursue such things. When I see third party verification that your claims are true I will feel better still.

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

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

Bill, I am an engineer and I have a patent (hopefully the first of many) so I am well aware of what the USPTO requires. They don't require a working prototype. They don't require test results. They care if the idea is unique. They don't make sure it works as claimed. Having a patent means \*nothing\* in terms of proving whether your invention works. Of course you already knew that.

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

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

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

Thats great. Now how about something that proves the idea works.

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.

I might do that but I'm not sure why you don't just put the photos up for all to see.

no test  
results,

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

no articles anywhere.

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 ommon concern when dealing with new ideas. This is your problem, not mine.

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

I am not worried about being a fool. I am just pointing out that only a fool would not be skeptical. But you already know that.

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.

Bill, why don't you buy yourself a dictionary and get back to me when find the definition for "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.

Re: H2 burner

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 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.

If you have test results by a reputable lab to show, why they hell would you only let them out on a per request basis? I would have that

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

shit plastered all over my website. "Look at me, I'm real."

Demonstrate a prototype to  
some journalists

Why?

So people believe you. Why do you think we have journalists? Anyone can make claims. If a journalist reports it he or she is putting their professional reputation on the line that the reported facts are true.

.