

# Ecologic

## Running your car on what?

-by the green skeptic  
(where green and reason seek common ground)

Due to time constraints, the Green Hornet is going to take the easy way out this month and provide a few hyperlinks to some eco material.

As mentioned last month, a little about the running your car with water idea might be in order. If you haven't heard about this yet, it's a subject that is pretty rampant on the internet, in fact, if you Google the phrase "run your car on water" or "run your car with water" you'll get over 600,000 hits. Most of the matches have to do with systems you can purchase (for as low as \$49.95) in order to convert your car to run on a mixture of conventional gas (refined petroleum) and hydrogen gas that is produced by electrolysis from the kit you manufacture and install on your car.

The obvious question is, if this thing works why don't all cars have them installed? If it's as simple as the internet advertisements profess, you could do it yourself and if it's complex, the automotive industry could certainly provide it for a fee. Of course the answer is that it can't work; otherwise the device wouldn't be confined to internet hawkers who peddle it. Further and on the surface, it's been alleged that there seems to be a violation of the second law of thermal dynamics in that the underlying principal relies on getting more energy out of a closed system than what is being put in to it.

However, the response by the sellers of these things maintains that the hydrogen gas assists the conventional gas in burning cleaner and more efficiently and increasing your gas mileage in the process. The following link does a pretty good job in illuminating the subject matter.

[http://www.aardvark.co.nz/hho\\_scam2.shtml](http://www.aardvark.co.nz/hho_scam2.shtml)

Here's another link that goes to a YouTube video that pertains to a conspiracy to silence an inventor of this process.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8stApCmxYEM>

Snopes doesn't have anything on the subject, but there is information out there where this idea has been scrutinized by the legal system because of a lawsuit brought by investors, in one of these firms, and the technology has proven to be a fraud. There have been human interest spots regarding the topic on the web version of CNN (also on YouTube) but there is never any follow-up so the initial segment just kind of hits a dead end.

So anyway, that's too bad. But please let me know if you have experience that indicates otherwise and contradicts common sense and reality as we know it.

Next month, which happens to be right around the corner, maybe a little discussion on Al Gore's recent JFKesque challenge to be free from carbon based energy in ten years. It might be easier to send a man to the moon and return him safely in ten years; but I don't know why we would wait ten years to return him safely. Oh well, I guess we'd better keep recycling if we have any hope of freeing carbon from man and returning it safely to the moon by the end of the week. BTW, the following link will take you to Mr. Gore's speech/challenge:

<http://www.wecansolveit.org/page/m/570480329fe73ed7/MLOCOK/VEsE/>

And if you still haven't had enough and you're a real glutton for punishment, the following link will probably push you right over the edge. It is decidedly one sided and extreme, but it does bring up some interesting notions:

<http://www.storyofstuff.com/>