Letters

PRNewsFoto/Acciona

There is no ``free energy'': Here, Acciona's Nevada Solar One concentrating solar power plant, the world's largest, produces less than 15 megawatts of power, averaged over the course of a day.

Free Energy? It's a Fraud!

To the Editor:

Re: "The Astounding High Cost of 'Free' Energy" (www.21stcenturyscience cetech.com/ Articles%202008/Energy_cost.pdf): You need to think outside the envelope.... Start with Nicola Tesla.

www.metacafe.com/watch/915226/free_electricity_from_thin_air/

Thomas Lombardi

Laurence Hecht Replies

The video in your link is a fraud. The work done by electricity is not measured in volts but in watts, which are volts times amps.

If you think of electricity like water flowing through a wire, the voltage is like the pressure and the current (amperage) is the amount of liquid flowing. You can have a lot of water pressure passing through a pinhole, but it will take a long time to fill up your coffee cup.

That is the situation in the demonstration. If the energy of the free radio waves in the air were significantly higher, they would be dangerous to us.

If he had turned the multimeter dial over to amps, you would have seen that the reading was so low that there was scarcely a few milliwatts (thousandths of a watt) available. You can buy a million times that from Con Edison for about 12 cents an hour. The cost of charging your cell phone is less than a penny, thanks to our power grid.

Did the fellow in the video actually charge the cell phone with the so-called free energy? No. He only showed that there was enough power to activate the screen icon on the cell phone. This takes very little power.

Why do you suppose the author of the video failed to point this out?

Do you think you could actually charge a cell phone this way? Try it. Then write me back in two weeks, and tell me if the power from this free energy exceeded the discharge rate of the battery.

Next consider that we are not talking about running cell phones, but powering an industrial society.

The Global Warming 'Debate'

To the Editor:

I was looking at your website hoping to find more on the global warming debate.

I applaud sensible discussion about global warming. I have a technical, tertiary education, but will immediately admit up front that I am not a climate scientist. The more I learn the more I realize I don't know.

I try not to come to the debate from a position. Rather, trying to extract evidence from opinion. So I don't have 'a position.'

What does concern me is the attitude both sides of the debate have about the other. Clearly there are some well-respected scientists on both sides of the argument who push the evidence for and against.

But there are also a whole swag of other people, some scientists also, again on both sides, who argue from a position and a conviction, rather than accepting that the science either way is not certain. Each side claims the other is stupid, extreme, has a vested interest, etc., etc.

Surely we should all be concentrating on the science and trying to find out more. Not knocking those who we see as being 'on the other side.' Sadly, the whole debate has degenerated into a silly game of point-scoring.

I think that the many websites who push for either side of the argument could help here by refraining from personal attacks; from claiming that views of others are 'stupid,' or based on lies. It really doesn't help.

Why don't you all concentrate on the science and help to educate us rather than simply adopt an adversarial position?

Marjorie Mazel Hecht Replies

Unfortunately, the political agenda behind global warming has made civil debate or even discussion of the science nearly impossible, even among scientists. The fact is that the manufactured issue of "global warming" is intended to kill people, lots of people. For documentation on this genocidal intent, see "Where the Global Warming Hoax Was Born," www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202007/GWHoaxBorn.pdf.

In climate (and in other areas), science no longer searches for "truth" and causality. Instead we have "consensus" and computer models.

We'll see what happens to the global warming agenda as the economic collapse deepens.

On Bloated Windbags

To the Editor:

When, in your article ["Deepest Solar Minimum in Nearly a Century: Goodbye Global Warming," by Gregory Murphy and Laurence Hecht, www.21stcentury sciencetech.com/ Articles_2009/Solar_ Minimum.pdf] you engage in emotionally saturated rhetoric such as:

"But the bright side may be that such bloated windbags as Al Gore and his leaner companion James Hansen who have led His Royal Consort Prince Philip's genocidal global warming promotion, will finally be silenced."

. . . in a magazine that espouses to clarify 21st Century science and technology, you undermine the credibility of anything that you may have to say in defense of your own opinions supported by the very nebulous "many specialists" (who apparently speak without name or credentials).

As I am about to send this email I am musing (ha ha) about the colourful language that you reserve for the opinion of this sender.

Wilf Wenzel

The Editor Replies

We usually take letter-writers seriously, so don't worry. If you read other articles on the website, you can find documentation of the Malthusian intentions behind "global warming" and the outright genocidal statements of Prince Philip. You can also find articles by various specialists that include their credentials.

The point we are making is that the science indicates cooling and a new Ice Age, and that the alarmism is a hoax, which, if not stopped, will result in the death of millions of people. Those who promote this deliberate hoax deserve to be ridiculed.

(Personally, I find "bloated windbag" to be an apt term in describing Al Gore!)

NASA

A mosaic image from the Hubble and Spitzer telescopes and the Chandra Observatory of the starburst galaxy, Messier 82 (M82). The galaxy has a bright blue disk, webs of shredded clouds, and fiery-looking plumes of glowing hydrogen blasting out of its central regions.

Hubble Telescope Remembered

To the Editor:

My hope is that David Cherry was a young man when he wrote the outstanding article about the Hubble Telescope in the Spring 1994 issue of *21st Century* magazine, and that he is still involved. My copy of the magazine has some yellow cast to the pages but the story is real. It was real then and it is real today as the astronauts return from the space mission to up-date the Hubble.

I hope your next article is soon and that you will let me know what issue will carry the article.

As a bit of a sidelight, back in 1994 I sat in a meeting with two men from Danbury Instruments and the one man told us he was responsible for the polishing error on the original "blank."

Then some time later I saw an article that told of a back-up cast blank for the mirror and the value of that second blank was $7 million (back then). It would be interesting to learn what has happened to that second cast glass blank.

Now it's Hubble in HD . . . LOL

Mike Quaranta

The Editor Replies

Yes, David Cherry is still around and copies of the Spring 1994 issue with his article, "The Hubble Space Telescope: Bringing the Cosmic Past to Light," are available at $5 each.

We have asked him for a follow-up.