

A new development model with interactive energy and rich floating camps built in oceans with petroleum derivatives

A new development model with interactive energy and rich floating camps built in oceans with petroleum derivatives

Abstract

Unlike when one can think, it's not true that putting too many things together makes confusion. Confusion is created when many things do not come together rationally. For example, Global warming is nothing more than the fruit of industrialization of many scientific and technological applications without the scientific organization of environmental work, which I call in this article "Environmental Taylorism". This should not be in opposition to the well-known "Industrial Taylorism". The two systems should have traveled together since the advent of the industrial era, improving each other because one seeks the best quality and cost from the commercial point of view and the other from the environmental point of view. Unfortunately, compensation did not occur because of the absence of environmental Taylorism that should have been applied by public bodies and world legislators. Today industrial Taylorism has taken over. But we are still in time to save the rescue, if at least the judges of the International Courts of Justice, understand the reasoning of those who have lived half the working life in industrial systems and half in the environmental systems. However, it was not the automatic sum of experiences that led to the proposal of an "Alternative Development Model", but

eleven years of strategic inventions studies to link together the two sectors. These studies could only do those who are not tied to any scientific and technological discipline and are not interested in any industrial property, but only in intellectual property. Obviously, if the global public entities continue to pretend not to understand the lesson, those interested in industrial property of these inventions can be done ahead. The important thing must be the global environmental consolidation and the rationalization of all public and private world systems towards a single objective: The survival of the planet, of men and of animals. From these studies emerge clearly what are the many man-made plants to be scraped and replaced. If we have the courage to do so in the shortest possible time, because no new scientific and technological inventions are needed, the consolidation can be started immediately, even by eliminating the cost of fuels.

But the most positive aspect of the new development model is the global logic of all human activity, which as a side effect would not produce pollution and global warming, but the reversal of these processes: Purifying and cooling the planet, and thus preventing droughts, floods, and providing greater means of extinguishing fires. All this can only be produced by interactive energies, which cost almost nothing, work day and night, even at the north pole and dissolve oxygen in waters polluted by the world's worst industrial development. The aim of this study is to invite global authorities to make better use of scientific knowledge through the scientific organization of work, which would avoid making the wrong public works in dimensions, positions and incomplete work cycles. World public plants should be guided and supported by industrial activities, instead they must learn from them the organization of work. The current mistakes of industrial production, such as thermal motors, chimneys, incomplete purification, are scientific, non-technological errors. Public science and lawmakers should have prevented them. Today, worldwide, it is not possible to cite any prototype model of interactive development that is efficient at the same time in

many respects: energy, purification and production. It is necessary to start from scratch by scientifically organizing world work, starting with science, which is not in the process of working with stagnant compartments. This article also contains an original way to solve hunger and work world-wide problems.

Description

How do you create a model of sustainable world development? I do not think many people are able to answer this question. Unless there are many inventors who have clashed with the rubber walls built by the world's leading environmental and energy class. I came by chance to conceive of an alternative development model simply by putting together all my patent warehouses ignored by the world's ruling class. It may seem weird, but in this alternative development model, energy will protect the environment, it would not be just neutral. It also shows that oil from an economic point of view should not be used as a fuel. Instead, oil derivatives could give an incredible boost to creating new jobs and food production, above all, in view of the imminent growth of the world's population. So, for the undersigned, the ideal development model is exactly the opposite of the current one, which can not protect the environment, create work, and find sustainable and efficient energy. Obviously, the current ruling class, heir to the previous ones, cannot accept such radical changes. Global warming not want to fight with the palliatives of the car battery are intermittent renewable with energy storage.

The concept of performance that has entered all man-made machines is very difficult to comprehend globally, even to scientists. It 'so difficult to understand that the anthropogenic cycles and natural ones must not be in conflict? Therefore, pumps, hydraulic, pneumatic, and energy systems must be designed to support gravitational forces. It would simply be this simple concept to make it clear that the current system of development is to be scraped. I hope that

international judges will do their best to claim prototypes of alternative development models, drawing on the documentation developed and published on the website <http://www.spawhe.eu>.

The recent G20 summit in Hamburg (7 – 8 – 07 – 2017) has been characterized, like many other summits, more than outside protests outside the palace than from internal discussions to the same palace of power. The ideas were not seen either inside or outside the palace. However, in the opinion of the undersigned, it is more appropriate for young people who have the right to have no ideas than those inside the palace that should have the duty to have them. This can not happen if you do not study in detail an alternative development model that colder again by the fundamental principles of physics, chemistry, biology, in the light of the developed technologies, which opportunely selected and adapted, could make obsolete many activities of multinational And most of the world's public power and purification plants.

What do my reflections on such important topics arise? From the fact that as an expert on industrial plant solutions, environment and energy, at the end of my work as an employee, I set myself a problem of conscience: "Continue to work to achieve the maximum pension" or use the experience gained to propose, from retirement, new inventions, above all, environmental? My choice was the second alternative, knowing that no one would pay me for my job. What is an invention in any field of human activity? The correct definition might be: "A new scientific or technological application, not easily understood by the experts of the sector." What prompted me to make the inventor is the fact that, for myself, there should not be the "relevant sectors." The design should be global and all areas widened and linked together. In other words, the undersigned, he noticed that currently the entire Earth planet lacks connection inventions between one sector and another. Unfortunately, by developing these inventions, the undersigned realized that it is also necessary to modify the existing

inventions; otherwise, the links cannot be made. This is a logical conclusion, but it confirms that an invention is a new system that is not easily understandable to experts in the individual sectors. They do not understand it, not because it's complicated to understand it, but because they do not want to understand it. In fact, if they had planned the plants with a global view, they would have designed them as the undersigned proposes.

Even in the field of science, division into sectors has created more harm than good. Just think of the "PHYSICS" that is divided into many separate branches (metrology, classical mechanics, thermology, acoustics, rational mechanics, statistical mechanics, electrology, magnetism, optics, relativity, quantum mechanics, nuclear physics). Among these there is the lack of "interactive water-to-air physics" which deserves a specialization, being more practical and efficient than all the other specializations put together.

The triple combination of unmistakable water, uncompressed air, and hydraulic and compression air machines would have spared global warming, much of the pollution, and saved the economy. In fact, even thermology requires more than one element to be applied (air, water, fuels, burners, turbines, heat exchangers, but involves more side effects for the disposal of residual heat the purification of fumes and therefore, lower yields. If, on the other hand, we think of nuclear physics, it needs active radio materials, reactors, cooling circuits to be developed. In addition, as is known, it involves many problems difficult to manage, and if all goes well, remain unsolved problems of waste disposal.

By working in stagnant compartments in the fields of physics, some sectors have developed more than others. However, no one has developed, physical interactive between water and air, although the laws of Henry and Dalton, leaving a glimpse of a few centuries the purifying potential and that of Pascal, the energy potential.

The undersigned, did not want to deal with either physics or energy. As a design engineer and plant installer, he just wanted to demonstrate that fossil energy can be cleaned by expanding thermal plants with the biological and biological interactive water and air functions. Believing to have amply demonstrated with many publications and deposits of national and international patents, Not appreciated to world public agencies and corporations, has been found to further deepen the same principles, reaching even interactive energy, which also was met by silence of public and private science. But silences can not be enough to defend systems that have unnecessarily damaged the environment and the world economy because interactive energies could be born before nuclear and thermal energy, being much simpler and more economical.

Simplicity, efficiency, the absence of negative side effects, the absence of the cost of fuels and radioactive materials and the presence of positive and purity-enhancing side effects show that interactive energy is exactly the opposite of 'Thermal and nuclear energy from the economic and environmental point of view.

Let us lose the nuclear energy that has been condemned by itself with the many disasters, but also for the costs needed to make the plants. Instead, fossil energy has produced disasters of a different type, just as serious, in particular, global warming. However, representing over eighty percent of current world energy, it cannot be ignored from one moment to the next and cannot even give up a precious resource such as oil.

The title of this article anticipates the use we could make of the oil that will be described in the second part. The reasons why I am also concerned with finding a place for oil products, virtually defeated in the energy challenge with the interactive energy between water and air, is very simple: All of the planet's resources should be used for the purpose They have the highest yield, especially, in the field where there

are no equally valid alternatives.

The world's public research organizations, from the top of their science, have never commented on the environmental and energy solutions of the undersigned. And 'more understandable defense of the multinationals, which have also kept silent, but someone wrote me that they merely comply with regulations. How do norms be correct if the purification and energy plants are wrong? The reasons why they are wrong are written in thousands of pages of articles and patents: because they are incomplete in the chemical and biological cycles, the main and the collateral that do not close in industrial, environmental and energetic plants. These plants have known me very well since I worked, as a simple executor of orders in industry and in public procurement for about forty years. Whoever designs the same equipment without drawing ideas from outside can only slightly improve returns. But this is not enough. To further improve the purification and energy systems, environmental taylorism was also to be found, as I mentioned in previous publications

(<http://www.spawhe.eu/open-letter-of-denunciation-to-courts-of-international-justice/>). If that had happened, the work cycles of all human activities would be more complete and there would be more work for everyone. Indeed, in today's society, industrial Taylorism, increasing the efficiency of machinery and robots, reduces jobs and facilitates capital shift, according to the interests of entrepreneurs. While environmental taylorism, which has never been born, is about the organization of global labor, linked to the territory. Therefore, it cannot be subject to stock market speculations or to the interests of entrepreneurs, especially if energy sources are water and air. So the environmental Taylorism favors the development of small and medium-sized local businesses, while the industrial one favors multinationals with great serial productions. We need both tailorisms, which are not in competition with each other.

But today, not existing environmental Taylorism, we have obsolete local systems and developed industrial installations but not appropriate to the environment. It would be enough to analyze technically individual plant, industrial, environmental, agricultural, urban, to show where and how wrong designers, scientists and lawmakers of the present and of the past. If they continue to ignore or pretend not to understand, many examples of how to design interactive systems that could protect the environment are shown on the website <http://www.spawhe.eu>. These are very different from the current ones, which instead destroy it. What is the use of the violence of the demonstrators outside the palaces where the world summits take place? If the opposition prove that those who ruled worked badly and that even should pay damages, it would not be an opposition more efficient? Many scientists who do partial environmental consultations should explain to legislators that environmental installations must cover the entire territory, including the atmospheric emissions and the alkalinity of purified waters. They should explain that only interactive energies can improve without additional costs, including water and air that do not pass through purifiers. If they keep silent, legislators will never find it alone. No one can believe in a pensioner if universal science is silent.

I would say to young people who do not find work, but not to protest but to tap the cities where the world's top summits of alternative projects are being held, which have been looking for a fair comparison in the sunshine for years. Ignorance of those who rule can not fight with the ignorance of those who oppose it. It is necessary to confront, above all, public projects in the preparation phase before spending public money, then to build pilot plants and then the final installations to which the plants and equipment of private companies will have to adapt. This is how to create lasting development and work. Today, however, the absence of global projects linked to each other in the area has prevented the rational creation of small and medium-sized companies active

in the territory that install and manage efficiently and in detail the energy, purifying and protective plants of the environment. Today we have created a society that is incapable of producing work, where the weaker and with less dignity begging on the street and those that have more dignity throw themselves in unprofitable activities, just to survive. The more fortunate are those made by public bodies and multinationals, which do not allow alternative development to preserve their monopolies.

The alternative development developed by the undersigned on the <http://spawhe.eu> website, with zero public and private contributions, is not based on futuristic technologies but on past and present technologies, applied correctly, as could be done from the beginning of a thousand and twentieth century. Reasoning done, with a long delay, shows that even the inorganic CO₂ cycle can be closed everywhere. While on mobile power plants, it is possible to produce energy with the same current power and the same size, without even opening the CO₂ cycle.

It may seem strange, but, Interactive energies are more daughters of fossil energy than renewable. Infact, I could see in this energy a positive side that no one has ever underlined: Interactivity with purifying systems against acidification of fossil fuels fresh and marine waters that we could get by lengthening the thermal cycles over the chimneys: Capturing the fumes, bringing them into the subsoil and bringing them back to the atmosphere through limestone greenhouses with artificial rain, which would automatically produce alkaline waters by consuming CO₂ contained in the fumes through the known reaction: $\text{CaCO}_3 + \text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{Ca}(\text{HCO}_3)_2$. I took a long time to study these solutions because interactive energies do not improvise as the other energies. They need a careful study of the work organization of the place where they enter (environmental taylorism). In fact, in the urban environment also they occur other cycles, especially, organic

producing hydrogen sulphide in sewers and ammonia nitrogen, so it was necessary to put together rationally water and air to create unique installations. Instead, in the major thermal power plants that produce thousands of MW / h, the environmental Taylorism would have imposed, before the plant was found, enough water to complete the rational closure reaction of the above-mentioned carbon cycle. With the size of existing power plants it would be an impossible task, even by combining the thermal power stations to purifiers of the waters and cooling waters of the same thermal power stations. But designers of thermal power plants, not knowing environmental taylorism, have not even tried. They still build them the same way, neglecting the only environmental aspect that could save fossil energy. However, while wasting my time studying and to patent these unnecessary environmental solutions, many companies have in-depth research on solar energy and wind greatly improving yields. All, public and private, shouted at the miracle of energy. No one has noticed that these renewables can not solve insurmountable vices of origin, which are considerable bulk, large material requirements and disposal costs, high environmental impacts, discontinuous production, and the need to accumulate somewhere 'Energy produced with other plants that lower the yields earned by research and require additional space and materials to be disposed of. Some of these materials are already scarce, such as lithium. The question I asked myself eleven years ago, when I decided to turn me into an environmental inventor was as follows: "What is the job of public scientists and lawmakers who have never thought of eliminating vices of fossil energy, rationalizing sewage and purification systems, water management in general after a century and a half of development Wrong industry? ". Indeed, even the current way of producing hydroelectric power produces more damage than good despite the high investments made to make dams and basins current systems to produce energy with the hydraulic jump, which is a concept, understandable even without the contribution of science, have facilitated floods and

accelerated the speed of water to the sea instead of slowing down it in the valleys where it serves to manage it for agricultural purposes Preventing droughts and allowing the exchange with minerals that increase its alkalinity.

Unfortunately, public and private science, not being seriously involved in cleansing fossil energy, as the undersigned, did not realize that the biggest expenditure to be faced with such cleansing would be the energy for water lifting which would have to react with CO₂ and calcium carbonate. So they did not deepen the studies to reduce the cost of hydraulic lifting, which gradually led the undersigned to two inventions that put together not only avoided the opening of thermal cycles, but also allow to produce powerful energy such as thermal, Costing hundreds of times lower, both in infrastructure and management, and because fuel is not needed.

These two inventions are "The pump with the dual separate supply and hydraulic circuits of pressurized water recycling with compressed air" that include the same circuit both these pumps, both pumps used as turbines, which despite having lower yields compared to Turbines, require lesser dimensions and allow installations on the means of transport. In questi nuovi impianti energetici interattivi tra acqua e aria, possiamo concentrare facilmente 40 bar di pressione sulle giranti in serie di una pompa usata come turbina. Indeed, if we make a small pressurized hydroelectric plant to replace the thermal engine of a car with a pressure of 40 bar or 400 meters of water column, a flow rate of 7.5 L / s, and a turbine efficiency of 0.6 , We will have an energy output of about 17.6 Kw ($0.6 * 1000 * 0.0075 * 400/102$) with an energy consumption of around (0.35 Kw) for water circulation, which must only overcome losses Load of the hydraulic circuit always full. Therefore, the relationship between spent and consumed energy is 50,28 ($17,6 / 0,35$). If we consider that the average performance of the engine mounted on the car is about 35% of the lower fuel power, we can derive the convenience ratio

between a compressed hydroelectric motor and a thermal engine equal to 143.6 (50, 28 / 0.35). This convenience ratio excludes the cost of fuels, the greater complexity of thermal plants, the charges for the filtration of fumes, etc. Thus, the actual convenience ratio between fossil energy and pressurized hydroelectric power can even double. This type of plant can be realized on all transposed vehicles worldwide, even on spaceships, having infinite autonomy, conditioned only by the wear of materials. But it can be realized in fixed versions in every home and office. Not consuming water, not needing sun or wind. We can make desserts and poles livable, lifting, purifying, desalting large amounts of water, to feed industries, work the land with means of transport, consuming only wear of machines.

Ironically, they were mainly studies to clean up fossil energy to bring me to these inventions. Indeed, fossil energy has produced global warming due to the fact that lacked the organization of work that would bring the application of environmental Taylorism which forced designers to cross-arguments between physical chemistry, energy systems and purification of ' water and air in order to save resources and increase productivity, as happens in the industry with the industrial Taylorism, since the early nineteen hundred. . Only through reasoning and cross-cycles may occur environmental and energy efficient inventions, that differ for the other yields from existing systems, mono disciplinary In fact, mono-disciplinary energy systems can not exploit advantageous conditions produced by other systems, they are forced to remain within the limits imposed by the principles of energy conservation of closed, mechanical, thermodynamic hydraulic systems, which of course can not exceed the yield of 100 % Of the energy source fossil, chemical or biological, and even less for natural thermal and wind sources.

Indeed, today, the only energy that could have a high performance is hydroelectric energy that frees up the water's

energy position that is high for a gift of nature. This great advantage is not much notice because, to exploit hydroelectric power, costs are raised by the civil works needed to contain water. The invention of the pump with the dual supply until the impeller makes unnecessary current hydroelectric plants, because without infrastructure, it also allows the recycling of the water that produced the energy while the hydraulic jump is replaced by a small cushion of compressed air, which releases oxygen in water proportionally to pressure, also produces remarkable purifying effects. Moreover, water can be better managed by preventing floods, droughts, high seawater, never interrupting energy production. For example, think of the city of Venice or Amsterdam powered by submerged compressed hydroelectric power, produced in the same channels, where water by means of energy production would also be oxygenated and with the same energy plants, in the case of high tide, held Low, lifting them over the paratroopers.

It is obvious that current energies, including renewables, can not be competitive or energy-efficient because they do not start from an advantageous position (which allows the air cushion to be pressed) nor can they be environmental, because they can not Dissolve oxygen free in the water. If hydropower compressed costs very little, it is not logical to produce it even when not needed, only to power plants oxygenation additional river lake sea water? All world waters have been ruined by a century and a half of incorrect energy and purification plants. The political environment that govern these things they do not understand, but scientists, engineers, economists, policy makers, who insist to design and to support renewable current, when they learn to make comprehensive environmental reasoning?

If, as noted above, the convenience ratio between the fossil thermal energy and the compressed hydroelectric power is $1 / 143.6$, which can be the convenience ratio between solar or wind power and the compressed hydroelectric power, if the new

energies Are far distant from reaching the costs of fossil energy? Someone try to install the solar panels on the means of transport or the north pole. Suffice it to think that under the best sun conditions it takes 10 square meters to produce a KW with solar panels and that wind power to center the force of 0.83 bar on the blades of a propeller would need a wind blowing 80 kilometers timetables. There is no need for scientists and big economists to make these comparisons. Anyone could deny my simple calculations and reasonings. But it seems nobody wants to do it. For science it is easier to continue to deepen the problems, rather than discuss the solutions.

I'm sorry for the builders who made the wrong investment, but they can not expect an inventor to renounce the facts, seeing him own inventions without any explanation. What do pumps manufacturers think of, which have refined the processing techniques and improved the yields, but they do not dare to talk about the operation of the pumps with separate power until the impeller, which would change the world by circumventing gravity in open systems and compressed air pressures in autoclaves? What are they waiting for? What are the legislators to impose on how to build pumps to save energy? The same thing can be said of thermal power plant manufacturers and thermal motors.

And what about the same legislators, who do not require the experimentation of private inventors to public research organizations? They even ignore them. Indeed, they tied intellectual property to the industrial one, forcing inventors to pay unpaid taxes, even though no one takes inventions into account? International Justice can not allow these legislative injustices and these crimes of scientific and technical omission. From the point of view of justice, it would be like asking writers to pay taxes on written books without finding publishers who print and sell manuscripts. If you really want to boost social and economic progress, public

utility inventions must be free from the absurd bond with industrial property. The inventor must simply invent unknown state-of-the-art solutions and, at his choice, sell them to the best bidder or make them available to everyone. If they are available to everyone, they must receive a small fee for intellectual property, for each item produced and made. Companies that exploit the same invention if they are brave in their work organization gain a higher market share if they are not, they win a lower share. The difference should be the market, as it does now in all human activities. If lawmakers do not reasoning so simple and logical, it means you do not want to govern with justice.

Is this solution to the world community more unfair than to allow the exploitation of a patent to a single company?

Obviously, if the invention is entirely created within a private company, it is right that it exploits it exclusively for the time allowed by law and that it pays the fees for maintaining the patent industrial property. Probably, world legislators do not realize that with current patents legislation they favor commercial inventions and discourage inventions of public utility. Or is this their goal? Indeed, it is clear that legislators have never thought that there may be inventors free from companies and individual sciences and have never thought that there may be multidisciplinary inventions involving various sciences to various technologies such as those of the undersigned, fossil energy through unproductive but interconnected plants on the territory (modified chimneys, limestone greenhouses, overlapping biological ponds, linear digesters). In fact, if today there is global warming, it is precisely due to the fact that government scientists have not produced comprehensive inventions and rationally connected to each other, and lawmakers have not legislated. This meant that even private industries have been guided towards the production of components serving the global environment, for example, pumps with double separate supply until the impeller. Who has

produced self-inventive inventions, hoping for support from research organizations and lawmakers, has been disappointed by the one and the other who have not intervened. It 'obvious that if the legislature does not intervene to impose public utility solutions, as it did in the case of catalytic converters, airbags, ABS, seat belts in cars, the pumps and engine manufacturers continue indefinitely not to produce pumps with separate supply, and pressurized hydroelectric motors, because they have no interest in changing their secular production, and therefore making investments that the market still does not require.

Faced with inventions that are so important to the world community, the inventor should have Bill Gates's economic power to defeat the silence of public research, those of lawmakers and private builders. The scientific press also isolates private inventors, rescuing the inventions of powerful multinationals and research organizations.

It would be logical that the inventor who did not have the money would have at least the chance to file patents and wait for the times to mature without the author's rights decay. Instead, the legislator imposes on him the payment of deposit and maintenance fees as if he were a company that produces and gains from inventions that everyone pretends not to understand. These clear inconsistencies do not only damage private inventors, but all of the world's development, because if large public research organizations and large multinationals have not been able to produce these inventions, there is a serious problem of organizing global labor. The current specializations of private companies and research organizations do not allow the training of technicians who are able to tackle environmental and energy issues globally, while retaining the ability to enter into different technology details. The undersigned has shown it not because of presumption, but only because, by loving his work, he has sought and had cross-cutting experiences, first in the

automotive industry, and subsequently in the environment, in public hydraulic lifting, civil engineering in general. For a long time it has come to realize that global public entities would never find solutions to global warming because they are not scientific but global engineering design that no one is currently able to do. This has been demonstrated by 22 COP (conference of parts) organized by the United Nations because it is not only a scientific and technological problem, but above all, a method of work. This method of work I had learned from seeing a car factory (Alfa Romeo from 1970 to 1987) from zero, occupying the LAYOUT of the machining and assembly departments, following the machining cycles and at the same time the internal transport, feeding and unloading of machines. When in 1988, for my free choice, I decided to take care of the environment, immediately realized that the environmental and energy facilities were all wrong and uneconomic from the point of view of the work organization, but being a mere technical clerk, it was useless to talk about it. Nobody would have believed me. Knowing the environmental plants after the industrial ones, I realized that even the automotive industry is not perfect. Indeed, the industrial organization only cares for production efficiency. Industry did not look for an alternative solution to the thermal engine. I understood that the method of following the work cycles step by step and making them cross the right place at the right time was correct, but that it should always be applied, not only to reduce the working and assembly times but also to identify the cycles Incomplete from the environmental point of view.

Deepening of the global energy and environmental solutions can be done by identifying incomplete thermal cycles that involve two choices:

- 1) Completion of cycles in fixed installations by means of the capture of fumes, calcareous greenhouses and artificial rainfall, as described in some articles of the undersigned.

(<http://www.spawhe.eu/patent-drawings-synergic-plants/>,
<http://www.spawhe.eu/synergic-plants-files/>,
<http://www.spawhe.eu/synergic-plants-italian-files/>)).

2) To produce cold energy without opening the thermal cycles, which is the solution that can solve the problems of the automotive industry and of all means of transport in general by means of pressurized hydraulic circuits with compressed air, as described in some articles of the undersigned (<http://www.spawhe.eu/pressurized-domestic-hydraulic-energy-system/>,
<http://www.spawhe.eu/the-pressurized-submerged-hydroelectric/>,
<http://www.spawhe.eu/hydroelectric-power-auto-with-torque-peripheral-to-the-wheels/>,
<http://www.spawhe.eu/aerospatial-pressurized-hydroelectric-transport-system/>),

Unfortunately, the world's problems are not only environmental and energy. There is also the imminent growth of the world's population and the already serious problem of finding a home for migrants who run away from wars and poverty. Current scientific and technological inventions, instead of increasing sustainable food productivity, have increased desertification and climate change, which further reduce the areas that can be cultivated and the risks of not being able to complete harvests. Even in this case in the world it is developing an industrial taylorismo which provides for the increase of food production by means of GMOs, chemical fertilizers, pesticides, animal feed derived from organic waste. There is no environmental climate, which should zero the energy costs of agricultural, purifying and irrigation vehicles, by means of interactive energy, obtained from water and air, that would circumvent gravitational force and lead to oxygen in wells and of irrigated basins(
<http://www.spawhe.eu/the-pressurized-submerged-hydroelectric/>)).

The sustainable development model developed by the undersigned

is called SPAWHE, it means "Synergy Plants, Artificial Welling, Hydroelectric Energy". In this system, all systems, while using more or less existing technologies, have been redesigned differently than existing ones, replacing environmental and industrial cycles and organizing the territory differently. SPAWHE's less known sector is the central "Artificial Welling" that has never been developed by humans (like other sectors). In this area, they are mainly entrusted with the increase in sustainable food production and that of giving a home and a job to migrants and to the growing population:

<http://www.spawhe.eu/patent-drawings-artificial-welling/>,
<http://www.spawhe.eu/artificial-welling-files/>. This sector was born, observing that 71% of the Earth's surface is covered by water and that only five per cent of this surface produces fishes. Having learned that are fishy only the areas in which occurs the natural welling (ski currents towards the surface water of the sediments that lie in the depths), and that these occur mainly along the coastal areas, the undersigned has studied a system to create even In other areas of the oceans an artificial welling. To avoid the dangers of earthquakes and tsunamis, he has decided to propose floating islands on oceanic plane distant from the continents where the sea is completely flat and even earthquakes do not feel on the surface. In these areas, the depths exceed 4,000 meters. The choice made by the undersigned has been to create floating structures suspended from above, which discharge all loads on the upper deck supported by reinforced polyethylene tubes, internally filled with polystyrene to make them virtually unsinkable. In the abysmal depths, steel tubes would circulate in which the surface water would circulate, descending downwards, by means of venturi bottlenecks would aspire to a proportion of deep-water-rich calcium-carbon (solubilized by high pressures) that rises to the surface, should increase the percentage of nutrients and calcium and thus create the conditions that occur in areas where natural welling occurs (produzione di fitoplancton e zooplancton), How can you see

from <http://www.spawhe.eu/artificial-welling> floating system – hydroelectric – desalter/, above these platforms would be mounted desalination plants, capable of producing even hydroelectricity. Around these perfectly autonomous central nuclei of the energy and fresh water production point of view, they could be implemented authentic floating cities in lightweight materials such as wood and soils reported on tiled draining polyethylene that allow irrigation and sweet water recovery by means of the construction techniques of hanging gardens. So in the oceans we could have lawns and low-shaft trees. So whoever fears that the introduction of interactive energies causes the end of oil is wrong, because oil that is not used as fuel would be even more valuable and would not harm the environment.

These floating colonies could be accurately assigned to the countries of the five continents, with connecting roads, energetically autonomous homes with water and air generated energy for indoor and outdoor lighting, heating and air conditioning. Even the boats for fishing would use seiche energy. Given the immense spaces available, these colonies would be able to accommodate all the populations of land fleeing from wars and poverty, because there is no safer place for earthquake tsunamis and nubifrages than those located above the oceanic planes and there is not wealth greater than that buried in the oceans. In fact, terrestrial food production and animal meat involve processing of land, processing of products at very high costs, while fish production, once artificial artificial welling is experienced, would only involve fishing and freezing and shipment to Continents by air or sea with the usual energy made of water and air that would cost nothing.

If we consider that hydroelectric power compresses even ships and airplanes can travel without fuel and with greater security than current vehicles, we can see that the world from the point of view of the connections can become smaller and

smaller how big planes could land and rise vertically, like helicopters. If the energy that would fly the planes would not cost anything, the canadairs could carry much more water and position themselves just above the fires. Turn them off would be much simpler and also would simplify the water loading operations, not needing runways.

With all these solutions the world could accommodate twice the current world population. But the world's ruling class has not spent a dollar in that direction. It is more likely to fund the creation of a virus that sterilizes human sperm, as hypothesized in the fantasy novel "Inferno" by the famous American writer Dan Brown in the year 2013.

The world does not need great scientists, but people who can scientifically organize the work to do, select the most needed and the least useful energies. No energy should be discarded on the planet earth. Obviously, they need more interactive energies that cost nothing and protect the environment. If the society of the future will be set if the interactive energies, it will be fairer than the current one. There will be work for everyone, above all, to correct the wrong fixed and mobile energy plants, and to heal the environment by simply producing energy, even when it is not needed, especially if we produce energy with submersible systems in wells, bogs, basins, In ports, where it solubles oxygen without costs in the backdrops that with the current systems can not arrive.

Nobody should close the borders with migrants. It is mainly they who have to work, not in factories, where the industrial Taylorism, rightly, is automating all but out of the factories, where the environmental Taylorism, requires a continuous flow of water and air for energy, purification and production of resources food, no tricks and no GMOs. If we stretch the continent's boundaries with oil derivatives, we will not waste anything and we can accommodate migrants and future growing populations, giving everyone a decent home and a decent job.

It should not be forgotten that current energy production is considered a necessity, but contributes to the depletion of resources and the degradation of the environment, while interactive energies consume nothing and protect the environment. As Lavoisier said: "everything changes and nothing is destroyed," the problem that has not been understood by scientists and legislators is the fact that the transformations of matter must be temporary and everything has to be reported in the initial conditions under works designed by man. But there are no alternatives. The laws of physics and chemistry must also be respected in thermal systems. They cannot be considered true scientists who have designed the current thermal motors and thermal power plants. Science cannot reason like politics, where the "end justifies the means". Reducing the size of the implants cannot be a sufficient reason to alter the natural equilibrium of the planet in which we are merely passing. In addition, publications and subsequent patents have shown that we can produce electricity even without the use of thermal energy, simply by increasing the air pressure on the water. Obviously, the increase in pressure reduces the size and consequently, with a little of goodwill, thermal motors can also be eliminated.

How can we continue to have the confidence of scientists and legislators who are silent about these simple, logical inventions? How do pump builders do not understand that if the multi-stage pumps work, also the pumps with the dual supply separate until the impeller can work? Do they not realize that they use the same hydraulic principle? But the pumps that have dual supply until the impeller replace the multistage pumps that absorb energies hundreds of times higher, obviously in systems designed differently, as indicated by the undersigned. How does the world class leader not understand that if we save energy in recovery and lifting or pressurizing water, we can use the same water to produce endless energy, with small footprints, anywhere in the earth and space? How can we trust

those who do not order to spend a few thousand euros to find out these simple scientific and technical truths about interactive energies that could make many world leaders useless? These vertices only show the incompetence of those who rule. Young people are right to protest, but they have to do it without violence, above all, learning to design and demand a comparison of projects. As long as projects are on paper, they do not require public and private investment but only study and engagement. Rather, they also have to demand professional training other than the current one, because even the world's universities have never thought that there might be interactive energies that protect the environment, even though they have been teaching for many centuries the physical, chemical, and biological principles on which they are based. The silences of those who teach are also guilty. It is necessary to clarify once and for all and to teach it in schools that the limits imposed by the principles of energy conservation apply only to closed hydraulic and pneumatic circuits. There can be three cases:

1) In open ones, though isolated, we can produce energy infinitely by intubating the water from the surface and placing in the backwater a pump pumping downwards and a hydraulic turbine. The energy we produce will only be due to the kinetic energy that develops within the descent tube. In any case this energy is always much higher than the energy needed to spin the pump and the loss of load we will have at the output of the turbine which is nothing but a submerged outlet, where the loss of load depends on the output speed ($V^2 / 2g$). The hydrostatic pressure outside the downhole cannot oppose kinetic energy (or dynamic pressure). Moreover, the water that goes out into the backdrop, being of the same density as the surface, does not have to go upward by consuming other energy. This system, which the undersigned called "submerged hydroelectric power", besides producing energy, would lead to the oxygen of surface water in the polluted seabed, has never been taught in any school in the

world, how can we expect it to be realized in real plants?

2) In lifting systems open between two basins at different geodetic heights, instead of lifting the waters from the bottom to the upper reservoir, consuming energy and then distributing them to utilities, we can modify the plants as follows:

Connect the two basins on the suction side of a pump with the dual supply until to the impeller and the pump delivery to a hydraulic turbine, after which the water returns to the top basin. With this system we produce energy by recycling the upper basin water through a single aspirating mouth, without consuming water, as in the previous "submerged hydroelectric". When it is necessary to lift the water from the bottom to the upper reservoir, we do not become energy consumers as we currently do, but we reduce the amount of energy produced by opening the feed from the bottom basin that supplies the same pump impeller, which is fed separately also from the upper reservoir, allows the insertion of the water of the lower basin in the upper basin recycling loop. Therefore, we do not consume energy for lifting water, since the upper reservoir circuit is always full.

3) If instead of using open circuits, we use pressurized compressed air circuits, such as in the current autoclaves, these should be used as follows:

The water and the compressed air inside the autoclave should always store the same volume, so that the compressed air cushion eject the incompressible water, that we introduce in excess in the autoclave tank by means of the pump with the dual supply separate until the impeller. If we connect the water outlet to a hydraulic turbine, we can produce energy infinitely by consuming only the energy needed to recycle from the water under the same volume of water as in the previous case, without winning the pressure of the pillow of air because the volume of water does not vary within the

autoclave.

Obviously compressed air pressurized circuits are the most beneficial and efficient because we can imagine them being made in the polluted seabed, in the wells, where besides producing energy, Dalton and Henry's physical laws dissolve some of the compressed air in the water in proportion to the pressure of the autoclave. Therefore, the water coming out of the turbine carries a much larger amount of oxygen than the simply flooded hydroelectric plants of the simply opened basins of positions 1 and 2. In addition, if we want to realize small-size energy systems for use in flats and transport systems, we can only choose the operating pressure and side by side with the pressurized tank an open reservoir that collects water at the turbine output, through the pump with the dual supply, immediately inserts it back into the pressurized tank. Obviously, the energy produced is proportional to the pressure of the air cushion, as if we had a hydraulic jump of 400 to 500 meters in a small bonnet compartment of a car.

We need to ask what are the reasons why these solutions did not come to schools, industry, the environment, and energy? Why is the inventor compelled to turn to the International Courts of Justice with open letters to be considered? And 'forced to do so as a last resort because all the other categories that could have responded have not responded.

The present society does not reward individual industrial creativity, but only the artistic and literary creativity that does not affect the global economy. For public and private power centers, small inventors need only deal with small commercial inventions. These power centers did not realize that large inventions are not needed, but small mechanical, hydraulic and pneumatic inventions, which are rationally linked to meet the fundamental principles of chemistry and biology physics. They did not realize that scientists and researchers are the least suited to designing energy systems

and environmental protection, which require cross-machine engineering experiences and work organization, which can only be acquired through passion and personal sacrifice because, Both public and private, today only reward high expertise in individual sectors. The result of this dull industrial policy is in the eyes of everyone but no one sees the solutions because specialists only see single aspects of the problems. Nor have the United Nations ever put together teams of specialists who work together for years to design and update transversally public utilities that are energy and purification plants. If the United Nations had put together a large team of such specialists, ordering to design complete plants that close all the cycles that open and safe from the dangers of earthquakes and tsunamis, I can assure that none of the current energy and purification facilities would ever be realized. Indeed, if these specialists reason with only one head and with no party interests, considering the status of universal art, they would design the same plants that I designed the undersigned, who get the maximum environmental and energy results with the lowest expense of resources. Instead, these plants are the only ones that do not exist because all the sciences and all technologies pull water to their mill.

Thermodynamic and nuclear physics is better not to involve them because they open inorganic or radioactive cycles that involve high costs, high bulk, and in some cases we cannot close it. Large public bodies and large multinationals have shown that they are not able to relate rationally the plants to the territories.

The world power centers have not realized that the world cannot be divided according to the spheres of competence of men of ministries and companies. The best returns bring nature through physical, chemical, and biological interactive processes that we do not fully understand in our laboratories. No one should be surprised that the interactive energy

produced by compressed air and water has yielded hundreds of times more than current energies, especially science, which has always sought interactivity, especially in nuclear processes, unfortunately, neglecting interactivity which can also be done in the most basic processes.

To convince the skeptics and prove the validity of these solutions that science has overlooked, I could at least do the prototype of the pump with the dual supply until the impeller, which is fundamental. But I could not do it because I was forced to pay fees on patents, which should be exempt from such payments, not only because they are public utility projects but also because I have never claimed industrial property. . I would have liked modest copyright as they would to a writer. Those who make laws do not distinguish between industrial and intellectual property. Lawmakers, instead of encouraging inventors to develop ideas by recognizing their intellectual property and encouraging entrepreneurs to invest in projects, recognizing their industrial property, discourage inventors without bosses so that inventions only produce power centers that carry on only the projects of interest to them. No matter whether these projects, as is happening, widen the hole in the ozone, pollute the atmosphere and waters and warm the planet. What is the point of locating patents at the ministries of economic development of individual countries, if patents not aligned with the power system nobody takes them into account? The undersigned thought the phenomenon was only Italian. But she was wrong. It is also European and worldwide.

Everything conspired against sustainable development: political mistakes, scientific and technical legislation. But who can prove it? If millions of competent people are busy every day to handle the problems. Not to solve them. I myself, I was able to study solutions only as a retired but unable to spend money on experimentation. As I wrote above, I think it is all the fault of the world work organization and in particular the absence of "environmental Taylorism", which

would have forced experts to identify where the mistakes were. Today, you do not even know who should be the experts who identify the mistakes because the experiences are very fragmented. No one has a global vision and at the same time the knowledge to change the details. Environmental issues concern everyone but cannot be handled as economic, religious, political problems. Environmental issues concern everyone but cannot be handled as economic, religious, political problems. Everyone is entitled to political, economic, and religious autonomy. No one has the right to environmental planning because those who pollute the atmosphere and the water pollute the entire planet. A world-wide environmental authority at the United Nations should be established. I am referring only to energy and depurative designs that have a major impact on global warming. Not to industrial management and purification, which would remain in the hands of individual countries.

The industrial Taylorism has shown that to produce high quality consumer goods such as cars, computers, home appliances, the production of these goods requires a vast organization of labor in factories and a daily update of technology, which virtually gradually focusing on very few and very large companies that take advantage of a centralized design and as far as possible, are copying each other. Those who are left behind in such updates lose market share. This was possible because an activity model was created for each activity, which is followed scrupulously in all the world's factories. Today, if we go to a car factory in Europe or America or Australia, it seems we always visit the same factory. But to achieve these efficiency models, about one hundred years of inventions and work organization improvements were needed. Organizational work at factories is a sort of three-dimensional and dynamic puzzle. All dots must fit perfectly into the right place and at the right time. This organizational system cannot escape the mistakes of any type, apart from the defects of the origin of the machine produced, that if they are environmental, they cannot be identified

through industrial Taylorism but the environmental one that no one has ever realized because of competence of world governments. In fact, industrial companies simply comply with the laws issued by the legislator. Another problem that prevents the emergence of an alternative development model is undoubtedly the sale of patents by public research bodies to private companies. Indeed, while there is no environmental Taylorism that would lead to the discovery of alternative development models, research organizations sell solutions in line with current systems. This not only leads to conflicts of interest that should not exist, but how can they, the same bodies, feel free to change the solutions after they have been sold to the highest bidder? I do not say that public research institutions should not fund patents, I just ask to reserve intellectual property, and leave freedom to invest all the global companies capable of doing so? Would not the state of the art of environmental protection advance faster?

Today environmental Taylorism has a delay of one hundred years than the industrial Taylorism, to recover the lost time must intervene directly to the United Nations, because only the world's leading authority can be heard. But the United Nations must have the ability to select from among the many existing environmental solutions, the most efficient ones and if they do not exist, to propose new solutions in the interest of everyone. Practically, for the undersigned, the United Nations, faced with the failure of 22 COP (Conference of the Parties) organized by them, have the duty to move from words to facts, proving that global warming can be fought without even lose out economically. Who wants to defend the current fixed and mobile environmental and energy solutions it has to do with the comparison of solutions, environmental, economic and management efficiency. The best solution comes right into the general development model, which all member states should be required to follow in their own interest, having publicly demonstrated that it is the best solution. All this has already happened in industrial systems. The undersigned,

writes these things because he tried to put together the puzzle of the global environment, but it was not possible. There are too many strategic inventions, that is, those that have unnecessarily patented. Is not it strange that no one finances it, even though it costs little? No one can hide their responsibilities infinitely, not even the United Nations, which through the World Bank finances many environmental rehabilitation works in developing countries. These solutions repeat our own mistakes. I as a simple technical installer of installations I participated in carrying out some of these projects in Tunisia. If I had not gained these experiences, I would not have allowed me to propose improvements. I do not think to offend any of the designers or inventors and scientists who have designed the solutions in use, if I propose more efficient solutions. I will not be offended if anyone will improve my solutions, but I'm offended by the silences that collect those solutions.

We will never know how things really are if everyone continues to pretend that interactive energies and artificial welling have never been published. The history of sustainable world development has not yet begun. It can only begin when the world's leading science councilors understand that there is no good or bad science or even good and bad energy resources. The difference makes it the way to design industrial, environmental and energy plants, which in any case, must close the cycles they open. On the website <http://www.spawhe.eu>, I think I have shown that the most energy-efficient plants are environmentally-friendly ones that do not open cycles that can be avoided, which, unfortunately, has opened science. And never closed from the advent of the industrial era, wasting resources that could be employed differently. I am referring in particular to petroleum derivatives would be very important to create artificial welling that, without polluting and cooling the planet, could at least double the current capacity to find a home for work and food to world populations.

How do physics and hydrodynamics professors continue to teach current systems without thinking that at least in the water we could circumvent gravitational force and hydrostatic pressures? Carrying in some oxygen cases in the backbones, in other cases, raising nutrients and carbonates. Why do they even forget, leaving in ignorance or doubt even the students of the future? I believe that all science should discuss these solutions, even criticizing them, if they do not agree. I think that as long as we do not have certain and experienced answers, we must stop all public investment in the world. It does not take much to verify the truth. Public debt is too high. Much of it is due to the energy and purification public utilities, which are all to be demolished and reconstructed. To these must be added the high costs of fuels that aggravate balance of payments of the non-oil producing countries. Only interactive energies that cost nothing can start the real world recovery. Practically, from the environmental point of view, we are still in the early 1900's, when a few years later Albert Einstein theorized "general relativity" and Frederick Taylor theorized "the scientific organization of work". Both theories have not been useful to protecting the environment as they could have been expanding applications beyond the inventors' intentions. Relativity has been used mainly to produce nuclear power and atomic bombs, while it is also important to understand the functioning of interactive energies, atmospheric pressure at carbon and calcium in the oceans, already comprehensible by the principles of Newton, Dalton, Henry, Pascal, Bernoulli, Venturi, who could allow us to repeat the miracle of multiplication of fish for infinity. All this, it seems to us that statisticians, scientists, economists representing us at world summits and party conferences are not interested. It needs a bath of humility to all the powerful of the earth, political science and economy, proving that clean energy, even protective of the environment, was always at hand no secret formulas. They have not found it and are doing their best to not find it. But truth, sooner or later, must come out, because water and air are everywhere. You just have to

know how to put them together. As Pope Woytila said, if I'm wrong, correct me. Until now, nobody has done so.

Best Regard

Luigi Antonio Pezone