

## Wikipedia / Pop-pop : Attention !

By Loïc et Jean-Yves

We will now treat the pop-pop engine article found on the **French** Wikipedia web site. (We could wonder why the French page is so different of the English one.) We are ambivalent as to the information found there. In fact, some of the information is true whereas some is more controversial if not false. And this despite a "watch committee". This committee is made of you, me, anyone who wants to post information freely. This is at the same time the strength and the weakness of this encyclopedia, weakness as far as the topic that interests us here. In fact, obvious errors and moreover questionable ethics mar the page dealing with pop-pop engines. Attempts by us to modify this page were denied and this is why we have decided to post this comment. Let's examine without further ado the information that seems to us after experiments and a logical fault process to be questionable if not false.

For instance, we can read on the information page the following lines here highlighted in grey and in italics :

- *"Some different spellings are known, which can let us suppose that the sound is not exactly the same in every country". "This is certainly due to the technical progress in each country concerning the maritime propulsion of the pop-pop type"*

Indeed, the noise depends on the engine type, but there is not any doubt concerning the fact the noise is independent of the country. The different spellings that are "*Put-Put-Boot, Knatterboot, Putt-Putt boat, Pop-Pop boat, Toc-Toc boat, Puf-Puf boat, Phut-Phut, Pouet-Pouet*" don't result of a "technical progress", but simply of the way the sounds are written depending on the language. We smiled when reading "maritime propulsion of the pop-pop type"... A very pompous expression when we know that the pop-pop boats are and will remain toys (except for a few funny experiments), generally very far from maritime applications...

- *"The only known engine which emits a comparable noise, but loudly, is the famous motorbike Harley Davidson."*

You can like both, but there is no link between a Harley and a pop-pop ! Let's compare what is comparable !

- *"Scheme 1" (look at the site)*

The arrows prolonging the pipes are in opposite directions, thus letting us think that the water enters by one pipe and goes out by the other one. This is wrong. The water movement is a reciprocating one in both pipes. Look at the pages of Eclecticspace where are displayed some videos of transparent engines.

- *"Scheme 2" (look at the site)*

It is not fair to display a photo with legends and then to write that they are wrong ! (Concerning inlet/outlet pipes).

Then the article describes the running "a priori" and "actual". This is due to the publication of a wrong description, clumsily corrected later. Why not using only the description of the truth?

Let's smile at some ironic comments, but how could we refrain laughing when reading that *"the very respectable engineers who, without help and sponsoring, have run long and costly tests, risking their life (burns, explosions) but in the praiseworthy spirit to work for the advancement of science " ??*

- *"If we heat too much, the pop-pop engine sputters which is symptomatic of a permanent running in the starting mode."*

The technical reason is too long to be explained here. The reality is more complex than this and such a simplification doesn't help and could lead to erroneous interpretation.

- *"After filling the circuit with water, avoiding to let air that would delay its normal running, or even could let it suffocate at the start."*

Wrong. If some people thought that air was harmful, it is now clear that some air improves drastically the thrust at the pipe outlet.

- *"Due to that, the pop-pop engine is a two stroke reciprocating engine with external combustion with steam and biphasic thermal exchange"*

Let's stay zen. It is only a pop-pop "engine"!...

- *"The problem of the propulsion is not clarified. On this point the opinions diverge :
 
  - One can consider that the water is expelled faster than it is sucked. The difference in kinetic energy would create the propulsion
  - One can, as most of the specialists, think that the water when sucked comes from all directions, though it is expelled in the only opposite direction to the running one. Thus, there will be a forward reactive effect to the expulsion, a less reverse reactive effect when sucking.
  - One can also adopt a neutral position and wish that in the future some deep experimental researches will allow to dispel the doubt."*

Though we can read on-line some rantings, it is not possible to doubt. No need to multiply the points of view. The second statement says the reality. Multiple experiments all over the world have demonstrated that a reciprocating waterjet has a propulsive effect. A very simple explanation proves it (Look at "Functioning of a pulsed waterjet" on Eclecticspace). Furthermore, a math demo (very simple math for a hydrodynamics specialist) allows proving it.

- *"The brand name « bateau à moteur pop-pop » (pop-pop boat) is a registered trade mark..."*

This is not wrong, but let's smile... It is as if tomorrow the brand name « two pedal bike » was registered! On one hand, those who registered this brand name didn't inquire much. On the other hand those who requested this registration were not very fair by attempting thus to lock the market.

- *"The big pop-pop boat race, called World championship of pop-pop boat takes place every year at Loguivy-de-la-Mer."*

Let us emit a last small comment on this topic. Nothing forbids to organize and spend a good day in this village (on the contrary!) but doing that through a pseudo international exhibition, which in fact is more a commercial action organized by a pop-pop boat dealer and a bar owner is probably less ethic that what could be thought *a priori*.

Here are in a few words some comments that we had in mind when reading the "Pop-Pop engine" page of Wikipedia as it was in 2006. This post, voluntarily a little bit "provocative", was intended to inform readers in order to involve a revision, a must for us, of the concerned page of this free on line encyclopedia. The purpose of this compedium is praised, but it will find its full usefulness only when the on line information is drastically selected.

Since that time, there has been some corrections, the reference to Harley-Davidson disappeared...but an enormous error has been implemented. In November 2011 one can read: *"this is not a waterjet"* Yes it is! It is not a direct waterjet but it is a waterjet, a pulsed waterjet.

Why did the responsible guy of this Wikipedia page never accepted any of our modifications though we are (without asking for glory) among those (we are not the only ones) who tested many of these engines??... If not involved directly in the writing of this page (but wasn't it the principle of this free encyclopedia?) we would have been pleased to bring our remarks, due to our observations, calculations, and measurements...