

## Re: H2 burner

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy.hydrogen/2008-06/msg00123.html>

---

- *From:* Williamknowsbest <[William.Mook@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:William.Mook@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 17 Jun 2008 08:10:39 -0700 (PDT)
- 

No I only said you haven't shown \*me\* proof that you did the work you said you did. That is a very different thing.

How is publishing something in a patent – that is available to the public generally – not showing you something? You are the public and have access to it, therefore I have shown it to you. Furthermore, I have asked you to complete a contact screen on my website to receive additional information. Obviously you are the one choosing not to gather relevant information before making conclusions about it. Clearly you do this because you have your own agenda independent of the relevant data.

Since you love syllogisms,

I don't love or hate syllogisms, I merely said you are using them to follow a logical form and wrongly conclude that I'm a liar and blame it on logic. This is an old disinformation trick – and should be pointed out whenever its encountered.

let give you one that is actually relevant  
to this discussion

Let's recount our discussion shall we? The discussion started out by you saying that my reported 55% efficiency was impossible. When I gave you an unimpeachable source showing that 60% was routinely achieved in systems like mine, you ignored your error and said I couldn't have done what I said I did since there was no third party confirmation. When I gave you references to news reports in Jakarta and US Patents you denigrated the foreign press and the US Patent Office.

Re: H2 burner

and not some delusional fabricated paranoia.

Now, when I deconstruct your attempts you say I love syllogisms and imply I'm a delusional paranoid.

Obviously you seek to denigrate my work and achievements no matter what evidence I present here. So, you are best ignored as the idiot you are.

Fact is, I produce solar panels that convert water and sunlight to hydrogen and oxygen at \$0.07 per peak watt that are 55% efficient. This produces hydrogen at \$110 per metric ton. I have incorporated these panels in the design of eight energy projects outside the USA which I am sponsoring which will pay for the construction of a supply chain for these panels. Once that is completed I will enter the US market and convert surplus stations shut down due to low volume sales caused by high gas prices (gas will be \$6 per gallon by August) and buy re-marketers that are hard hit – and merge them with coal companies to create with my technology an integrated oil company that is domestically sourced.

I have explored very closely Sunoco and Westmoreland Coal. These can be acquired and merged for \$5 billion. Looking at their balance sheets, its easy to see that the value of the integrated companies with my technology of using a solar assisted Bergius process, that I can create a \$200 billion asset very quickly. This increase in value will allow me to build a national hydrogen infrastructure along Sunoco's pipeline rights of way and add stations out West along with certain parts of Peabody's assets – increasing value to \$600 billion – with over 20 billion barrel equivalent reserves in the form of coal.

In the end, the 8 energy projects will expand to 42 coal-to-liquid facilities each processing 30,000 tons of coal per day into 220,000 barrels of oil per day, using 3,500 tons of hydrogen per day.

Expanding panel installations at each of the solar sites (I already have 24,000 sq km of land in sunny regions optioned), increases hydrogen output, and at that point I will add hydrogen sales to stationary producers, and retail hydrogen sales at the retail outlets throughout the nation.

Then, we'll be on the road to a hydrogen economy.

1) I can not be certain of something if I have not seen solid and verifiable proof that it is real.

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

2) William Mook has described his invention here and in patents but I have yet to see to solid and verifiable proof that the invention is real and works as he claims.

3) I can not be certain that William Mook's invention is real and works as claimed.

Those are your problems, not mine. It is your choice to ignore patents and press coverage I gave. Your pattern of behavior toward me and my efforts are clear. Bottom line you are using any interaction with me to denigrate me and my efforts. You started off saying that my efficiency was too high, when that was addressed satisfactorially you said there was no third party confirmation, when I pointed to third parties, you say I'm delusional. Obviously, you are the one with the problem not me. I merely report what I do here from time to time to get some feedback that is sometimes useful. Clearly when someone is characterizing me unfairly, as you do, I need to point that out.

That is the relevant syllogism.

No its not.

At no time have I claimed you are a liar.

You implied in response to my statement about product that it couldn't work as I said – that's implying I'm a liar. More recently, you have implied I'm a delusional paranoid for objecting to you dismissing my direct statements in a way that labels me a liar. You have consistently denigrated me personally throughout all your commentary, now you pretend that you have not.

I have built solar panels and sponsored projects using this technology and I am moving forward with these projects creating tremendous value. You have chosen to classify these efforts as inadequate to your requirement for proof and continue your mischaracterization of my efforts and of me – in the absence of any solid evidence that supports these mischaracterizations.

You just can't resist the strawman can you?

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

Straw man requires that I misrepresent your position in order to refute the mis-represented position. I have not misrepresented your position that you are just being reasonable and fair. You have stated many times you wish my 'claims' were true, but you have some nagging doubts that any reasonable person would have – and then launch into a most unreasonable set of statements. At first I gave you references to address your concerns, but your pattern is not one of a reasonable person, no matter how you try to represent yourself as such.

When did I claim to be  
the "soul of reason and fairness."

You are now not claiming to be reasonable and fair in your analysis? haha.. Like I said, you started out saying you really support my efforts and so forth, but... and then launch into unreasonable unfair statements that have no basis in reality. This is posing as a reasonable and fair person in order to make it seem that your objections are based solely on logic and fair and equitable analysis. Of course we see that you are not being fair, and that your use of logic merely follows the syllogistic form, while ignoring the facts and denigrating and abusing me personally.

What a load of nonsense.

So, you accept the notion that you are not reasonable and fair in your analysis?

Wow. You're really wound up about this.

No I'm not.

You keep repeating this  
nonsense about syllogisms.

Its relevant, and repeated whenever you repeat the behavior – to point it out for what it is. Let's recap –

- 1) You made some favorable statements about my efforts at first
- 2) You then said despite your desire for my statements to be true you worried they were not since my 'claims' of thermodynamic efficiency were so high as to be unbelievable – citing an irrelevant and wrong

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

reference.

- 3) I gave you an unassailable reference that shows my thermodynamic efficiency isn't special
- 4) You ignored that reference and did not retract your earlier statements
- 5) You then changed your position to question why I didn't have third party confirmation
- 6) I pointed you toward my patents and newspaper articles in Asia
- 7) You then denigrated foreign press and the US patent office and the patent process
- 8) I pointed out your pattern of abusive behavior
- 9) You then said I was delusional and paranoid –

Take a pill, bud.

and now you say I need to medicate...

You don't see a pattern here? There is absolutely nothing I could say that you wouldn't twist into some sort of insulting statement about me and my efforts.

I gave you the reason.

You have attempted to paint your efforts as being logical – they are not logical. They are aimed at undermining my efforts.

I haven't seen verifiable proof that any of it is true.

This is a continuation of your second argument that you switched to in step 5 above. My response is step 6 above. How are US patents, NASA test results, and articles in business magazines insufficient for your needs?

That doesn't mean it isn't true, its just that I haven't yet seen the proof.

Why do you choose to ignore the things I provided?

When a bank asks to see proof of income or assets before they loan you money are they calling you a liar?

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

No – but when a bank says of my tax returns that the IRS has made mistakes in the past, how do I know these IRS documents don't have similar mistakes in them? I think it is fair to say that that banker is demanding a level of proof that is unattainable. That's what you have done. You changed your argument, and when I said, hey, I have patents, and those patents have test results from NASA, you say that's not good enough.

By your absurd logic they are.

Talk about strawman. You have mischaracterized my logic here and now calling your construction absurd. Stick to the points. You said 55% efficiency was too high for you to believe. When I showed you how it was possible, you then shifted your attack to say you needed third party confirmation. When I gave you patent information and invited you to visit my website and fill out contact information – you denigrated the process I have for divulging certain information, and said the US patent office can't be trusted as a confirming source. When I said that was just nutty – and pointed out that you would never have a good thing to say about my efforts – you called me delusional, paranoid, said I should medicate myself and that I was being absurd.

Fact is if a bank asks for proof of income and then says they don't trust the IRS documents because the IRS has made mistakes in the past – I would say that particular bank was being unreasonable in their demands for proof – just as you are.

They are not simply taking your word on the matter that you have the assets you claim.

You are going on and on and on – talking about your strawman – all the while gaily ignoring the facts. I'm responding to your pattern of behavior in this matter.

No they want to see documents, pay stubs, account statements.

Right, but I'm not applying for a loan, I'm having a conversation. You started out saying you thought my statement about 55% efficiency was totally unbelievable – when I gave you proof that it was in fact routinely achievable, you IGNORED that and changed your position so you could maintain your attacks. You then said I needed third party confirmation and photos and whatnot. I said check out my patents and

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

if you want photos visit my website and fill out my contact page. You ignored that and railed against the patent office and railed against me for wanting to keep track of who gets what I consider critical information.

So, this is very much like a bank officer who says, do you have any documents that show that these documents are real?

At some point– in this conversation – you have passed from being a reasonable person to an unreasonable one – at that point I say f–you. lol.

Its called verifying, dipshit,

See? You create the strawman, come to a totally bogus conclusion, and then say insulting things to me. f–you again.

and its how the world works.

Now, you are taking a superior position implying I don't know how the world works while you do. Obviously, I know how the world works, and clearly, I see what you are attempting to do in ALL of your exchanges with me.

Its not about calling someone a liar.

You are still attempting to paint yourself as a reasonable person and your commentary as fair and balanced. Obviously nothing could be further from the truth. You have not only called me a liar, you have said I was paranoid, delusional, a dipshit, someone who doesn't know how the world works, and more. All without any reason whatever.

Lets take your strawman of the banker asking for proof of income. I give him the last 3 years of my IRS returns. He wants account information. I give him 3 years worth. He wants to see a summary. I get my accountant to put together spreadsheets and confirm their accuracy. He wants confirmation from the bank, he wants to see the accountants license.

These are all reasonable – but if the banker then says, you know, people like you Bill can fool the IRS and I just don't know if what these documents say is true – what evidence can you give me that you haven't fooled the IRS and your bank and your accountant?

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

What is that banker saying about his opinion of me?

At some point you say, you know, I think you're being unreasonable in your demands...

that's what you are doing here – being unreasonable –and attempting to say you are being reasonable.

You know, I don't even know what your device looks like.

Its not my fault. You could fill out a contact screen on my website, or visit the patent office website and look it up.

You don't  
post any photos or even sketches of it.

You can look up the patents and see.

You can fill out a contact screen and I will send you reports and such.

Yet you expect everyone to  
have complete faith in its capabilities.

No, you are constructing another strawman again – mischaracterizing what I said to make your insulting statements seem more reasonable.

You take offense that  
someone might want to see verification.

No, I take no offense at anything. I merely say fuck you when you are being unreasonable.

That's amazingly arrogant.

Now, according to you I'm an arrogant delusional paranoid dipshit who doesn't know how the world works.

What evidence do you have of that? None. But that doesn't stop you from saying it. In fact, nothing I say is good enough for you.

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

Anything you cannot attack, you ignore, and make up shit to continue your attack. Go back to your original objection. 55% efficiency – can you see how I achieve that after reading the Stanford paper? What other real objections do you have? Since then, you had no real objections, since then you've just made shit up and found everything wanting. The patent office isn't good enough for you. Foreign newspapers can't be trusted.

Fact is, you can see what my panels look like by filling out a contact screen on my website, or by visiting the patent office and typing in 'mook' and 'solar' in the search engine – to pull up the patents and applications.

That's because such a position is indefensible, in light of not only my work, but the work of others in the field.

Well I not the one you need to discuss that with.

You're the one making the abusive statements about my work – so you're the one who gets my attention.

It has been offered to you, yet you have gone out of your way to say damning things despite the easy availability of the very things you ask for. Obviously, you are not the fair honest and balanced observer you pretend to be.

Listen, there is nothing preventing you from putting this stuff (test reports, photos) on your site for all to see.

Yes there is.

You choose not too.

Yes.

Therefore, a casual observer such as myself does not have easy access to verifiable proof.

How is a photo verifiable proof?

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

That's your fault, not mine

You are constructing another strawman. Patents and information delivered in confidence after filling out contact information is providing the sort of proof you seek. You choose to mischaracterize what I do offer in order to maintain your abusive stance toward me and my accomplishments.

therefore I qualify my statements with an "if". Deal with it.

No, you created the syllogism

I created this syllogism:

- 1) I can not be certain of something if I have not seen solid and verifiable proof that it is real.
- 2) William Mook has described his invention but I have yet to see to solid and verifiable proof that the invention is real and works as he claims.
- 3) I can not be certain that William Mook's invention is real and works as claimed.

The rest of that crap about lying and whatnot is just some paranoid BS made up by you. It has nothing to do with me.

Yes it does. Look at what you've really done here. You first stated you were enthused and supportive of my efforts. You then stated that my claims of 55% efficiency was way too high to be credible. I gave you proof that it was reasonable. You ignored that proof and your earlier argument. You shifted your argument that I didn't have third party confirmation of my claims. I said I have patents and you can get any sort of report by filling out a contact screen and agreeing to maintain confidentiality. You then attacked the patent office and the patent process and said reporters were your preferred method. I said I had coverage of my business affairs in Asia where I'm working and gave you a reference with that. You said foreign press can't be trusted. I pointed out the pattern of abuse you've been heaping on me, and now you call me delusional and a number of other things, and say only confidential stuff posted publicly will satisfy your criterion.

Please forgive me for laughing at you.

You are an idiot.

Re: H2 burner

Re: H2 burner

If Mook doesn't have third party confirmation or photos on his website then he must be lying given the tremendous advances he has made (I'm paraphrasing)

No you are making shit up as you go. I never said anything about lying.

You implied direct statements I made were not true. Going back to your strawman. There's a difference between a banker that says please give me 3 years of tax returns and a banker that says I don't believe these tax returns because despite these returns I think you're exaggerating your income. The first instance is reasonable, the second is not, and implying I'm a liar.

Its the second and third steps I am objecting to. Its also your pattern of ignoring reality merely to denigrate my efforts that I wish to point out.

Remember, you started out saying that 55% was outrageously efficient and could NEVER be achieved by any sort of system... remember that?

No. I commented that 55% seemed extremely high but I never used the words impossible.

Its your pattern of abusive behavior that gives you away.

.