THE PROCESS OF SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION FAKING FOR PUPILS

– PART I –

Motto: The true science is simple, only the imbecility is complicated. True science supports itself on clear evidence. Imbecility has to build up on other accepted imbecilities in an endless chain of mental arguments.

This newsletter is dedicated to pupils who have the first contact with science and want to make fun of the imbecilities preached by an entire elite of intellectual criminals.

The first section demonstrates, based on the classical geometry, how the imbecility of Big Bang theory can be ruled out. An example is provided, and then based on Hubble deep field images, the distance between two old galaxies (which existed about 13 billions years ago) is estimated.

It can be found that a few hundreds millions years after Big Bang, the distance between the considered galaxies was about 25 billion light years. Even adopting a new kind of spatial inflation after the Big Bang, it is impossible to explain how the Universe arrived to such dimensions in an early stage. Adopting any other imbecile idea to explain this early size of the Universe rules out anyway the Hubble law. Astronomy has arrived to a situation known in chess as ZuZwang. Any move you make is going to worsen your situation

The rest of scientific part of the newsletter is dedicated to thermodynamics.

Section two presents how a genius has become only a footnote of science and it is obvious that the new theory is going to revive his image. We speak about Denis Papin the true father of thermodynamics. One of his crucial experiment is reloaded and even improved in order to show how the thermodynamics should have taken another path about three centuries ago.

The third section is the top notch topic for the scientific part of this newsletter. It simply demonstrates in various ways that Carnot has ben falsely considered the father of thermodynamics. His analogy between a waterwheel and an engine is analysed and found to be an absurd analogy. One by one, all of his claims are analysed and found absurd on basis of new experiments which can be performed even in less equipped school laboratories.

The fourth section is about the most famous intellectual criminal of all times. The Papin's life is reconsidered too because he was in fact assassinated for others having the priority over the steam engine.

There are two sections about nuclear and coal power plants where it is demonstrated that a simple switch for the working agent would improve the total production with a conservative 20%. A more realistic improvement would be around 30%, but this has to be proven.

The last section analyses what has the society done for having this new theory of sciences and what are the consequences for not implementing it!

The following newsletter is dedicated to nuclear reactions and this, finally, is going to be a priority....

SECTION I HOW SIMPLE ELEMENTARY EUCLIDIAN GEOMETRY RULES OUT THE BIG BANG IMBECILIY

In mathematics, the Pythagorean theorem is a fundamental relation in Euclidean geometry among the three sides of a right triangle. It states that "In a right-angled triangle, the square of the hypotenuse side is equal to the sum of squares of the other two sides" - $c^2 = a^2 + b^2$.



Figure 1

Someone would wonder: how could this simple elementary theorem and the sine or cosine formulas, discovered more then 2000 years ago, rule out the complex and sophisticated Big Bang imbecility?

Let us suppose a powerful telescope is at hand and of course with this telescope far away galaxies can be observed.

As far the exercise is designed for pupils, let us further consider that "the lucky" observer finds two such old galaxies which fit into a simple geometrical pattern of a equilateral triangle as in fig. 2.



For this particular situation it is obvious that 2b = c because the triangle OMN is equilateral.

If the OM = ON and this distance let be about 13,3 billion years then the distance between these galaxies has to be MN = 13,3 billion years.

So it is obvious that those old galaxies A and B were about 13,3 billion light years apart when the age of the universe - according to the Big Bang - was only 500 millions years.

How was it possible for those old galaxies to get so departed in such a short time interval?

Unfortunately for the Big Bang fanatics this situation is not a patch which can be fitted with a new kind of spatial inflation.

I described a hypothetical simple situation which is going to be in the near future the curriculum of pupils for introductory lessons in geometry.

By sure few Big Bang fanatics, if any, are going to further pop up publicly when some pupils in the last underdeveloped countries are going to make fun of their imbecilities.

Someone is going to say that such experiment is difficult to be performed and the telescope time is expensive and of course in order to perform such experiment one has to have the approval of some imbeciles who take the decisions in science; in reality the experiment was already performed only with a little bit different set up.

Hubble telescope has performed some very interesting measurements and here I would like to remind the case of Deep field and South deep field. Later, with an improvement to the optical system, the same telescope repeated these experiments and there are even the so called "ultra deep fields" and extreme deep fields.

There is a nice history of the first Deep field but I do not have time to divagate about it.

In short, for 100 hours, Hubble telescope stared at a patch of sky near the Big Dipper's handle that was only about 1/30th as wide as the full moon where there was nothing to see; of course there was nothing to see with the terrestrial telescope of that times. It turned out that "nothing" was actually stuffed with galaxies. More than 3000 of them came spilling out, some roughly 12 billion years old and even older.

The first deep field has the celestial coordinates: right ascension of 12h 36m 49s and declination of $+62^{\circ}$ 12' 58" as in fig. 3.

Not long after, the experiment was repeated in a different patch of sky in the southern constellation Tucana, and came to be called the Hubble Deep Field South. The coordinates for the south field were: right ascension of 22h 32m 56 s and declination of -60° 33' 02.69" as in fig. 3.

And now it is a problem of elementary geometry for pupils to estimate the distance between P and S points.

In case P and S were to be collinear, the SOP would be the diameter of the considered sphere. As far in both direction very old galaxies - formed a few hundred millions years after Big Bang-, were observed, the PS distance would be more than 26 billions light years.

In reality, the P and S points are not collinear, but the PO and OS segments form an angle between them. It is simple euclidean problem for a pupil to find the size of the SP segment in this peculiar situation. Without making any demonstration, only by having the coordinates of these points (by having these coordinates the angle between PO and SO can be found), it is obvious that the SP size has to be smaller than the diameter of the sphere, but in any case at a first approximation it is about 25 billions light years.

There is no imbecility to be advanced in order to explain how a few hundreds millions years after the supposed Big Bang, the size of the Universe was already at least 25 billions light years. Of course big universities around the world have no problem in still promoting the imbecility of the Big Bang theory because for all these modern scientists promoting dogma and imbecility has become a paramount mission of their existence.

Even adopting a new kind of spatial inflation after the Big Bang, it is impossible to explain how the Universe arrived to such dimensions in an early stage. Adopting any other imbecile idea to explain this early size of the Universe rules out anyway the Hubble law.

Astronomy has arrived to a situation known in chess as Zu Zwang. Any move you make is going to worsen your situation

What do you think a simple pupil of Euclid would do in front of this situation?



Figure 3 Deep field and South Deep field position on the Celestial sphere

A postulate is necessary to clear up the things in astronomy:

POSTULATE: The Big Bang Theory is completely incompatible with a large scale homogenous Universe.

If Big Bang really existed, then by looking at far away universe, one should find a strong anisotropy of matter in the Universe. In certain directions, older and older galaxies have to be observed. In other directions of the Universe, only young galaxies have to be observed.

There are some astronomers who are waiting for James Web telescope to bring them more information about the distant universe; they do not have enough synapses to understand that such device would bring only the deepest humiliation for the present day astronomy.

For any common sense mind the entire research in astronomy should be stopped and start again from scratch; but if people have money to throw away for nothing.....

There is going to be necessary a generation of scientists to clean up the mess from astronomy

SECTION II THE REAL FOUNDER OF THERMODYNAMICS - DENIS PAPIN

Denis-Papin quote:

"In what manner that power can be applied to draw water or ore from mines, to discharge iron bullets to a great distance, to propel ships against the wind, and to a multitude of other similar purposes, it would be too long here to detail; but each individual, according to the particular occasion, must select the construction of machinery appropriate to his purpose."

The "classical" presentation of Denis Papin can be easily found on internet or in some books about history of science.

Hese is such an example which is uploaded from a website dedicated to protestant personalities.

https://www.museeprotestant.org/en/notice/denis-papin-1647-about-1712/

Denis Papin was born near Blois in 1647, the son of a protestant doctor. He studied medicine in Angers then came to Paris in 1673, where he became assistant to the famous Dutch physicist and astronomer Christian Huygens, who was also a protestant and who had settled in France.

Huygens sent him to England where he worked with Robert Boyle, a physicist and a chemist, one of thegreatest scholars of his time. They worked on a machine using air pressure and in 1679 added the finishing touches to the well-known "cooking pot", the original model for all modern pressure-cookers – it is he who invented the famous "safety valve".

In 1679, he became the assistant of Robert Hooke, a mathematician and an astronomer belonging to the Royal Society of Physics in London – Papin himself became a member of this illustrious institution in 1680.

In 1685, due to the <u>Revocation</u> of the Edict of Nantes, Denis Papin had to give up any idea of returning to France as he was determined to remain loyal to his protestant faith.

In 1687, the Elector of Hesse-Cassel appointed him professor of mathematics at the University of Marburg. Here he built various remarkable machines; a centrifugal ventilator to provide air for the mines, a machine for making plate glass for windows, another for pumping water out of salt mines etc. But he concentrated all his efforts on building a steam engine and in 1705 he achieved his aim, (the engine was described in a book written in Latin in 1707). In 1707, he also built his first steamship; sadly, this was destroyed by boatmen who were jealous of this new invention and thought that it might cause them to lose their jobs. So he went back to England, where he tried to do more experiments but without success. He died in London, around 1712, in poverty and forgotten by all.

One can find many other sites with similar scarce information about Denis Papin and his work.

Bering hectic with time, probably I would have postponed reading about him for an indefinite future, but a series of events forced me to dedicate some time for such inquiries.

First of all, I was curios to see who invented the first piston steam engine so I landed to read about Papin's life and work.

Later on, another coincidence "struck" me: Papin lived in London and was a member of the Royal Society when Newton was president there, so I was curious to see what was the reaction of Newton to the Papin's experiments.

After some digging into internet, I was able to find some more specific information about Papins work and here I would like to remind the experiment performed with his piston cylinder engine.

In some previous newsletters, without having any ideas about Papin's work, I advanced some new experiments based on a similar approach. For this newsletter, it was my intention to expand those experiments in my style, but I changed my mind and I would like to formulate these experiments as a extension of Papin's work.

In this way, even a laymen is going to understand that making Papin one of the founder of thermodynamics is not a personal preference, but a necessity.

One of the experiments performed by Papin around 1690 is one of the most complex experiment in science and by sure is going to become one of the pillars of the new theory of thermodynamics.

On the other hand, by reloading these old experiments, a lot of so considered experts in science are going to observer how the thermodynamics took a wrong path form the beginning and how the corrections are to be made.

It is a real tragedy that thermodynamics, which a very down to earth part of physics, instead of becoming a real science continued to be a place of speculations and the situation in this field is the same now as centuries ago when caloric theory was reigning supreme.

The following link has not only a clear description of the original Papin's experiment but also a very nice and intuitive simulation:

https://digilander.libero.it/calchic/english1/papinen.html

The Papin engine was a metal tube (closed at one end) with a piston inside.

Under the piston there was a small quantity of water which, warmed up and transformed in steam, raised the piston who reached the edge of the cylinder where was stopped by a click.

A stream of cold water was sprayed onto the cylinder.

The steam inside condensed.

This produced a partial vacuum and the outside air pressure forced the piston down (active stroke).

The tube had three roles: boiler, cylinder and steam condenser.



Figure 4 The functioning of the first piston steam engine

Without any additional information this experiment proves that both a positive and a negative gradient of pressure can perform mechanical work.

This experiment is the father of all later developed engines working with positive or negative gradient of pressure.

For the present science of thermodynamics an entire chapter of real science about steam engines has been pushed under the carpet. This was again a deliberate action and has a very simple reason: something which cannot be explained has to be kept away.

In any true history of science and for any common sense mind it is impossible to push away an entire chapter of science, i.e. the steam engines which work by condensation. There is going to be a new experiment in the section dedicated to the fake founders of thermodynamics about this topic.

In the first version of the Papin engine, it was impossible to have the active stroke during the expansion of the steam and here is the explanation why....

Well, his first prototype was not so performant to evaporate a huge quantity of water at once, in order to move rapidly the piston during the expansion of steam. Of course, even during slow steam expansion, the piston moved toward upside position, but this was not considered the active stroke of the engine.

One has to imagine that active stroke of the engine happened when the steam condensed and the piston moved rapidly downwards.

For more than a half a century, all the steams engines used, were working having the active stroke during the steam condensation. All these engines in the new theory are engines which works with a negative pressure gradient because during the steam condensation a partial vacuum is generated inside piston and the atmospheric pressure pushes the piston downwards. Although these are steam engines, in fact, the active stroke is given by the atmospheric pressure.

Ok, in the time of Papin and with this rudimentary set up, the engine was performing poorly with about 20 up to 30 strokes per hour.

Some texts about the history of science recognize the contribution of Papin to the early development of steam engine, but they offer for reading only the first part of the story and the rest is hidden under the carpet.

Quite all references I found, close the presentation of Papin with the following idea: his design wasn't practical but it was improved upon by others and and it led to the development of the steam engine, a world-changing contribution to the Industrial Revolution.

Other are even twisting the words in order to appear "politically correct". Here is an example of a general conclusion regarding this genius:

"However, although Papin envisaged applying the principle to various applications, including pumps and paddle boats, there is no record of him having any success in this direction."

The history of science has to be ashamed for how this genus was maltreated.

Papin further improved the piston steam engine and even built a small boat powered by a steam engine. Here is letter of Papin to Leibniz where he describes his invention. He foresee that such invention could be used by road transportation too after some other problems are to be solved.

Papin to Leibniz on July 25, 1698:

"The method in which I now use fire to raise water still rests on the principle of the rarefaction of water. But I now use a much easier method than that which I published. And furthermore besides using suction, I also use the force of the pressure which water exerts on other bodies when it expands. These effects are not bounded, as in the case of suction. So I am convinced that this discovery if used in the proper fashion will be most useful. ...

For myself I believe that this invention can be used for many other things besides raising water. I've made a little model of a carriage which is moved forward by this force: And in my furnace it shows the expected result. But I think that the unevenness and bends in large roads will make the full use of this discovery very difficult for land vehicles; but in regard to travel

by water, I would flatter myself to reach this goal quickly enough if I could find more support than is now the case ...

It gave me much joy to find that you also have some plans to put the moving force of fire to use, and I strongly hope that the little test you told me of succeeded to your satisfaction".

So it is important to highlight that *Papin before 1698 was already able to use the force* of expanding steam to produce useful mechanical work; this idea has to wait about one century in order ,,to be reinvented" and to have a steam engine working with positive gradient of pressures.

In March 1705, a selfconfident Papin wrote to Leibniz:

"I can assure you that, the more I go forward, the more I find reason to think highly of this invention which, in theory, may augment the powers of man to infinity; but in practice I believe I can say without exaggeration, that one man by this means will be able to do as much as 100 others can do without it"

He intended to make the trip from inland Germany along Wesser River through Hanover up to the Nord See and then to England to present this invention to the Royal Society and the Queen.

In a letter to Leibniz (Sept. 15, 1707), Papin asked that he help obtain the required permission for passage up the Weser River through Hanover. Leibniz tried to intervene with his friends among local magistrates, but Papin got no further than Munden before encountering the ignorant opposition of the Boatmen's Guild, no doubt incited by corrupt elements of the court.

An official of Munden reported to Leibniz, on Sept. 27, 1707, that Papin "had the misfortune to- lose here his little machine of a paddlewheel vessel ... the Boatmen of this town having had the insolence to stop him and to take from him the fruit of his toil, with which he thought to introduce himself before the Queen of England.

Papin continued his trip to London, without his boat, and what happened in London is the topic of the following section; here we deal only with scientific and technical items.

How could this simplest piston steam engine change the face of thermodynamics, at a time when thermodynamics was only a collection of sparse and even more absurd ideas?

The partial answer can be further found in the correspondence between Papin and Leibniz.

"Both Leibniz and Papin agreed that the useful work performed by a heat engine, was to be measured by the height to which it could raise a given quantity of water."

The experiment I would like to present is very simple: in the set-up from fig. 5, one has to substitute water inside cylinder with alcohol or acetone. Both these substances were known at that time, although their structures were elucidated much later.

By switching to other substances which have different boiling points and different latent heats of vaporization, and by using the same amount of heat one would have observed that the useful work performed by the piston is different.

Of course, at that time, the concept of latent heat was not discovered yet; even in these conditions a different amount of useful mechanical work, using the same amount of heat, should have been observed.

Here is why:

- The heat of vaporization of acetone, at its boiling point is 29,1 kJ/mol and that of water is 40,7 kJ/mol; water heat of vaporization is about one third bigger.
- The boiling point of water is 100 C and for acetone is 56 C.
- The heat capacity of both fluids is quite identical: for water is 75,3 ·J·/mol·K and for acetone is 75 ·J·/mol·K

Without doing any math, it is obvious to a layman that vaporizing a mole of acetone is going to require about 2/3 of the amount necessary to vaporize a mole of water.



Figure 5 Replica of Papin experiment with another working fluid

What would have someone observed by doing this experiment more than three centuries ago, in absence of these data?

By switching to acetone and by using the same amount of heat, the following experimental results should have been observed:

- the time for vaporizing acetone is shorter than the time for vaporizing water and less heat is necessary also;
- assuming that for water the engine was doing 30 strikes per hour, in case of acetone the number of strokes would have increased to 40 strikes per hour;
- by using the same amount of heat the amount of water needed to cool the engine would have decreased with about 1/3 in comparison with the amount needed to cool the steam.

In conclusion without knowing modern thermodynamics, the earliest pioneers would have started with a environmental friendly approach to energy production.

Well, I do not claim that Papin really would have followed this direction, but I am sure that by providing him some minimal conditions, he would have performed other astonishing experiments and the industrial revolution would have started a century earlier.

Unfortunately, the official version is that his life ended in England, unknown and poor, after having another ,,*tragic encounter with Newton and an another even more vicious mob - the British Royal Society.* "

This information is going to be discussed in a following section entitled the greatest intellectual criminal of all times.

SECTION III SADI CARNOT, THE FAKE FOUNDER OF THERMODYNAMICS

The Carnot contribution to thermodynamics was considered "*The most original study in physical science*" [Larmor, 1916]. It is obvious that such "original" work deservers a section of its own and a thorough analysis.

At this point, I am not sure who is more guilty for faking the entire branch of thermodynamics: Sady Carnot who wrote an booklet which describes his ideas about thermal engines or the illustrious followers who, without thinking, accepted this ideas and piled up an entire edifice on a wrong foundation.

A picture of the science of thermodynamics in that times is necessary to be made in order to understand Carnot work. At that moment, the caloric theory of heat was reigning incontestably in science. One of the main assumptions of this theory was that heat can neither be created nor destroyed. Heat was considered to be an invisible fluid without mass that moved from one body to another when heat was transferred. This fluid was called 'caloric' by the famous French chemist Lavoisier.

Although Count Rumford had demonstrated categorically in 1798 that mechanical energy can be converted to heat during the boring of a cannon, his experiments did not convince the believers in the caloric theory because he was not able to quantify the relationship between mechanical and thermal energy.

Supplementary, in 1824, when Carnot did publish "Reflections on the Motive Power of Fire", the law of conservation of energy for thermodynamic systems (i.e., the first law of thermodynamics) was not formulated yet.

It is obvious that Sadi Carnot formulated the basic ideas about steam engines and what later was considered the second law of thermodynamics based on the caloric theory assumptions.

It is further assumed that Sadi Carnot somehow managed to formulate the second law of thermodynamics correctly although he did not know the first law of thermodynamics. He somehow arrived at the basic postulates of the second law of thermodynamics through his knowledge of hydraulic turbines.

He treated heat in analogy with water as a substance that produces mechanical effect (work) when it "falls" from a hot place to a cold place – fig. 6.

Sadi learned from his father - Lazare Carnot, who was an engineer, about the design of water wheels and how to optimize them to extract kinetic energy from the potential energy of falling water. As consequence he advanced the idea that a heat engine is a device that works in a cycle and converts thermal heat to work. A water wheel receives water from a hydraulic reservoir at a higher level and discharges water to a hydraulic reservoir at a lower level. Hence it converts a part of the potential energy of the falling water to kinetic energy of the water wheel. In the water wheel the potential energy available in the water can be extracted as kinetic energy without any loss of water. Sadi Carnot argued that, like the water wheel, a heat engine receives caloric (heat) from a thermal reservoir at a higher temperature and conducts caloric (heat) to a thermal reservoir at a lower temperature. Since he believed that the total amount of caloric has to be conserved, the functioning of an steam engine is very easy to be grasped; there is an amount of caloric which is transformed by the engine into mechanical work, i.e. the difference between amount of caloric received and transmitted.

Here is a quotation which apparently give substance to this analogy:

"From the ideas that have been established so far, we are sufficiently justified in comparing the motive power of heat with that of a fall of water.

The motive power of a fall of water depends on its height and on the amount of liquid. The motive power of heat likewise depends on the amount of caloric that is used and on what might

be termed— in fact on what we shall call—the height of its fall; it depends, in other words, on the difference in temperature of the bodies between which the passage of caloric occurs"

The booklet published by Sadi Carnot in 1824 was not appreciated during his lifetime. It is still considered that his ideas were well ahead of his time and also his theory was based on caloric theory which soon was going to become obsolete. Emil Clapeyron recognized the importance of Carnot's monograph and extended his ideas further by displaying the ideal heat engine in thermodynamic diagrams. Kelvin completed this task by showing that an ideal heat engine can be used to define an absolute temperature scale. Rudolf Clausius, later, developed the second law of thermodynamics without appealing to the caloric theory of heat. He defined an important property called entropy that emerges directly from the basic postulates of Sadi Carnot.



Figure 6 Analogy between water and heat according to Carnot (internet picture)

It is a pity that further scientists working in the field of thermodynamics have not seen that the analogy between a water wheel and an engine is completely wrong and rotten even in the frame of caloric theory. Further on, by adopting these concepts to kinetic molecular theory got us to imbecilities of which thermodynamic science is so proud today.

The first absurdity of the situation can be spotted when he assumes that a steam engine is a cyclic process.

In the frame of caloric theory, one has to accept that neither a water wheel nor a heat engine are cyclical processes.

This is a confusion and imbecility which can be spotted even by small children: *the* wheel or the piston of the engine have a motion which can be considered cyclical, but the working agents in both cases do not perform any thermodynamic cycle.

In case of the water wheel, all the time a new water quantity falls from the height H and convert some of the potential energy into kinetic energy and after that it goes away...

In case of a caloric theory of heat, all the time the engine has to be feed with matter (steam) and by passing to the low temperature reservoir this matter "converts" some of the "caloric" into mechanical work.

Quite all of the engines developed along history do not fit into the pattern of a cyclic thermodynamic process regarding the used working agent.

There is only a small class of engines for which the "working agent" remains the same and only for them a thermodynamic cycle can be assumed as true. The first idea of such engine seems to be developed by Guillaume Amontons, although these kind of engines are better known as Sterling engines after Robert Stirling who built one about a century later.

Carnot has advanced the following premise, based on the conservation of so called "caloric", in justifying the cyclicity of the processes involved into an engine:

"In our proof, we make the implicit assumption that when a body has undergone its various changes and after passing through a number of stages, has returned precisely to its original state (its state here being defined in terms of its density, temperature, and mode of aggregation), it contains the same quantity of heat as it did at the start."

The problem is: there is no such "body" which undergoes different thermodynamic al processes and return to its original state in case of steam or internal combustion engine!!!!

In making this analysis, I have been using the following definition accepted for a thermodynamic cycle:

A thermodynamic cycle consists of a linked sequence of thermodynamic processes that involve transfer of heat and work into and out of the system, while varying pressure, temperature, and other state variables within the system, and that finally returns the system to its initial state.

Although not clearly formulated in this definition, but implicitly assumed, *no mass have to be changed between the thermodynamic system and the surroundings*.

Coming back to the Carnot analogy, both the water wheel and the heat engine there is a change of mass with the surroundings as in fig. 7. It is obvious for children, but less obvious to theoreticians that in absence of this mass exchange both water wheels and steam engine stop working immediately.

In the happiest case, all it has been written in the field of thermodynamics may be considered useful for the so called Amontons-Stirling engines. In this case there is no exchange of matter between system and surroundings. Only in this case there is a truly sequence of processes that leaves the system in the same state in which it started.

But, it is important to be reminded that all so called thermal engines are in fact pressure engines and therefore, from the perspective of the new theory, there is nothing to be saved from the so called modern thermodynamics.

Of course, in the new theory, there is going to be a distinction between so called Amontons-Stirling engines and other steam engines or internal combustion engines and the mathematical approach is completely different.

Another imbecility which can be spotted in this fake analogy is related to phase transformation.

In the case of a water wheel there is no change of phase for the working agent. Water comes in as liquid and goes out as liquid. During the contact with the blade of the wheel, the transfer of heat is insignificant. If water were to undergo a phase change to steam for example, the yield of a water wheel would be much different. If by a magical trick the water were to get frozen, it is obvious that collision of chunks of solids with wheel blade would have another outcome in regard to the mechanical work produced.

In case of real engines, the most majority of them involve also some phase changes.

A steam engine supposes that some water is transformed into steam and after that the expansion or the condensation of this steam can generate a mechanical work. The yield of a steam engine is dependent on the amount of heat used for vaporization.



Figure 7 Mass exchange during water flow or engine funtoning

In combustion engines, the chemical reactions which release heat, generates also gases during the combustion process and convert also some of reaction products to gases; this increase of gas particles concentration generates pressure into the cylinder engine. Of course the heat generated into chemical reactions heats also the inert gases which are brought into the cylinder during admission stage and this further increases the pressure in the cylinder.

No phase change has been ever taken into consideration in case of the theoretical modelling presented by modern thermodynamics in the so called thermodynamic cycles. All theoreticians are seeing only isothermal, adiabatic or other similar processes which are purely non sense.

Again, it is possible to have some peculiar engines which work without a phase change. The engine developed by Guillaume Amontons, and later Robert Stirling do not suppose a phase change; they work only by the expansion or contraction of a gas.

The advanced version of a steam engine works also without phase change, because the engine is completely distinct from boiler; yet in this case the steam engine is an open system because for each active stroke there is steam coming in and after the active stoke there is steam pushed out.

Further on, in his booklet Carnot advances also some theorems or claims, which were later incorporated in the so called "modern thermodynamics" and after this introduction it is high time to deal with them too.

Claim no. 1: *"Wherever there is a difference in temperature, motive power can be produced."*

This claim can be summarized to mean that a temperature difference is a necessary condition to produce motive power.

There have been some exemplifications about solids and liquids in another newsletter which clearly show that the amount of mechanical work produced in this case is microscopic and not relevant from practical point of view. Of course, if someone wants to build a nano-engine, then even solids or liquids can be considered as working agents for producing some mechanical work.

By browsing some literature I found that this claim was treated as suspicions by Kelvin too. Here is a more detailed presentation of this piece of information ...

There is a passage in Carnot work where he recognize that indirectly heat generates motion as far in a subtle way produces changes in volume or shape. Here is the quote:

"Obviously heat can only be a source of motion in so far as it causes substances to undergo changes in volume or shape." This can be summarized to mean that a change in the volume of substances is an indispensable condition for producing motive power. "For there is nothing in nature that does not undergo changes in volume, contracting and then expanding as it experiences cold or heat; there is nothing which, in doing so, cannot act against a resisting force and there by develop motive power."

Kelvin observed that there are cases when heat is transferred between solid bodies but with zero mechanical effect. Of course there is a small change on volume of a solid, but not enough to generate an useful mechanical work.

What happen in this case from thermodynamic point of view?

Here is what Kelvin writes:

When thermal agency is thus spent in conducting heat through a solid what becomes of the mechanical effect which it might produce? Nothing can be lost in the operations of nature – no energy can be destroyed. What effect is then produced in place of the mechanical effect which is lost? A perfect theory of heat imperatively demands an answer to this question; yet no answer can be given in the present state of science. It might appear that the difficulty would be entirely avoided by abandoning Carnot's fundamental axiom; a view which is strongly urged by Mr. Joule. If we do so, however, we meet with innumerable other difficulties, insuperable without further experimental investigation, and an entire reconstruction of the theory of heat from its foundation."

In completion to the information previously presented in another newsletter, I would like to add a simple experiment which proves that a difference of temperature in case of gases do not produce mechanical work; by comparison, a difference of pressure in gases (irrespective of their temperature) always produces mechanical work.

This is a direct proof that such claim have no place in the science of the future.

The experiment is so simple that is going to be again part of the curriculum for pupils in science.

Let us consider two containers filled with the same gas, at the same pressure but different temperatures as in fig. 8. Both containers are connected through a pipe and in the middle of this pipe there is a small and sensitive fan. The less expensive gas which can be used for this experiment is nitrogen; of course the experimental results are the same if another inert gas or a mixture of inert gases are used. It is not the case to mention that left container is insulated by the right container and on each part of the fan there are some stops which prevent the mixing of the gases in the initial stage of the experiment.

After the gases in each container are brought to the desired characteristics (one container needs cooling and another one heating) and the pressure is checked to be equal, the experiment can start.

The stops in front and back of the fan which prevent the mixing of the gases are removed and the rotation of the fan has to be monitored.

The mechanical work performed by the gas, has to be proportional to the number of rotations performed by the fan.

There is a transfer of heat from the hot reservoir to the cold reservoir, there is even a working agent which can ensure this transfer so a mechanical work proportional with the difference of temperature between containers has to be observed.



Figure 8 Temperature gradient not converted to work experiment

Unfortunately, such experiment cannot generate a macroscopic mechanical work, because in this case only a kind of thermal diffusion of gas between compartments takes place. It is obvious that gas molecules in the heated compartment have higher energy as the gas molecules in the cooled compartment, but this does not mean that an macroscopic mechanical work is going to be generated.

As far the pressure in both compartments is the same, there is no bulk motion of one gas from one compartment toward another.

So, without doing the experiment, the prediction is clear crystal: No mechanical work is generated during the transfer of heat between the two compartments, although all the necessary conditions are fulfilled.

In the second part of the experiment, the temperature is maintained constant in both compartments and the pressure is different as in fig. 9.

For simplicity this part of the experiment can be performed at ambient temperature; anyway the same conclusions are obtained if other value for the temperature is chosen.

What is observed in case of a gradient of pressure between containers and absence of a gradient of temperature?

As soon the stops in front and behind the fan are removed, there is a strong motion of bulk gas from the high pressure compartment toward the low pressure compartment .

This bulk gas movement forces the fan to rotate in a certain direction – let us assume this rotation is clockwise when looking from the perspective of direction of gas motion – fig. 9.

It is a simple task to demonstrate that this rotation of the fan is directly related to the gradient of pressure between containers. In a shorter or longer time, depending on the volume of both containers, the pressure in both container equilibrates and the rotation of the fan stops. One has to keep in mind that an expansion of a gas also cools the gas, but the effect can be neglected.

In order to eliminate any doubt about some other collateral thermal effects which could interfere with this experiment, a third experimental set-up is necessary to be taken into consideration.

The same containers, the same fan, but there is a difference of temperature and a difference of pressure between them - fig 10.

The difference of temperature acts in one direction (from container 1 toward container 2) and according to mainstream thermodynamic should rotate the fan in one direction; the difference of pressure acts in opposite direction (from container 2 toward container 1) and it has to rotate the fun in opposite direction.





The prediction for this version of the experiment is obvious even for children. The gradient of pressure generates again a bulk motion of the gas and the fun rotates in the direction dictated by this gradient. It is a matter of detail to show that in this case the temperature gradient also affects somehow the transfer of gases between compartments and the amount of the mechanical work obtained.



Figure 10 Temperature and pressure gradient combined effect on mechanical work

Claim no. 2: Efficiency (work done per heat input) of any heat engine (reversible or irreversible) only depends on the temperature of the hot and cold place; not on the working fluid.

In the section about Denis Papin work, there was presented a simple experiment which rule out this claim.

There are going to be another two sections dedicated to boosting the yield of a coal and a nuclear power plant only by changing the working fluid from water to an organic compound.

There is still another set up for Papin experiment, with rule out this imbecile claim forever. The original experiment was already published quite a decade ago using CO2 as working agent, but water can be used too.

So, the original set-up for the Papin experiment is reconsidered again, and in the cylinder an amount of 10 moles of water is added.

The experiment starts when the entire system has arrived to a temperature of 100 C, i.e. when the water starts to evaporate but the piston does not move yet - fig. 11

Although the set-up is identical with Papin old experiment, there are necessary some sophisticated laboratory devices which are able to control the amount of heat supplied or removed from the system, thermometer, etc.; these are not added in the figure in order to not complicate the presentation. One has to understand that setup is designed for children understanding and anyway, high level theoreticians were not able to understand the original experiment and as one person ages the neuronal synapses deteriorates, so there are even fewer chances that they are now able to grasp the idea.

To the cylinder an controlled amount of heat is added in order to have a partial evaporation of water.

As far in the cylinder there are 10 moles of water the amount of heat added has to evaporate only 8 moles. The heat of vaporization for water is well known, i.e. 40,7 kJ/mol so in practice an amount of 325,5 kJ has to be added.

What happen in these conditions with this engine?

As far the steam has a much greater volume as liquid, even in the conditions that not all the water is evaporated, the piston is pushed upwards and a mechanical work is generated - fig . 11.

Ok, it is not the maximum possible mechanical work which can be obtained, but the purpose of the experiment is not to demonstrate this fact; the purpose of the experiment is to demonstrate that mechanical work is produced when a thermodynamic system is maintained at constant temperature.

In principle, with a very cautious approach, it is possible to evaporate all the water in the cylinder, get the maximum mechanical work and still keep the system at constant temperature, but this version is an futile expense of resources because it does not demonstrate something new.



Figure 11 Mechanical work generated by partial liquid water evaporation

At this point, it is clear even for pupils that it is not necessary to have a hot and a cold source in order to produce mechanical work.

The second part of the experiment is a succession of steps which have the purpose to condense back those 8 moles of water.

First, the heating source is removed and by using a cooling procedure the amount of 325,5 kJ is removed from the system - fig. 12. The thermodynamic system remains in the same state as the initial one so a new cycle can begin.....



Figure 12 Mechanical work generated by liquid water condensation

The beauty of Papin idea goes even farther. the Papin steam engine is the only one engine developed so far which can have only active strokes.

In this set-up it is indeed possible to have an engine in two times where both motions of the piston generates active strokes, but based on different principles; one active stroke is generated by a gas expansion and the second active stroke is generated by the atmospheric pressure which pushes the piston back when steam is condensed.

It is also true that Papin steam engine it is one of the few engines which do perform an thermodynamic cycle, with no mass exchange to surroundings; but, this does not mean that present thermodynamic theory works for him! The most amount of energy is used for phase change so, to deduce an yield for this engine based on some absurd isothermal or adiabatic transformations is pure imbecility...

With this simple experiment even a pupil can deduce that both Claim 1 and Claim 2 and the subsequent Claim 3 from Carnot theory are ruled out.

It is necessary to postulate the conclusion, maybe in this case theoreticians remember easier the main points of the new theory.

Postulate: Mechanical work can be produced by having a thermodynamic system which remains all the time at a constant temperature.

Of course in most practical engines, an exchange of heat automatically produces variation in the temperature of the system, but this is another topic to be discussed ...

The genius of Papin, more than three centuries ago, offered us an example of a possible engine which could have only active strokes...

Could this dream be implemented in a practical engine? Maybe, but with the actual bunch of imbeciles making the rules in science, never!

At this point, I would like to present still another simple experiment which again shows that heat has only a secondary importance in the yield of an engine; the pressure inside cylinder and the pressure which surrounds the engine are more important!

Although the set-up of Papin could be used for describing this experiment too, the use of an internal combustion engine is simpler and more suggestive for pupils.

There have been some previous article where the functioning of a internal combution engine was presented so in fig. 13 only the schematic is reminded.



Figure 13 General schematic of an internal combustion engine (internet picture)

Let us consider such a simple internal combustion engine with a slight modification: instead of having an admission of air from atmosphere, the necessary amount of air is supplied by a gas bottle as in fig. 14.



Figure 14 Modified internal combustion engine

Three identical copies of this bottle-feeded engines are made an one is sent to one of the outer planets, i,e, Neptun, Uranus or Saturn; another one is placed on the Moon and a third one – the comparison – remains on Earth.

Even pupils know that on Moon there is no atmosphere and on outer planets the atmosphere there is about thousand times greater than the Earth atmosphere.

What are the expectations when these engines are put at work and their yields are compared?

It is irrelevant for the discussion the fact that different intensity of gravitational force changes the weight of any mass and this affect a bit the yield; for the sake of the experiment, it is simple to neglect the gravitational effect.

If one analysis each step from the functioning of this bottle-feeded engine, it is obvious that intake, compression and expansion steps are identical for all engines, at their locations.

If there is a difference in the observed yields, this can be caused only by the fourth step, i.e. the exhaust.

What does it mean combustion products exhaust from physical point of view?

It simply means that the piston has to perform a motion, which is not an active stroke, in order to push into atmosphere the products of combustion to start again the cycle.

Let us suppose for exemplification that after the expansion step, the pressure inside cylinder is 10 atm.

On Earth, if there is no motion of the piston to do the exhaust, but only the exhaust valve opens, then in virtue of the gradient of pressures, gases are still going to expand into atmosphere until the pressure inside cylinder is equal with atmospheric pressure as in fig. 15.



Figure 15 Exhaust step for an combustion engine on Earth

What happen with a similar engine on Moon?

Well, on Moon, there is no atmosphere, and therefore once the exhaust valve opens, but the piston is still blocked, all the gases from cylinder expands into vacuum as in fig. 16.



Figure 16 Exhaust step for an combustion engine on Moon

What happen with a similar engine on a outer planet - Neptune, where the atmospheric pressure is a thousand times greater then on Earth?

In same identical conditions, the piston blocked and the exhaust valve opened, the gases from cylinder are never going to expand by themselves into planet atmosphere! I discuss about expansion and not diffusion, which are different things.

As far the gradient of pressure is now from atmosphere toward cylinder, the gases from atmosphere enters into cylinder, once the valve opens, until the pressure inside cylinder is 1000 atm as in fig. 17.

With these considerations, it is obvious even for pupils that the yield of the engine is correlated with the amount of energy needed to push out the gases from the cylinder.

The greatest yield is going to be observed when the engine is placed on the Moon, because in this case, when the exhaust valve opens, the gases practically leave by themselves the cylinder.

An intermediate value for the yield is observed in case of the engine on Earth, because in this case to push all the gases out it is necessary a greater amount of energy as in first case.



Figure 17 Exhaust step for an combustion engine on Neptune

The case of the engine working on Neptune is horrible. Of course, it is another topic to discuss if such an engine could really work on Neptune. Here I have made an exemplification only for the sake of understanding the phenomena.

In order to push out the gases from the cylinder, the piston needs a huge amount of energy, so the yield in this case is going to be the lowest.

Some people must have imbecility deeply encoded into their genes in order to continue preaching the imbecilities promoted by today thermodynamics.

Claim no. 3: The maximum efficiency of any heat engine is equal to that of a reversible engine operating between the same hot and cold reservoirs.

This claim was already discussed in a previous newsletter and even a postulate was formulated there.

The idea is purely imbecility because an irreversible engine is going to have all the time an yield greater than an reversible engine;

Why?

Because for the most engines and even for a pupil understanding, only the expansion process is directly producing work.

Any reversible engine needs some supplementary steps which consumes energy in order to turn back the piston to the initial point. These supplementary steps cannot work without energy consumption so

The only exception to date is again the Papin engine which although reversible can be used to have only active strokes.

Last but not least, the extension of Carnot study to the entropy and the second law of thermodynamics was debated in another article more than a decade ago.

Here is the link, and I am sorry I do not have time to refresh the information. <u>https://www.pleistoros.com/en/books/thermodynamic/entropy-concept</u>

If there are other fabulous claims from Carnot theory, and I forgot about them, please draw me some lines and I am going to come back with a sequel.

Let us see what imbeciles are now going to pop up and claim that basic postulates proposed by Sadi Carnot form the basis of modern thermodynamics and also for the derivation of the second law of thermodynamics.

SECTION IV THE GREATEST INTELLECTUAL CRIMINAL OF ALL TIMES

Motto:

"Give to a man the absolute power and judge his character after what is he doing!"

In a previous newsletter the case of astronomer Edwin Hubble and his major intelectual fraud was discussed. As underlined there, it is obvious that for the science of the future Hubble law has no sense and supplementary Hubble should be at least morally charged as being an intelectual criminal.

Well, in comparison with the case to be presented in this section, Hubble was only a small fish in the pound.

A couple of weeks ago, I was watching a documentary about Newton in Italian, and the presenter - Piergiorgio Odifreddi, who is a italian historian of science, amazed me with this piece of information:

At a certain moment during last century (year is not so important and I do not have the time to check it!) a lot of inedited documents belonging to Newton were discovered. The owner wanted to offer these documents to a prestigious university to study them and of course to make them available to the public.

He asked the Yale University and the university declined the offer...

He asked the Princeton University and again the university declined the offer...

He asked the Harvard University and the university again decline the offer...

He asked the British Museum and even this institution declined the offer...

Finally, he sold them to auction and they arrived to be known to the public due to an economist.

Why do you think all these institutions were so reluctant to accept and make public such information about a person who is still considered one of the greatest minds of humanity?

Well, the answer given was very simple: We don't want to change the image we have about Newton.

First of all, what was so striking in those documents!? Well, there were a lot of information about the religious and alchemist preoccupations of Newton.

As a preliminary information, I would like to start with the idea that Newton was for me, up to a few months ago, the model of an ideal scientist. Of curse, I knew that he had disputes with Hooke and Leibniz, but I did not have enough information to formulate an opinion about these disputes and other aspects of his personality. Put it simple, as all of the people around the world, I was "indoctrinated" with a fake image about Newton.

By sure, his religious or alchemist hobbies wouldn't have changed much of "my idealised" portrait of Newton. Any person, who has a mind over his peers, has also a personalised view of religion and other hobbies as the crowd. In my opinion, one should not condemn or blame these preoccupations. More important for a person who look at this information is to see if there is something which can be used for completing his own personality, etc.

But, in the same time, anyone should condemn all the institutions and the entire system which did not allow that such information becomes freely available. It is unpardonable for these universities and even for British Museum to proceed in this manner and to still be rated as reference institutions in the world. The Newton who was the scientist is the same who was a puritan and an alchemist and I suppose he used to use the toilet at least once a day. I hope he was not constipated, otherwise my estimation for the frequency of the toilet use is already biased.

By the way, in another video, another presenter amazed me with this information: the walls of Newton's personal toilet were full of formulas and other mathematical figures. It seems he was spending al lot of time there...

It is a morbid preoccupation for some people to entertain the public with all kind of details from someone life instead of getting focussed on his works and ideas.

At that time he had his own toilet? What a lucky person he was!

In other three centuries of civilisation and scientific progress, humanity did not solve the problem of toilets and I suppose there are at least 1 billion people who have no toilet at all!

To have a "personal" toilet is a luxury even in our times...

Anyway, returning to the main topic, probably for what I am going to write in this section, a lot of people would like to skin me alive before being burned.

My investigations about "real" Newton started a couple of months ago, when I noticed in my mind the strange coincidence of Papin and Newton being in the same club, i.e. the Royal Society. Papin lived in London from 1707 up to his death (1712 or 1713, his exact death date is unknown) in a time Newton was the president of the club....

From a "genius" like Newton, I would have expected to see a "wow!" in front of Papin's experiments.

Yet, no information is really available showing that these people were in contact at least.

After digging and digging, I found an article which shocked me and I read it many times in disbelief. I know some of the sentences there by heart, yet I was still refusing to believe that article.

It took me about a month to see for correlations, cross link the information, check other sources and to my disappointment to conclude that quite the entire article, if not all, has presented the real face of the events.

The article was written by Philip Valenti (I do not know if this is his real name or a pseudo name) and here is the title and the abstract of the article:

Britain sabotaged the steam engine of Leibniz and Papin

The early history of the invention of the steam engine shows without doubt that the British Royal Society, including Isaac Newton personally, deliberately prevented the industrial and naval applications of steam power for nearly 100 years. In fact, the Royal Society was so intent on burying Denis Papin's 1690 invention of a paddle-wheel-driven steamship, worked out in collaboration with Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, that it stole his work, and created a mythical story of how two British "Newtonian" heroes invented the steam engine for the sole purpose of raising water from coal mines - a myth that has persisted in the history books until today. Here is the link for the entire article:

https://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/1996/eirv23n08-19960216/eirv23n08-19960216_018britain_sabotaged_the_steam_engi.pdf

As far the article is freely available, it is not worth to discuss the article here in detail; some scientific information from that article was already presented in the section about Papin.

I think it is important to cross link the information from this article with other articles information found after serious digging in internet.

The Royal Society has also an old article about Papin, which in part confirms most of the information published by Valenti. The Royal Society article was written by H. W. Robinson in 1947 with the occasion of three hundreds years from Papin's birth.

Here is the version of facts related to the use of stem engine for maritime transport according to Robinson:

https://doi.org/10.1098/rsnr.1947.0007

It is recorded that sometime before 1707 Papin constructed a boat with paddle wheels by which he intended to cross the sea to England. He did not get far with this venture for the boat was confiscated. Although it is generally asserted that the boat was fitted with a steam engine, there is not sufficient evidence to prove that it was propelled by steam power. Papin read a paper to the Society on n February 1707 offering to build a ship of eighty tons to which would be applied a fire engine to give the motion to the oars. But he wanted £400 to build this ship, and this may be the reason why the project was not pursued by the Society.

Although there is a difference in the facts presentations, both sources acknowledge that Papin intended and asked support for building a ship propelled by steam in 1707.

Let us take as reference the information released by Royal Society.

What was representing the amount of £400 at that time?

Well, in that time, Newton salary at the Royal Mint was after some sources $\pounds 1500$ and after other sources $\pounds 2000$ per year; probably he was doing so well in hanging some counterfeiters that he got a bonus from $\pounds 1500$ to $\pounds 2000...$

So, an inventor comes and ask Royal Society to build something extraordinary, something unheard of - a ship of eighty tons propelled by steam -, to a price which was a quarter or a fifth from the annual salary of a high ranked functionary and the Royal Society refuses....

Very strange indeed...!

Let us further consider the correspondence between Papin and Royal Society as described in these articles.

According to Robinson document:

Papin sent twelve papers to the Society in 1711, all of which were read at the meetings, though none were thought at that time of sufficient importance to merit publication. **This was unfortunate since so many of them contain ideas far in advance of the time.** His invention of the Hessian Bellows and the description of its use excited much interest when he produced a model and demonstrated it on 26 April 1711. It was here suggested by him that the bellows could be used to create very great and lasting blasts of wind sufficient to melt or refine ores. This is probably the first suggestion for the creation of blast furnaces such as are in use to-day for melting all kinds of metals.

In the other article written by Valenti, the situation is descried as follows:

In his last letter, Jan. 23, 1712, Papin complained that a number of his inventions presented before the Royal Society had deliberately not been registered under his name: "So there are at least six of my papers that have been read in the meetings of the Royal Society and are not mentioned in the Register. Certainly, Sir, I am in a sad case, since; even by doing good, I draw enemies upon me. Yet for all that I fear nothing because I rely upon God Almighty."

Both sources acknowledge that Royal Society under the guidance of a genius, but now declassed as intellectual criminal, deliberately sabotaged Papin.

Other internet sources, although appear as very credible, generates only confusion by mingling the words and presenting the information in such a manner that anyone could be considered satisfied.

A classical example of this style can be found on a site which present historical information on industry and manufacturing in Britain - Grace's Guide.

https://www.gracesguide.co.uk/Denis_Papin

One can compare the information from this site with the previous information from the cited articles. Most of the relevant information about Papin is truncated, and their conclusion is astonishing:

"However, although Papin envisaged applying the principle to various applications, including pumps and paddle boats, there is no record of him having any success in this direction."

Well the author of that article should find an answer to a simple question: *when an entire society sabotaged a poor man, what results can remain behind?*

Let us see what the "real" business with this steam engine in England of the early 1700 was!

On 2 July 1698 Savery patented a steam engine with the title "A new invention for raising of water and occasioning motion to all sorts of mill work by the impellent force of fire, which will be of great use and advantage for draining mines, serving towns with water, and for the working of all sorts of mills where they have not the benefit of water nor constant winds."

From the information found on internet, it is assumed that he demonstrated it to the Royal Society on 14 June 1699, i.e. one year later.

The patent had no illustrations or even description, but in 1702, i.e. five years later from the time a patent was issued, Savery described the machine in his book The Miner's Friend in which he claimed that it could pump water out of mines.

With other words, Savery in 1698 get a patent for nothing, then in 1699 he comes in front of the Royal Society with a toy (a black box) which apparently pump the water to a certain height and the Imperial authority did not ask for a scheme or a description.

But this is only the beginning...

Savery's original patent of July 1698 gave 14 years' of protection; the next year, 1699, an Act of Parliament was passed which extended his protection for a further 21 years. This Act became known as the "Fire Engine Act". Savery's patent covered all engines that raised water by fire, and it thus played an important role in shaping the development of steam machinery

With other words, in absence of a description or a schematic, the parliament consider his invention so extraordinary and so important that it gives him another 21 years of exclusivity. By sure, all the members of the parliament were genial scientists, who did not need an written description of invention to pass this law, because they had seen the invention with their imaginative minds....

It is clear that this was a "political" scam in order to have the control and exclusivity for all engines developed across British empire into a person's hand.

It is important to be highlighted that Papin's first paper about piston steam engine was published in 1690, about eight years before the Savery patent was granted; by sure there was a fear that he is going to succeed in building a more performant steam engine, but now with this "political scam", even Papin should have asked permission from Savery in order to enter the market.

It would be interesting to see how many other patents in the same period obtained a similar extension from the parliament ...

What do you think ? 10 or maybe 100?

I bet there was none, except the Savery one!

I did not find an original scheme of Savery invention and for the moment I do not have time for such details; based on other opinions found on internet even a layman can arrive to the conclusion that things were arranged "behind the curtain".

Here are some comments about Savery engine found on internet:

Savery's engine had no piston, and no moving parts except from the taps. It was operated by first raising steam in the boiler; the steam was then admitted to one of the first working vessels, allowing it to blow out through a downpipe into the water that was to be raised. When the system was hot and therefore full of steam the tap between the boiler and the working vessel was shut, and if necessary the outside of the vessel was cooled. This made the steam inside it condense, creating a partial vacuum, and atmospheric pressure pushed water up the downpipe until the vessel was full. At this point the tap below the vessel was closed, and the tap between it and the up-pipe opened, and more steam was admitted from the boiler. As the steam pressure built up, it forced the water from the vessel up the up-pipe to the top of the mine.

However, his engine had four serious problems. First, every time water was admitted to the working vessel much of the heat was wasted in warming up the water that was being pumped. Secondly, the second stage of the process required high-pressure steam to force the water up, and the engine's soldered joints were barely capable of withstanding high pressure steam and needed frequent repair. Thirdly, although this engine used positive steam pressure to push water up out of the engine (with no theoretical limit to the height to which water could be lifted by a single high-pressure engine) practical and safety considerations meant that in practice, to clear water from a deep mine would have needed a series of moderate-pressure engines all the way from the bottom level to the surface. Fourthly, water was pushed up into the engine only by atmospheric pressure (working against a condensed-steam 'vacuum'), so the engine had to be no more than about 30 feet (9.1 m) above the water level – requiring it to be installed, operated, and maintained far down in the dark mines all over.

A few Savery engines were tried in mines, an unsuccessful attempt being made to use one to clear water from a pool called Broad Waters in Wednesbury (then in Staffordshire) and nearby coal mines. This had been covered by a sudden eruption of water some years before. However the engine could not be 'brought to answer'. The quantity of steam raised was so great as 'rent the whole machine to pieces'. The engine was laid aside, and the scheme for raising water was dropped as impracticable.

In a layman words, Savery has got a patent for an invention which did not work, but the exclusivity rule was that any other developed engine had to work under his coverage and of course under his conditions.

As far I understand from the up presented description, the machinery of Savery is everything else, but not an engine. The fact that such machinery failed to be used in mines was not surprising....

More astonishing is another fact: it is impossible to "adapt" that machinery to mills or for any other application. Yet, for the British parliament, there was no problem to give exclusivity to Savery for all these applications because the most important purpose was to keep things under control.

Maybe for some people, without experience in intellectual property, it is difficult to grasp the idea behind this "political scam". A comparison is necessary to grasp the full extend of it.

Let us suppose that a person invents a drone and this was the first drone in the world. He goes to the patent office and ask for a patent in which every man made object which can fly in the sky is covered by his invention.

Of course without a description of the invention and in case of mechanical objects without some drawings, the clerk from patent office must send him home. No authority can accept that a patent is requested without these compulsory information.

Anyway, let us suppose that by some miracle, the request is accepted and any patent has some claims for which the author asks protection. One cannot ask intellectual protection for something which is not described and justified in the description of the patent.

In case of Savery request those conditions were not fulfilled, but in our example, the author comes with a description of a drone, some images and even a small example.

The clerk from the office should normally put an objection that his invention is only a toy for children or for some recreational activities, but there are a lot of man made objects which can fly in the sky and these cannot be covered by his "invention". There are plane carrying goods and people, there are helicopters, there are even balloons, etc.

Yet, by a strange coincidence, i.e. some higher interventions, the person gets the patent

covering all man made objects who can fly in the sky based on his drone toy. The problem is, he is an impostor and even with this intellectual property covered, he cannot build a real plane or an helicopter. He can only build some toys for amusement, etc.

No the problem become serious, because in 14 years covered by the patent, he has not enough time to get the skills for building planes or helicopters so the scam has to be somehow extended.

Of course the intervention of higher ranks in the patent office cannot extend the validity of an patent; it is necessary to have a law in order to cover these rights for a longer period. Like in the case of Savery, our person has all the parliament at his small finger so a law is passed and extend the right of the patent to another two or three decades. Like in the case of the "Fire Engine Act", this result is only a legalised fraud. Now, anyone who wants to build a plane or an helicopter, must work under a licence, because there is an intellectual property covering the field.

Around 1705, when they got a schematic of Savery machinery, Papin and Leibniz arrived to the same conclusion. i.e. the Savery machinery is only a toy which could be used for decorative fountains but not for hard work of pumping water from mines.

Unfortunately for Papin, he returned in London in 1707 and here is what happened according to Valenti's description:

When he arrived in England, Papin presented a copy of his treatise to the Royal Society along with a proposal: "Proposition by Dr. Papin, concerning a new invented boat to be rowed by oars, moved with heat," which was recorded in the Royal Society Register of Feb. 11, 1708.

One pro-British history contains a succinct account of the fate of Papin's proposition:

"Papin, then at Cassel, submitted with his paper, a request for fifteen guineas to carry out experiments, but the Royal Society, like our own, did not hand out fifteen guineas at a time. Instead, the matter was referred to Savery in 1708, and in his letter of criticism turning down Papin's design there is a passage in which he damned the cylinder and piston, saying it was impossible to make the latter work because the friction would be too great!"

Papin then argued for his proposal before Newton himself, who rejected it, on the absurd and malicious pretext, that it would cost too much. Papin was then stranded in England without any means of support, completely at the mercy of Newton and Savery, whose exclusive patent covering all conceivable "fire engines" was still in effect. No record remains of Papin's subsequent activity in England.....

If this really happened, in anyone mind a simple question should pop up: What kind of genius was Newton?

What remained from his famous phrase "Hypothesis non fingo!".

By chance, wasn't he able to solve the problem of a simple piston motion under the action of two opposite forces? Further on, wasn't he able to see that Savery report is an imbecility and correct him? Why did the Royal Society accept Savery conclusions?

Well, the conclusion of Mr. Valenti is clear crystal: Newton and Savery were part of the same gang and had all the intentions to sabotage Papin.

In order to see the duplicity of Newton character one has to consider still other information. It has become well known that Newton was also doing charity gifts; well, it is an entire topic of discussion what the charity of wealthy people in reality means, but it is not time for this topic now.

The simple question any historian of science should answer is very simple: how was it possible that Newton in this quality of president of Royal Society and also as a rich men who was doing charity gifts did not lift a finger to help a poor exiled scientist?

The following question is even more disturbing: Was Papin left to die alone and poor or was he helped to disappear and die and his documents stolen?

Based on my personal experience with the "civilised mob of XXI century science", I am sure that Papin disappearance has a lot of hidden things behind.

I said "civilised mob"!? Well it depends from what angle the things are analysed. From Darwin perspective the species appears to evolve, and by sure in comparison with method used during that time, the "civilised mob" has evolved, surpassing the expectation of Darwin's laws.

I know that you have been (like me!) indoctrinated with the idea that Newton was a solitary scientist who stayed for months alone in his chamber thinking to solve some difficult problems. Maybe this was true in his youth, but by sure not after he started the work for Royal Mint.

This is another chapter which has to be written about Newton, because he was doing undercover work, he was also interrogating the counterfeiters, and so on. Imagine Newton after being knighted by the queen, disguised as beggar going night by night in the sloping taverns of London looking after counterfeiters. Imagine that Newton was doing this in his 60's, 70's and even 80's, when "normal" people have other preoccupations....

Maybe an article about Newton and organised crime would be welcome for the future...

Imagine that he used to hang the counterfeiters instead of deporting them into one of the far away colonies of the empire, so ordering the death of a person was not a problem for him....

By the way, was he sadistic enough to watch the execution or was he having lunch during this time?

The fact that Papin disappeared from the scene without any trace is by sure not a normal thing even in the conditions of those times.

By sure he rented a room to stay in London and in case of a natural death his tenant or some neighbours should have informed the authorities.

By sure his documents would have surfaced somewhere after his death and maybe some of the original documents would have remained up to these days. Do you remember what Robertson wrote in his article about Papin ideas:

Papin sent twelve papers to the Society in 1711, all of which were read at the meetings, though none were thought at that time of sufficient importance to merit publication. This was unfortunate since so many of them contain ideas far in advance of the time.

The most logical explanation would be that Papin documents were stolen and he was eliminated from the scene...

By coincidence, in the same time with Papin disappearance, Thomas Newcomen, an unknown from nowhere, suddenly appeared and built his functional fire engine "near Dudley Castle".

For the time these happened, the plot was masterly designed. Papin disappeared in London, an engine appears somewhere in Cornwall at large distance from London (judging after the means of locomotion of those times) so, no one can make a connection and suspect something.

If the engine would have appeared in London, a few months after Papin disappearance, a lot of people would have questioned this fact because Papin was the only one who was working to improve a steam engine. Savery was an impostor who got the patent for nothing and he never ever tried to bring an improvement to the invention.

When analysing these series of events from the perspective of the XXI century, their masterly plot has a serious drawback. Devonshire was a place where "nothing happen", a country place without any intellectual elite. There were no conditions that a person there get informed about the latest intellectual achievements in London or on the continent.

According to wikipedia, which cites Charles R. Morris, The dawn of innovation the first American Industrial Revolution. New York: Public Affairs. p.42.ISBN 978-1-61039-049-1:

Newcomen's great achievement was his steam engine, developed around 1712; combining the ideas of Thomas Savery and Denis Papin, he created a steam engine for the purpose of lifting water out of a tin mine.

The fact that someone without any scientific background, without any prior experimental

models, pops up and presents a complex and functional steam engine at once, has a very simple interpretation: *that person is only the constructor, because the plans were given to him.*

From my point of view, Britain has forgotten to promote and advertise one of the greatest genius in the history of humanity, i.e. Thomas Newcomen. One cannot remain indifereent to the skills of a person who did not ever see a Savery machinery (only heard about it!), who did not see the Papin engine (nor heard about it!), but in a struck of genius combine them and without any prior experience, without any tests or any small scale model, it builds a completely functional steam engine, at once!

Here is how the things are presented on wikipedia:

It is likely that Newcomen was already acquainted with Savery, whose forebears were merchants in south Devon (where Newcomen was living). Savery also had a post with the Commissioners for Sick and Hurt Seamen, which took him to Dartmouth.

So, the parliament and the patent office were waiting for a description of Savery invention in vain for years, and in the same time simple folk people were already knowing about the details and how this invention works.

But this is only the beginning: how could a simple ironmonger (seller of pieces manufactured in copper, iron and other alloys) living in Cornwall get in touch with Papin invention published in a journal in Leipzig, Germany?

Well, there is no information written in this direction, but I know how! There was a direct connection between Cornwall and London and, very very keen of scientific information, Newcomen was secretly improving his knowledge by following the debates of the Royal Society. They already invented the internet and were watching live the debates!

There is going to be a further article, where these aspects and the advancements in the steam engine are going to be analysed in detail (Watt, Woolf, etc.). What is now called the Newcomen engine is in fact the last model of Papin engine and this is gong to be discussed either.

For the new thermodynamic theory, Papin is not only the true father of thermodynamics, but also the only inventor of steam engine. He should have earned this title only for the earliest model developed in 1690 and published in Leipzig, Germany. All others after him performed only innovation to his model and ideas. Commercial success is not similar to intellectual properties rights.

It is a pity that Papin's life ended so tragically.

He was not only a scientific genius but also a true noble mind and soul who understood the meaning of science and the purpose of a scientist; here is a quote from his letter to Huygens after the invention of the pressure cooking pot, where he describes his motivation: *"to relieve poverty, and to get wholesome and agreeable foods from things that we ordinarily reject as useless"*

I think that on his statue in Blois, the following quote is appropriate to be displayed:

His invention of steam engine brought him death, instead of eternal glory

.... because in reality he was assassinated, so that other people got in the possession of his precious documents.

To add perjury to injury (as Newton tried in the dispute with Flamsteed once - see bellow), the Royal Society unveiled a commemorative plaque for Papin, in 2020.

To offer 10£ for a poor exiled scientist was not possible, but now the same institution brings honour to him!

What a shame! What a disgrace! https://blogs.royalsociety.org/history-of-science/2020/03/10/papin-plaque/ An they even remind about these facts in their presentation:

With old acquaintances such as Boyle and Hooke no longer on the scene, however, this period in London was apparently a less happy one, clouded by disputes with the Royal Society over money and leading to his death in 1713 – precise date, again, uncertain.

Of course, there is no document to accuse directly Newton and Royal Society of this criminal act. When someone is in a high position, it is so simple to remain with clean hands and find others who do the dirty jobs...

Quite similar things happened to me in the dispute with the "civilised mob of XXI century science". Even in these modern times, I cannot accuse someone directly because again those who organised these things have clean hands but for the moment, I am still alive....

I am sure that this description of events is going to bring storm in the history of science, but this is only the beginning.....

If we want to have a new start, it is absolutely necessary to have a sound base and this cannot be obtained with half measures and closing the eyes for a genius or because has a strong historical or hysterical background, etc.

Let us see some incontestable documented facts about Newton and how these things have never been presented by those who still polish his shoes

It is a pity that Newton lived in a time when Freud was not born yet. I can only imagine what Freud would have been written about him.

Here are some excerpts from a website dedicated to the biography of important people along history. I consider the entire description very instructive and I suggest that this article is worth the time being read. The link is:

https://www.biography.com/scientist/isaac-newton

• • • • •

The experience left an indelible imprint on Newton, later manifesting itself as an acute sense of insecurity. He anxiously obsessed over his published work, defending its merits with irrational behavior...

••••

In 1703, Newton was elected president of the Royal Society upon Robert Hooke's death. However, Newton never seemed to understand the notion of science as a cooperative venture, and his ambition and fierce defense of his own discoveries continued to lead him from one conflict to another with other scientists.

By most accounts, Newton's tenure at the society was tyrannical and autocratic; he was able to control the lives and careers of younger scientists with absolute power.

,,,,

,,,

In 1705, in a controversy that had been brewing for several years, German mathematician Gottfried Leibniz publicly accused Newton of plagiarizing his research, claiming he had discovered infinitesimal calculus several years before the publication of Principia.

In 1712, the Royal Society appointed a committee to investigate the matter. Of course, since Newton was president of the society, he was able to appoint the committee's members and oversee its investigation. Not surprisingly, the committee concluded Newton's priority over the discovery.

That same year, in another of Newton's more flagrant episodes of tyranny, he published without permission the notes of astronomer John Flamsteed. It seems the astronomer had collected a massive body of data from his years at the Royal Observatory at Greenwich, England.

Newton had requested a large volume of Flamsteed's notes for his revisions to Principia. Annoyed when Flamsteed wouldn't provide him with more information as quickly as he wanted it, Newton used his influence as president of the Royal Society to be named the chairman of the body of "visitors" responsible for the Royal Observatory.

He then tried to force the immediate publication of Flamsteed's catalogue of the stars, as well as all of Flamsteed's notes, edited and unedited. To add insult to injury, Newton arranged for Flamsteed's mortal enemy, Edmund Halley, to prepare the notes for press.

Have you ever seen a single documentary about Newton where the Flamsteed case is described?

Is this the comportment of a genial mind and a noble character or is only the comportment of a sadistic one?

For me personally, I cannot imagine that a "superior mind" can do so much harm for free and only to abuse of the power at his disposal.

This piece of information has become available because there was a court order forcing Newton to return the information stolen from Flamsteed.

Regarding the quarrel with Leibniz, the author forgot to mention that Newton nominated Newton, i.e. auto nomination, as the president of the committee designed to analyse the case of plagiarism and in the committee there were selected only Newton's acolytes. Leibniz was never asked to testify in this case. The committee needed only 40 days to deliberate and take the decision.

Later on, it was discovered another shocking fact: in the manuscripts of Newton, it was found a draft of the commission report written by his hand, so the conclusion was clear crystal: Newton himself wrote the report in advance and the entire act was only a masquerade...

How many other cases of tyrannic comportment or power abuse from Newton remained unknown or hidden in the archives?

For those who wants to have a better image about Newton, there are very instructive materials on Youtube and I would like to remind some here, as far they are related to the discussion:

Math Encounters -- On the Shoulders of Giants: Newton Revealed <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qFo7xZFdBdc</u>

Newton versus Leibniz: Who Invented Calculus? - Tony Weathers <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xhm4AKTrT-Y</u>

Although the introduction was a bit long - this was only the warming up part for describing what Newton did in order to become the greatest intellectual criminal of all times-, so it is high time to switch to other serious things....

The discussion here is based mainly on the video of Tony Weathers, who has many condensed information, and it is further completed with other information found on internet.

The general idea emerging from all materials freely available is that Newton was an outstanding mathematician as a fellow at Trinity College, who developed and used new mathematical methods for solving physical problems.

It is accepted that around 1665, Newton came up with a "general" version of the formula for binomial theorem that is not limited to integer exponents and so, he was able to solve a lot of complicated problem for that time.

He kept the method secret and I suppose he offered only the results....

But, in 1668 a Dutch – Mercator published a book about one case which can be solved using the binomial theorem.

Here is the presentation of the events according to J. B. Biot described in the book Lives of Eminent Persons -London: 1833, available online.

http://www.newtonproject.ox.ac.uk/view/texts/normalized/OTHE00089

At length in the same year (1668) an occurrence in the scientific world compelled him to declare himself. Mercator[7] printed and published, towards the end of this year, a book called Logarithmotechnia, in which he had succeeded in obtaining the area of the hyperbola referred to its asymptotes, by expanding its ordinate into a infinite series; this he did by means of common division, as Wallis had done in the case of fractions of the form 1/1-x: then, considering each term of this series separately, as representing a particular ordinate, he applied to it Wallis's method for curves, whose ordinates are expressed by a single term, and the sum of the partial areas so obtained, gave him the value of the whole area. This was the first example given to the world of obtaining the quadrature of a curve by expanding its ordinate into an infinite series. And it was also the main secret in the general method which Newton had invented for all problems of this nature. The novelty of the invention caused it to be received with general applause. Collins, a gentleman well known to science and philosophy at that time, hastened to send Mercator's book to his friend Barrow, who communicated it to Newton. The latter had no sooner glanced over it, than recognizing his own fundamental idea, he immediately went home, to find the manuscript; in which he had explained his own method, and presented it to Barrow; this was the treatise Analysis per æquationes numero terminorum infinitas. Barrow was struck with astonishment at seeing so rich a collection of analytical discoveries of far greater importance than the particular one which then excited such general admiration. Perhaps, too, he must have been still more surprised at their young author having been able to keep them so profoundly secret. He immediately wrote about them to Collins, who, in return, entreated Barrow to procure for him the sight of so precious a manuscript. Collins obtained his request, and happily, before returning the work, took a copy of it, which being found after his death, among his papers, and published in 1711, has determined beyond dispute, by the date which it bore, at what period Newton made the memorable discovery of expansion by series, and of the method of fluxions. It would have been natural to suppose that an interference with his own discoveries would at last have induced Newton to publish his methods; but he preferred still to keep them secret. "I suspected," says he, "that Mercator must have known the extraction of roots, as well as the reduction of fractions into series by division, or at least, that others, having learnt to employ division for this purpose, would discover the rest before I myself should be old enough to appear before the public, and, therefore, I began henceforward to look upon such researches with less interest."[8]

Here is a more sober presentation for some of the same facts: <u>https://mathshistory.st-andrews.ac.uk/Biographies/Newton/</u>

In July 1669 Barrow tried to ensure that Newton's mathematical achievements became known to the world. He sent Newton's text De Analysi to Collins in London writing:- [Newton] brought me the other day some papers, wherein he set down methods of calculating the dimensions of magnitudes like that of Mr Mercator concerning the hyperbola, but very general; as also of resolving equations; which I suppose will please you; and I shall send you them by the next.

Collins corresponded with all the leading mathematicians of the day so Barrow's action should have led to quick recognition. Collins showed Brouncker, the President of the Royal Society, Newton's results (with the author's permission) but after this Newton requested that his manuscript be returned.

Let us rephrase the framework and consider what a normal person or a genius would do in such situation!

One has found a general method which can be applied to a lot of problems and keep it secret (for no apparent reason or because he is an egoistic!); now, another person find the same solution for a particular problem and get acclamations and recognition.

Any sound mind (normal or genius) would publish the general solution because it is evident that other people are going to find it soon.

I do not have enough information to judge what happened in this case, but for me this story of Newton who, in one day gives the permission that his manuscript can be read by other people and another day asked to be returned, is not so clear; for me, even this story stinks!

Years are passing and we arrive to the *invention and development of calculus*.

There are some clear facts which are necessary to be presented first.

Newton and Leibniz never met. Leibniz visited London twice, first time in 1573 and second time in 1676. Both these trips were made as part of Leibniz duties as diplomat.

In the year 1573, Newton was a completely unknown person to Leibniz. In the 1676 visit, Leibniz stayed for a week in London and by sure the visited the Royal Society and read some of the documents there.

As far Newton was always very secretive about his work, Leibniz could not find relevant information about infinitesimal calculus in that documents.

There were some letters between Newton and Leibniz where each of them were describing their works. Even in these letters, Leibniz was open and described clearly what he was doing, in opposition to Newton letters which were secretive and ambiguous.

The history of events is as follows:

Leibniz published his first paper about derivation rules in 1684.

Leibniz published his second paper about integration rules in 1686.

Leibniz published his third monumental paper in 1693 with the connection between differentials and integrals.

Newton published his fist edition of Principia in 1687, where *there is no single problem solved with infinitesimal calculus.* The first edition of Principia was written based on euclidean geometry. There are a lot of people who writes about this topic without at least browsing this book. One single remarkable person, so far, was honest in this direction i.e. Richard Feynman. He admitted not understanding this book even he is considered a genius in physics.

How many people who wrote adulatory words about this book have gained more knowledge in Physics as Feynman and understood it?

Here is how the things are described in wikipedia:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica

....But the language of calculus as we know it was largely absent from the Principia; Newton gave many of his proofs in a geometric form of infinitesimal calculus, based on limits of ratios of vanishing small geometric quantities.

Largely absent is a fancy expression to say it is completely absent!

Some of the Newton's acolytes advanced the idea that Newton (although knew how to use the differential and integral calculus) purposely wrote this book in the language of euclidean geometry in order to keep it secret or for other personal reasons (to not have litigations etc.).

What was to keep secret when another person has already published the foundation of infinitesimal calculus?

On the other hand, in the "specific Newtonian style", in the first edition of Principia there is a reference to Leibniz method, but this was removed in ulterior editions.

After the first edition was already published, there is a discussion between Newton and one of his collaborators, where this collaborator was complaining about the difficulty of Leibniz method and Newton gave him advices. So, it is clear that translation of Principia, by using the infinitesimal calculus, was made much later.

It is a pity that Newton didn't understood anything from the case of Mercator publishing his book, although it is supposed that Newton had a more general solution earlier.

The fact that one screwed it up once, can be tolerated in a certain historical context. The fact that one was screwing it up in a systematic manner, is intolerable in science, irrespective of the historical context!

For the new proposed theory Newton has nothing to do with the invention of infinitesimal calculus. He is only the first who used it in solving some problems of physics.

If Newton would have published at least a relevant paper regarding infinitesimal calculus between 1684 and 1693, then he or his acolytes could have reasons to argue about this topic.

Last but not least, the quarrel with Hooke has to be taken into consideration. A broader discussion about this topic is going to be made in a sequel about gravitational theory, but some insights can be made in advance.

By analysing the materials available on internet about this topic, it is impossible to not see how these are full of ambiguities and a lot of nonsensical assumptions.

Educated people still have difficulties in understanding the main problem and distilling these facts in relevant and irrelevant for the problem.

Here are the relevant facts....

As previously presented, Newton become a good mathematician after entering Trinity College but as physicist he was not so bright, at least not all the time. There are enough materials on internet where Hooke made fun of his solution to a simple problem of physics. He did not make any comment about Savery report regarding the functioning of a simple piston which is again a problem for pupils ...

It is assumed that he solved the problem of celestial orbits in the early period of his career but this is again false.

The main problem for Newton as mathematician was a bit different. There were rumours and assumptions about a gravitational force inversely proportional with distance, but for him this idea did not make any sense.

For those who already want to jump out of their pants, it would be better to read more information about those events and that period first!

Kepler demonstrated that planets have elliptical orbits and this was an incontestable fact. During Newton early period of research in astronomy, *he was not able to demonstrate that a force inversely proportional with distance generates an elliptical orbit.*

His complicated geometrical demonstrations (as we have seen he did not knew and used the infinitesimal calculus before 1700) were able to prove that a force inversely proportional with distance generates a circular orbit.

With other words, his early mathematical demonstrations were able to prove right a Copernican model and not a Keplerian one.

If I can make a joke, *he was able to prove right precisely the wrong model*

As consequence, for a long period of his career, Newton considered that a supplementary term is necessary to be added to the $1/r^2$ in order to obtain a ellipse.

Even by adding a corrective term and by doing a painstaking work - which sincerely has to be admired-, he wasn't able to solve the problem, so he switched the tasks and dedicated to optics.

His career went along and a certain moment his interest for astronomy is revived from various reasons. There was the Halley comet on the sky, which by sure was a frequent topic of discussion between scientists. Hooke, as secretary of Royal Society, humiliated him by publishing a letter where he made a childish error in solving a simple problem of astronomy. There was even a bet for getting the right form of the gravitational force, etc.

Although today the classical gravitational theory is considered the work of a single men, the reality is completely different.

In this general framework, Newton was finally able to find the solution (again with some geometrical approach) and demonstrate that in case of force of the form of $1/r^2$ the trajectory could be an ellipse too.

In simpler terms, a central force of the form of $1/r^2$ can have two physical solutions: a circular orbit and an elliptical one.

No one is ever going to contest this brilliant solution he obtained!

But, in the new theory, from the status of a good mathematician up to the present image of Newton, there is a huge and unjustified gap.

He is going to remain a good mathematician and physicist for his time, but in the same time his new fame is going to come from the fact that he is going to get the title of the greatest intellectual criminal of all times.

There is no possibility that such case could ever be repeated in the future because each country, who is going to adopt this new theory, is compulsory going to perform serious reforms in research and intellectual property.

The theft in intellectual property has become legal today and Savery case would make some contemporary laugh. In order to have a real progress of society, it is absolutely necessary to clearly regulate the intellectual property and support the inventors to enter the market with their inventions.

The real market economy existent now is only a joke to fool the children or the theoreticians. One cannot enter the market with a new (eventually revolutionary) product because usually he has not enough money to bring the product on the market and on the other hand he is only a small fish and the big sharks are waiting for him....

It is obvious that the only unknown thing which remains to be seen is what shark gets the prey!

If an inventor chooses to get support from a company, this is another problem and it can be allowed, but in principle, any inventor must have a clear possibility to enter the market, even the entire running industry is against him!

Of course, the research in universities in research centres is going to be reorganised either.

For those who don't like these perspectives, there is no problem at all! Do continue spending your money on imbecilities and stick to the present way of doing science and research....

How many years do you think your country can continue doing so?

And after that what?

There is going to be no discount in the future. There are going to be only increased penalties.

The value of my theory is going to increase with each passing year....

SECTION V BOOSTING THE COAL ELECTRICIY PRODUCTION WITH A SIMPLE FINGER SNAP

According to International Energy Agency the total worldwide gross production of electricity in 2016 was 25082 TWh. Sources of electricity were coal and peat 38,3%, natural gas 23,1%, hydroelectric 16,6%, nuclear power 10,4%, oil 3,7%, solar/wind/geothermal/tidal/other 5,6%, biomass and waste 2,3%.

I could not find updated data for the interval 2017 - 2020, but in any case the trend is to have more energy pro each year and eventually there should be a small but constant increase in the proportion of renewable energy.

Although this discussion is made for coal power plant, electricity produced by biomass, waste, oil and some of the electricity produced by natural gas follows the same technology.

In conclusion, the present changed procedure could be applied to a larger categories of power plants which deliver about 50 % of the world electricity production.

For 2016, a boost of this production, with an conservative 20%, by using the same inputs (amount of fuel) would have mean an amount of 20% of 12541 TWh = 2508 TWh obtained for free ...

Some of the developed countries are considering not worthy to continue producing electricity based on coal, but these countries are becoming irrelevant for the discussion and for the production too.

When India or China open a new power plant based on coal every month, what is the relevancy that UK closes a few power plants in a decade?

In some previous newsletters dedicated to electricity production, some truly revolutionary technologies were presented.

Unfortunately, although electricity produced around the world is not enough and in the same time most of it is produced in a dirty way, no company was interested to promote these technologies. From the main European electricity producers, the only company which responded to my letters was E-ON Germany; they politely informed me that they are not interested to promote these new technologies.

The European Commission was not interested to regulate the market either, although their mission is to do so....

As far we have reloaded the discussion about thermodynamic as science, it is high time to see what a simple finger snap can do in a coal power plant. Of course "a finger snap" is a metaphor to illustrate what can be achieved without investments, only with a small change which costs quite nothing.

The idea is very simple: take a functional coal power plant and change the working fluid from water to chloroform.

In a couple of centuries of steam engine and electricity production by steam, no one had the curiosity if other liquid perform better as water. Ok, there has been a prediction that ,,all gases should perform identical a thermodynamic cycle", but that was based on an ideal comportment of gases. In a real machine there are no ,,ideal gases".

Someone could have easily promoted such project, in the frame of present thermodynamics, as a study regarding the departure of a real thermodynamic cycle from the ideal expectations.

This did not happen and one has to accept the situation and go further....

In a similar manner with the presentation made in Section 2, and in other previous newsletters, it can be demonstrated that changing the working fluid in a coal power plant can bring a lot of advantages.

The amount of mechanical work is dependent on the amount of liquid transformed into gas and having a fluid with lower vaporization heat will allow performing more work if

the same quantity of heat is delivered to the system.

The schematic of a coal power plant working with steam is presented in fig. 18.



Figure 18 Functional power plant working with steam

Steam produced by boiler, after producing mechanical work on turbine, enters into a condenser where is cooled down and returns to the boiler as liquid making a closed circuit. The condenser release the excess heat into environment or in some cases part of it is recovered in a different way.

By switching to a freon the circuit is the same - fig. 19.



Figure 19 Proposed model of a power plant on freon

In the following comparison between water and chloroform as working agents. I am going to use only the accepted data found in literature without advancing any new idea; any engineer and even laymen can follow the discussion and make comments.

The comparison is going to be made for working in subcritical regime, from reasons which are explained bellow. Water is a kind of special substance and it have strong associations between molecules even in gaseous state; these associations affects the yield, so the solution found was to go in the supercritical conditions where water comports in a completely different way. I could not found some reliable data between a power plant working in subcritical and supercritical conditions so I would be pleased to get such information; based on this information a comparison between water and a organic compound working in supercritical mode is going to be closer to the observed reality.

The freon can be used in supercritical mode too, with net advantages over water again, so there is no problem for those who are keen of "supercritical conditions".

Working in subcritical conditions should be preferred as far it is a much simpler technological solution.

For a coal power plant working between room temperature and 150 'C, the following amount of energies are necessary to vaporize a mole of water.

To arrive at water boiling point: $Q_1 = mc\Delta t = 18 \times 4, 18 \times 80 = 6912 \text{ J}$

To boil the mole of water : $Q_2 = m\lambda = 18 \times 2260 = 40680 \text{ J}$

To push the water steam to 150 'C: $Q_3 = mc\Delta t = 18 \times 2, 1 \times 50 = 1890 \text{ J}$

Chloroform has a different boiling point (61 °C) so the same steps needs to be performed but for other values. For chloroform, I found the values for molar heat capacity as liquid, molar enthalpy of vaporization and in the following link the molar heat capacity as ideal fluid. http://unifac.ddbst.de/en/EED/PCP/ICP_C47.php

The heat capacity of chloroform as ideal gas varies strongly with temperature and it is important to observe that this value is much higher in comparison with water.

The same power plant using a mole of chloroform is going to need the following amounts of energies.

To arrive at boiling point: $Q_4 = mc\Delta t = 116 \times 41 = 4756 J$

I have a single mole of chloroform and this have the liquid capacity of 116 J/mole K

To boil the mole of chloroform : $Q_5 = m\lambda = 30000 \text{ J}$

To push the chloroform vapours to 150 'C: $Q_6 = mc\Delta t = 78 \times 89 = 6942 \text{ J}$

The difference between 150 'C and boiling point of 61 'C is 89 'C and the molar heat capacity was made as an media of 78 J/mole K based on the variation presented in the link.

In order to arrive at 150 $^{\circ}$ C , the total amount of energy spent for water is about 49482 J in comparison with chloroform which needs only 41698 J.

This simple change ensures a gain of about 18% in the frame of accepted thermodynamic, only by using chloroform as working agent.

If one analysis the values from Q1 to Q6, it is a striking evidence that chloroform has an advantage in terms of energy heating as liquid and during vaporization, but it looses this advantage by going to elevated temperatures in vapours state.

To bring steam to 150 $^{\circ}$ C, the heat necessary is about 1890 J; by comparison the heat to bring chloroform from 61 $^{\circ}$ C to 150 $^{\circ}$ C is about 6942 J. Going at higher temperatures makes chloroform to perform equally to water and at about 700 $^{\circ}$ C even worse as water.

In order to gain a further advantage of chloroform characteristics, the working conditions for it has to be limited up to maximum 100 'C and even up to 80 'C . In this case there is an increase in yield of about 20%.

If one takes a working coal power plant which currently generates 4000 MW, by changing the working fluid it can be improved to produce 4800 MW with the same amount of coal burned. There is a gain of 800 MW only from this simple switch. It is obvious that a gain in productivity and less environmental impact for each MW of electricity is accounted.

In my opinion, by switching to chloroform the real gain in subcritical conditions is going to be even higher, around 30%.

Here is why:

The turbine is driven by the molecules of working agent acting on turbine blades. It is more efficient in my opinion to have a flux of heavy molecules (chloroform molecular mass is 119) instead of light molecules (water molecular mass is 18). The flux of heavy molecules although at lower speed can be better controlled and another efficiency can be gained....

For the future, it is necessary to look for a proper working fluid appropriate to be used as a working agent. There is a need to have a study about the way a working agent have to be chosen.

Such working fluid has to fulfil the following conditions:

- a lower latent heat of vaporization as possible;
- a boiling point less than 60 'C ;
- a higher molecular mass as possible;
- a round molecule in order to avoid unnecessary interactions in gaseous phase;
- a low critical temperature and pressure in case of supercritical working conditions.

An example of such more appropriate working fluid would be Perfluorocyclohexane C_6F_{12} .



Its boiling point is 59–60 $^{\circ}$ C and its latent heat of vaporization is 28 KJ according to the data published here:

http://umsl.edu/~chickosj/JSCPUBS/vap2003.pdf

Gaining 2 KJ, in comparison with chloroform, for one mole, seems trivial and irrelevant, but in correlation with other favourable properties, this can further improve the yield of the electricity production.

SECTION VI BOOSTING THE NUCLEAR ENERGY PRODUCTION WITH A SIMPLE FINGER SNAP

According to International Energy Agency the total worldwide gross production of electricity in 2016 was 25082 TWh. Sources of electricity were coal and peat 38,3%, natural gas 23,1%, hydroelectric 16,6%, nuclear power 10,4%, oil 3,7%, solar/wind/geothermal/tidal/other 5,6%, biomass and waste 2,3%.

I could not find updated data for the interval 2017 - 2020, but in any case the trend is to have more energy pro each year and eventually there should be a small but constant increase in the proportion of renewable energy.

Speaking of 2016, although the nuclear power represents only a 10% of the total energy, in absolute values, is a quite considerable amount: 10% of 25082 TWh means 2508 TWh from nuclear sources.

There are countries which rely mainly on the nuclear technology for ensuring the necessary of electricity; as example: France 80%, Sweden 40%, South Korea 30%, Finland 30%, UK and US about 20%.

For 2016, a boost of this production with an conservative 20%, by using the same inputs (amount of fissionable material), would mean an amount of 20% of 2508 TWh = 500 TWh obtained for free ...

This section is going to demonstrate how this amount can be obtained without doing any investment, only by changing the working fluid.

As most people already know, a nuclear power plants generate electricity using heat from nuclear reactions. The nuclear reaction take place inside a nuclear reactor. The heat generated during the reaction boils water to generate steam which further drives the turbine to generate electricity. There is no need to enter into the details of the nuclear chemistry and nuclear fission, which are a further topic for discussion.

Most of the nuclear reactors currently operating arround the globe are either boiling water reactors or pressurized water reactors.

A boiling water reactor heats up the water in the reactor until it boils into steam and the same water steam runs through the entire power plant as in fig. 20. After performing mechanical work, i.e. acting on the turbine, steam is cooled back into water and returns to the reactor.



Figure 20 Boiling water reactor schematics

A pressurized water reactor overcomes some of the the drawback of a boiling water reactor by separating water the used inside the reactor for waste management from that used to generate steam - fig. 21. The water inside the reactor is used at a high pressure and high temperature. Because of the high pressure, the water doesn't convert into steam. The hot water in the reactor transfers heat to a second circuit to generate steam for electricity generation.



Figure 21 Pressurized water reactor schematics

Except the nuclear reactor, a nuclear power plant works very similar to a conventional thermal plant and therefore a simulation made previously for a coal power plant is going to be valid for a nuclear power plant.

In the following comparison between water and chloroform as working agents. I am going to use only the accepted data found in literature without advancing any new idea; any engineer and even laymen can follow the discussion and make comments.

The comparison is going to be made for working in subcritical regime i.e. boiling water reactor type, from reasons which are explained bellow. Water is a kind of special substance and it have strong associations between molecules even in gaseous state; these associations affects the yield, so the solution found was to go in the supercritical conditions where water comports in a completely different way. I could not found some reliable data between a power plant working in subcritical and supercritical conditions so I would be pleased to get such information.

The freon can be used in supercritical mode too, with net advantages over water again, so there is no problem for those who are keen of "supercritical conditions".

Working in subcritical conditions should be preferred as far it is a much simpler technological solution.

For a nuclear power plant working between room temperature and 150 °C, the following amount of energies are necessary to vaporize a mole of water.

To arrive at water boiling point: $Q_1 = mc\Delta t = 18 \times 4, 18 \times 80 = 6912 \text{ J}$

To boil the mole of water : $Q_2 = m\lambda = 18 \times 2260 = 40680 \text{ J}$

To push the water steam to 150 'C: $Q_3 = mc\Delta t = 18 \times 2, 1 \times 50 = 1890 \text{ J}$

Chloroform has a different boiling point (61 °C) so the same steps needs to be performed but for other values. For chloroform, I found the values for molar heat capacity as liquid, molar enthalpy of vaporization and in the following link the molar heat capacity as ideal fluid. <u>http://unifac.ddbst.de/en/EED/PCP/ICP_C47.php</u>

The heat capacity of chloroform as ideal gas varies strongly with temperature and it is important to observe that this value is much higher in comparison with water.

The same power plant using a mole of chloroform is going to need the following amounts of energies.

To arrive at boiling point: $Q_4 = mc\Delta t = 116 \times 41 = 4756 J$

I have a single mole of chloroform and this have the liquid capacity of 116 J/mole K

To boil the mole of chloroform : $Q_5 = m\lambda = 30000 \text{ J}$

To push the chloroform vapours to 150 'C: $Q_6 = mc\Delta t = 78 \times 89 = 6942 \text{ J}$

The difference between 150 'C and boiling point of 61 'C is 89 'C and the molar heat capacity was made as an media of 78 J/mole K based on the variation presented in the link.

In order to arrive at 150°C , the total amount of energy spent for water is about 49482 J in comparison with chloroform which needs only 41698 J.

This simple change ensures a gain of about 18% in the frame of accepted thermodynamic, only by using chloroform as working agent.

If one analysis the values from Q1 to Q6, it is a striking evidence that chloroform has an advantage in terms of energy heating as liquid and during vaporization, but it looses this advantage by going to elevated temperatures in vapours state.

To bring steam to 150 'C, the heat necessary is about 1890 J; by comparison the heat to bring chloroform from 61 'C to 150 'C is about 6942 J. Going at higher temperatures makes chloroform to perform equally to water and at about 700 'C even worse as water.

In order to gain a further advantage of chloroform characteristics, the working conditions for it has to be limited up to maximum 100 'C and even up to 80 'C. In this case there is an increase in yield of about 20%.

In my opinion, by switching to chloroform the real gain in subcritical conditions is going to be even higher, around 30%.

Here is why:

The turbine is driven by the molecules of working agent acting on turbine blades. It is more efficient in my opinion to have a flux of heavy molecules (chloroform molecular mass is 119) instead of light molecules (water molecular mass is 18). The flux of heavy molecules although at lower speed can be better controlled and another efficiency can be gained....

For the future, it is necessary to look for a proper working fluid appropriate to be used as a working agent. There is a need to have a study about the way a working agent have to be chosen.

Such working fluid has to fulfil the following conditions:

- a lower latent heat of vaporization as possible;
- a boiling point less than 60 'C;
- a higher molecular mass as possible;
- a round molecule in order to avoid unnecessary interactions in gaseous phase;
- a low critical temperature and pressure in case of supercritical working conditions.

An example of such more appropriate working fluid would be Perfluorocyclohexane C_6F_{12} .



Its boiling point is 59–60 $^{\circ}$ C and its latent heat of vaporization is 28 KJ according to the data published here:

http://umsl.edu/~chickosj/JSCPUBS/vap2003.pdf

Gaining 2 KJ for one mole seems trivial and irrelevant, but in correlation with other favourable properties, this can further improve the yield of the electricity production.

SECTION VII OLD GAME, SAME SCENE, NEW ACTORS AND FIGUREHEADS

In a previous section, I made a short presentation for the Papin case in order to see what lesseon of history has to be learned.

Of course, I am going to continue the investigations and write a book about the Papin's life. I hope that some French organizations or individuals are going to support this initiative.

By sure the life of a genial man deserves a book; by comparison, some people considered necessary to write a book which analyses only the origin of the expression presented by Newton ,, by standing on the shoulders of Giants".

I hope that some German and UK organizations are going to support a much larger project to write a more objective version of the XVIIth century events based on the documents available.

And now it is important to make a comparison between what happened three centuries ago and what happens now....

At that time there was only Royal Society which sabotaged Papin, for some small reasons which by sure are going to surface soon

In our days, and for a quarter of century, a crowd of imbeciles, occupying key positions in society, have been preventing an intelectual revolution, i.e. a change of the entire foundation of exact sciences.

This crowd is composed mainly by the present intelectual elites but legislatives and executives are part of the plot too.

The European Commission is a representative example which needs a special attention. They are meant to ensure progress and stability for the European Union and steward the interests of European citizens, but in reality they are doing the opposite. In the past, I filled in a complaint against European Commission without any positive result, there is still a petition to the European parliament, but as in the Savery times, it is so simple to pass by these things and cover everything in a bureaucratic procedures.

Of course, from their point of view, no one sabotaged me! They were doing their jobs only and they were only doing with a bit of excess of zeal their jobs! Can someone accuse such people that being well paid, they were doing the jobs even more thoroughly as it should have been?

The academies and other representative institutions (universities, research centres) all over the world are part of the plot or in any case they tacitly tolerated it. I remember sending a paper for publishing to the Australian Academy of Science around 2007-2008 and they refused publishing it on the reason they do not understand the English in the article. I kept the original version of the article on the website (about covalent bond - the atomic book) and although there are some grammatical errors, the idea can be spotted easily. Anyway, after correcting the article

to an professional English speaker and resubmitting the corrected article, they did not ever answer to my email.

Any such representative institution, in a direct or in an indirect way, has took part in the plot, by not doing what they were meant to do!

The Romanian Academy, which should promote the national values, including this theory, did the worse job in its history. There are available about 40000 Euro each year for an academician to be spend on indemnity and other expenses, but one Euro for this theory could not be found! Well, don't imagine that an academician lives only from the money coming from Academy!

Of course, all the present Romanian academicians have been schooled in the wealthy western society and they are in contact with the intellectual elites; in fact, they have been paid directly or indirectly by these elites to keep their mouth shut and do nothing for promoting this theory. For a few thousands euro, they can be bought anytime at ,,their real market value". They have forgotten that they should have represented the cultural elite of a nation and in the same time a model for the young generations.

It is important to be highlighted what is at stake for the entire society in this modern plot...

Well, it is impossible to quantify at this moment what this new theory in economic terms really means! I am going to exemplify what does it mean only for a part of the energetic sector. Again, I do not make the estimation for the entire energetic sector, but only to highlight the consequences for the simple application discussed today, i.e. a simple change of a fluid in a power plant without any other investment. We have shown that by doing such small change, an amount of 3000 TWh (from coal and nuclear) could have been produced "from thin air" at the level of production estimated for 2016.

Ok, "from thin air" it does not mean I got it from my pocket, it is only the result of a technological improvement.

At a cost of production of about 0,1 Euro per KWh, that amount would have represented 300 billions Euro for 2016, i.e. more than entire GDP of my country.

What do you think now? Would someone want to kill for this fortune? If you say no, then your are completely torn from the reality! 99% of the human population in these civilised times would do it with the first occasion if they would be sure they are not caught!

Attention, this is not a new technology in itself...it is only a small detail which was left aside by an imbecile science...

What can a real new technology of electricity production bring, is going to be seen in the future....

Anyway, there is going to come a time when any company in the electricity field is going to be asked why did they, directly or indirectly, opposed to a switch in the technology!

The direct consequence of not implementing these technologies is seen in climate change and industrial pollution. Of course many people, especially politicians, make a lot of noise about these topics but all the strange measures they want to implement have to be supported by citizens.

The new theory comes with solutions to at least alleviate this burden on the citizens shoulders; but, do you think that this is important for a bunch of corrupt or lazy bureaucrats?

Even a laymen could understand that society as a whole is already losing because these technologies are not implemented.

I am not going to lose because the royalties for the electricity production are going to be recovered for me starting with 2010. Supplementary the new technologies are going to remain as intellectual property and never as brevets. Someone in the field of intellectual property knows what the difference is....

If a country wants to have progress and real scientific research, then it is high time to think in the future.

Let us see what the consequence of this organised plot for the educational system are!

At least 20 generations of pupils, scholars, students and teachers were indoctrinated with a wrong scientific background and for most of them it is going to be impossible to switch to the new one. There are other generations coming from behind and although theoretically it is possible to "re-educate" these lost generations, in practice this is not going to happen.

Although there is no doubt that this new theory of science is going to become the foundation for the future progress of humanity, this theory is only in its initial stage....

In the view of opposed resistance from the imbecility of elitist intellectuals, I was forced to dedicate my scarce time to bring up new experiments and facts which could demolish or rule out the present accepted dogma, so the "proper" development of the theory is lagging behind. If for example, the theory is going to be accepted tomorrow, there is a huge vacuum in many branches of science which cannot be filled over the night.

As already presented with another occasion a period of at least five years is normally necessary for having new manuals, new teachers and so on. If the society as a whole afforded to be careless about such transition, this period is going to be extended accorded to the rules defined in a previous newsletter.

How many lost generations can a society still afford? And who is going to be charged guilty for this disaster?

Another major loss for the society as a whole is related to research expenses.

The amount of money spent on futile research in this lost quarter of century is difficult to be imagined. At national level, for a developed country, there is about 5% of GDP dedicated to research. This is money from budget dedicated to fundamental research by the grant system. If one considers the private and industrial research, the expenses are bigger. In a quarter of a century, each developed country has thrown away at least the equivalent of a GDP....

Of course some are going to argue that part of these research are applicative research which remains valid even the foundation changes. This is true, but now there is necessary other input of money to clean up the mess and decide what is going to remain and what is going to be discarded. If this step were to be done a quarter of century earlier, tons of junk literature would have not been written and the transition would have been simpler...

Does someone think that such process can be performed over the night and with a team of few people?

Where are these people coming if the entire community is indoctrinated with imbecilities?

So, even for research there is going to be a discontinuity period according to the rules defined in a previous newsletter.

In a future newsletter, there is going to be a broader presentation about the purpose of this theory and what are the targets....

First of all, each living person should ask himself what price would (s)he pay that his/her offspring have access to this theory.

A real price, from my point of view, would be as follows: one generation of his/her offspring work for me, in the same conditions I have been working for decades and paid as I was paid. When his/her offspring have generated at least 1% of what I generated, then they are free to have access to this theory for them and for their descendants.

If they are not able to generate in one generation that 1% of what I have generated, the contract extends in the same conditions for the next generation and so one.

What do you think about this bargain? Would you be interested in it?

The difference between a great man and a common one can be seen in these conditions.

What is going to happen when a great man acquires the power? Would he change something for the future or will he use the power only to get revenge for what happened to him previously.

The Newton – Hooke case can be framed as a classical example for what happen when a tyrant got the power in his hands....

We imagine that such repetition of things is not possible in democracy but this is false. In a democracy these things happen all the time, but they are hidden.

Beside professional harassment, for a quarter of century I was hunted by "imaginary ghosts" because when the entire system is against you, the danger comes from everywhere.

A simple walk in a beautiful but uncrowded place, in a second can become a place where your life is endangered. A simple theft can appear as an accident, but these are only appearances because few (if any) such occasional acts are done for documents. Or maybe in the latest times many thieves want to improve their scientific knowledge...

Probably the most tranquil period I remember was when I worked as a chemist for a half year to a cannabis cultivar in Switzerland. Unfortunately, this tranquillity suddenly disappeared when in a Sunday morning some gunshots outside disturbed my intellectual preoccupations. By sure I did not want to be a collateral victim in another war so this was also a reason I quit soon that job. Of course I was not keen to be part of such insignificant conflict either....

In a dictatorship, a dissident knows where the danger is coming from. In a democracy the danger comes from everywhere.

Of course there is police but they are only to serve the system and to register the facts; they are not to prevent such situations.

Such direct or indirect pressure would drive any normal person crazy and would make it slip into paranoia and mental derangements. Boltzmann arrived to suicide for much less pressure and of course there was no one to see why such a person arrived to such desperate act.

Unfortunately for this bunch of criminals, I have trained myself to endure this pressure and overcome any situation.

Of course in such situations a strong believe in a "upper" protection is crucial; I always had an internal feeling that there is a greater purpose behind all these events and maybe someone incarnate in this life in order to change these things and show another path to be followed in the future.

What would you think if your offspring would live in these conditions for decades?

Aren't you happy that the modern democracy we have build has tried to eliminate the greatest mind of humanity ever?...

.....and no one is guilty!

Is someone in a hurry to unveil another commemorative plaque for me and I did not know ?

This is not a new thing in history. The first democracy in Athens, succeeded in killing one of the most outstanding personality of that time and of course no one was charged guilty.

In the meantime they have learned to keep secret these things though!

The purpose of this theory is to change a lot of things in the world, starting with environmental aspects, education, research and development, sound and sustainable economic rules and up to some social aspects. Do not worry, it is not the purpose of this theory to change a political system!

As Romanian, it is going to be a priority to buy my country back for Romanians and to make it entire.....

Now, my country is chopped and has become only a colony for the mercantilism of a mad society.

I hope that God is going to help me to transform my nation in an example to be followed by others, in their way toward progress and spirituality.