

## **Blocking Publications of Alternative Physics to Flow Electrification**

*By Thomas V Prevenslik*

*Dated: Dec 14, 2008*

*Prominent Scientists who promoted and supported the false physics of Flow Electrification over the past 20 years have over the past 5 years tried to avoid damage to their reputations by blocking publication of Alternative Physics.*

In 1879, Helmholtz proposed the electrical double layer (EDL) to explain how charges form on the surface of a capacitor under applied electrical voltage, a theory that is commonly used today for high voltages applied to electrodes immersed in dielectric liquids. Dielectric liquids are insulators having high electrical resistance to avoid electrical breakdown of the electrode to the surroundings. Under applied voltage, the surface of the electrode acquires a layer of electrical charge balanced by an equal and opposite layer of charge in the adjacent liquid, thereby forming the EDL. Liquid motion relative to the electrode carries the charge away to electrify the flow. Flow Electrification by the EDL from an electrode under applied voltage is without question.

Flow Electrification in typical piping systems finds importance in the dangerous build-up of static charge that upon discharge ignites vapors in hydrocarbons, e.g., fires caused by pumping gasoline in automobiles. However, piping systems are not under applied voltage, and therefore any analogy with the EDL in electrodes is no longer applicable.

The problem is Prominent Scientists: M. Zahn (MIT) and J. K. Nelson (RPI), USA; G. Touchard and H. Romat (Poitiers), France; and J.S. Chang (McMasters), Canada; over the past 20 years have promoted and supported the EDL as the mechanism underlying Flow Electrification.

Piping systems absent applied voltage require the potential difference in work function (WF) between the pipe wall and the liquid to be at least 5 eV to charge the EDL. The Prominent Scientists by their standing knew that WF differences between oils and hydrocarbon liquids and typical piping materials are less than 1 eV, and therefore Flow Electrification by the EDL is simply not possible. Nevertheless, the Prominent Scientists in the manner of the Greek sophists, covered-up the falsity of the EDL by repeated claims of its validity so that any Alternative Physics having the potential to indeed charge the EDL has and continues to be denied by majority opinion the Flow Electrification community.

Of course, the Prominent Scientists could admit to the truth that the EDL has nothing to do with Flow Electrification, but this would be interpreted as proof they misguided the Flow Electrification community over the last 20 years. The fraud that the EDL is the source of Flow Electrification is repeated time and time again by students and colleagues of the Prominent Scientists in publications and conferences, e.g., the Electrostatics Society of America (ESA), International Conference on Dielectric Liquids (ICDL), Conference on Electric Insulation and Dielectric Phenomena (CEIDP), Society of French Electrostatics (SFE), and the International Conference on Applied Electrostatics (ICAES) in China.

Quoting Leo Tolstoy:

“I know that most men, including those at ease with problems of the greatest complexity, can seldom accept even the simplest and most obvious truth if it be such as would oblige them to admit the falsity of conclusions which they have delighted in explaining to colleagues, which they have proudly taught to others, and which they have woven, thread by thread, into the fabric of their lives.”

At ICDL 2004, I presented Alternative Physics called QED induced EM radiation that indeed had the EM energy necessary to charge the EDL. Here QED stands for quantum electrodynamics and EM for electromagnetic. By this theory, the EM thermal kT energy of liquid molecules on the surface of collapsing bubbles is frequency up-converted to vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) levels that by Einstein's photoelectric effect electrifies the surrounding liquid. See URL <http://www.nanoqed.net>

The CEIDP 2007 Flow Electrification abstract was rejected by Nelson, although it was an extension of the published papers at CEIDP 2003 and 2005. Under the direction of Zahn, Touchard's review of Flow Electrification at the 2006 EHD Symposium at Buenos Aires presented only the EDL as the source of Flow Electrification, the Alternative Physics of QED induced EM radiation mysteriously omitted. Chang and Touchard prejudiced toward the false EDL objected to QED induced EM radiation by making erroneous comments about QED induced EM radiation at EHD 2006.

Beyond Flow Electrification, QED induced EM radiation allows one to entertain the notion that all of electrostatics may be explained by a Unified Theory based on EM confinement of kT energy in nanoparticles (NPs). At SFE 2008, I proposed: Flow Electrification is caused by NP impurities in the liquid; Static Electricity by rubbing of NPs from solids, and Atmospheric Electricity by NPs formed in the collisions of frosted graupel in the updraft of the thundercloud. See Ibid at Link "Natural Electrification".

The Unified Theory was also submitted to the IEEE Transactions on Dielectrics and Electric Insulation (TDEI) on Electrostatics. The aforesaid Prominent Scientists were named as reviewers, save Nelson because the IEEE allows only 4 reviewers. Regardless of whether the IEEE paper is accepted or not, the record shows the Prominent Scientists are prejudiced to the EDL over QED induced EM radiation.

Quoting Schopenhauer:

"The discovery of truth is prevented more effectively not by the false appearance of things present and which mislead into error, not directly by weakness of the reasoning powers, but by preconceived opinion, by prejudice."

The Prominent Scientists because of their prejudice to the false EDL theory can no longer be objective in Flow Electrification, and therefore I am asking them on the grounds of conflict of interest to refuse the review of any and all papers on Flow Electrification at ESA, CEIDP, ICDL, SFE, and ICAES conferences. Otherwise, they are subject to litigation alleging that to save their reputations they knowingly have misled the Flow Electrification community with false EDL theory for the past 20 years.

###

About QED induced EM radiation: Classically, thermal EM radiation conserves heat by an increase in temperature. But at the nanoscale, temperature increases are forbidden by quantum mechanics. QED induced EM radiation explains how heat is conserved by the emission of nonthermal EM radiation. Here, EM and QED stand for electromagnetic and quantum electrodynamics.

Category	Science, Technology, Research
Tags	Flow Electrification, Edl, Qed Induced Em Radiation
Email	<a href="#">Click to email author</a>
City/Town	Youngwood
State/Province	Pennsylvania
Zip	15697
Country	United States