

qiman13

Posted: Fri Sep 10, 2004 3:31 pm Post subject: Secrets of the Water Cell Explained!!!

Hi Everyone, new to the board but have somethings I want to bring to the surface.

Below was posted in Dave's Cell folder. I added more below that.

Hi Gary, what material is your plates or tubes made from? I use t304 steel tube setup and I get no gunk. The only thing that even appears to corrode are the non ss leads that connect to the positive tubes.

Also, if getting gunk, then most likely you are getting too much regular electrolysis. The idea is to prevent current from doing that. Therefore, no oxygen can go to your positive plates/tubes and oxidize them.

I'm new to the group and would like to tell you that I have a circuit virtually identical to SM's. It was developed by someone that I have learned from over the years. It isn't used to make fuel from water but is used to charge batteries overunity. I can post the schematics soon as appropriate. I also have other info to share if you're interested.

The circuit is not a resonant circuit. The water doesn't go into some magical resonance. The blocking diode should be telling you all something. No resonance (at least not the circuit). The voltage never drops to negative.

What is the difference between a transverse wave and a longitudinal impulse?

<http://www.gmi.edu/~drussell/Demos/waves/wavemotion.html>

and

<http://www.glenbrook.k12.il.us/gbssci/phys/Class/sound/u111b.html>

and

<http://www.glenbrook.k12.il.us/gbssci/phys/mmedia/waves/lw.html>

3 very good basic examples. Unidirectional DC pulses are not transverse waves. They are longitudinal impulses. The whole secret is sending TIME IMPULSES to the water.

What the goal is is to pump the water with radiant energy. This is nothing but pure voltage potential with no current. When it is done right, you can create the voltage potentials without ever inducing electrons to flow to begin with. How? We'll get to that. Imagine not having all the problems of having to restrict amps. I will be happy to share this with anyone who is serious.

Let me know what you think.

I'm also looking for copies of the two Stanley Meyer videos and the book. If anyone can get me copies, I would be extremely grateful. Even if nobody can get me these, I'll still share my info with you all.

Take care!

I've observed in this board some comments I would like to comment on.

I saw that someone mentioned that Meyer was flawed in saying the inductor increases frequency. That isn't a flaw, of course it increases frequency when a pulsed input is put into it and there is a blocking diode. One pulse is given and it goes through the blocking diode, charges the inductor and gets to the cell with less amps. That is

one pulse. When the pulse is cut off, the inductor collapses in the SAME direction because the blocking diode prevents it from going opposite polarity and this is pulse #2 going to the cell. You paid for one and got 2 pulses.

For example, let's just stick to straight wall cycle. 60hz going into the bridge to turn it into pulsed dc will be 120hz pulsed dc. Remember that there is one dc pulse for each half of the ac. 120 hz pulsed into the inductor will get 240hz at the cell. So, the frequency is increased by using the inductor. Of course we want higher frequency than this, but this is only for an example.

The secret is pumping radiant energy into the water and this puts it into a higher energy state. You're swelling the water up with the Aether.

Each time a coil is given a pulse, there will be a certain volt and amp over a certain time. When the pulse is shut off, the collapsed SPIKE is pure voltage potential with no current. That is why it is virtually a straight line. You're converting work back into potential. The spike is time compressed energy...pure Aetheric potential or radiant energy. Think about it...you're turning work back into potential. It is the radiant potential that you are wanting to pump into the water unidirectionally.

Frequencies are important but that is a case by case situation. Based on cell spacing, material of it, voltage, etc... there will of course be optimal frequencies for each system and they will all be different. It has nothing to do with a magical frequency that water will mysteriously separate at. There are frequencies that can do that but that isn't what Meyer was doing I don't believe.

It is essential to understand what energy is and that energy is NOT the capacity to do work, what electricity is and to realize that there is no such thing as electricity...electricity is truly an adjective to describe an event...where the source charge comes from and for example if you power your system with batteries, the charge does NOT come from the inside of the battery...it is important to understand what a dipole is and how a dipole gets a flow over wires. It is a myth that we don't know where the source charge comes from. These things are really necessary to duplicate something but if you understand the above and a little more, it will be overwhelmingly obvious what Meyer was doing. It is obvious he didn't know but he still got results.

The patents are there to give the concept, not the actual working model. Same as the xogen patents. It will not work using the exact same circuit and input of 12v, etc... that shows the concept of what they are using but that doesn't mean their working models are that same circuit.

For example, the battery charging method I'm using for overunity gain...this is how to measure it. measure the joules of input energy from the input source over a given time. When the battery is charged, power a resistive load (light bulb) from it and measure the joules being used to light that bulb until the battery is back down to the voltage that it was before charging. The joules will be more than what left the input source. This is overunity. Hundreds of % in fact and up to a few thousand is possible without a doubt.

This is what the fakes out there want you to measure: Well let's measure the input and hook meters to the output of the circuit and measure that hundreds of volts, etc... that is all BS. The ONLY honest way to test this kind of thing is measuring WORK. Measure work in and then measure usable work AFTER the battery is charged. You can't directly measure potential like this with devices because there aren't any devices that can measure pure Aether. The devices we use and this is important... only measure wasted energy. They all want to hook the output of the circuit back into the input source (battery) or whatever and have it run itself. That is ridiculous...that closes the loop and kills the dipole.

Anyway, this is my 2 cents.

There is one book that spells out word for word what Meyer's is doing, what Gray did, etc... that is chapter one on Tesla in this book: <http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/0932813801/yokotahighschool>

That book was used as a Rosetta stone to cracks Grays patents and therefore revealed some of Teslas secrets.

Looking forward to all of your input.

Thanks and I'll look foward to comparing notes on devices you're all building.

qiman13

Posted: Fri Sep 10, 2004 4:58 pm Post subject: correction

I meant to say that it is NOT necessary to know about what a dipole is, etc... to make the things work. It is only necessary to easily see what Meyer and other were doing.

Murray

Posted: Sat Sep 11, 2004 3:04 am Post subject:

Hi Qiman

I converted the international news release briefings by Stanley A Meyer on the water fuel cell to PDF and laserline has uploaded them for all to see. thanks mate

http://www.icubenetwork.com/files/watercar/non-commercial/stanley_meyer/

worth a read

Murray

Imagination is more important than the knowledge.

The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

Murray

Posted: Sat Sep 11, 2004 4:34 am Post subject:

I thought this was interesting and has some relevance.

refer to links

<http://www.geocities.com/CapeCanaveral/Lab/5322/ind-kick.htm>

Quote:

It is possible to step-up voltage without using a transformer. The property of an inductor to build up a high counter-electromotive force (cemf) can be used to flash gas discharge tubes and light neon bulbs and small tubes from very small batteries. All you need

to do is connect a fairly large inductor (.5mH or higher works best) in parallel to the bulb or tube and then attach the inductor to a square wave pulse generator. The result should be the tube or bulb glowing, sometimes very brightly depending on the inductor used, the input voltage/current, pulse rate, and the bulb or tube characteristics. It is important to have the neon bulb, etc. lighting, if it doesn't the cemf will come back to the output transistor and possibly ruin it. When the bulb is glowing the gas is a low resistance, therefore shorting the cemf. The bulb or tube you use will also protect the rest of the circuit. For the pulse generator, a low frequency 555 timer circuit or signal generator will do. Experiment with the inductor, I have gotten neon bulbs to give off almost white light.

also this is some good info on the dc resonate charging circuit

<http://www.richieburnett.co.uk/dcreschg.html#resonant>

I am with you! and have come to very similar conclusions, now we just have to prove it.

Murray

Imagination is more important than the knowledge.

The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

Gary

Posted: Sat Sep 11, 2004 8:57 am Post subject:

Hi Guys, that "richieburnett" link above in Murray's post explains the dc resonant charging circuit very clearly, leaving no room for misinterpretation at all.

Qiman, you can see that the frequency is NOT doubled, but the dc supply voltage across the capacitor is! You can see what Meyer was trying to achieve with this, doubling the supply voltage pulses while the inductor naturally limits the current - it even shows the step charging sequence. This explanation of the circuit is far, far better than anything Stan ever wrote in his wild babblings.

The blocking diode simply serves to stop the capacitor discharging in the opposite direction through the inductor once the capacitor is fully charged.

As I see it, the flaw with this circuit when applied by old Stan to his wfc is that of course, the wfc is NOT much of a capacitor, more of a resistor.

Pure water makes a great dielectric, with a dielectric constant of around 80 and a breakdown voltage in the order of thousands of volts per mm, but tap water conducts very well as we all know. Just 240v mains provides a very healthy current - or unhealthy if you happen to be in the bath when the hair dryer drops in!!!

Having said all that I intend to play about with the dc resonant charging circuit and do some proper tests as it might be there is enough of a capacitance to still provide a substantial step charging effect. I don't really expect this to be the case tho as the resistance offered by my electrode set up is at best much less than 1 ohm!

However, I find that putting things actually into practice often throws up info, ideas and insights that don't always reveal themselves on paper.

All the best

regards, Gary.

qiman13

Posted: Sat Sep 11, 2004 1:40 pm Post subject: What a dipole really is

Gary, I can understand your explanation of charge carriers, etc...

Let me ask you this...when you measure voltage...what are you measuring? Electron charge or voltage potential? They are two totally different things.

First of all, where does the source charge come from? Isn't that the big mystery with "electricity?" We all are told and we can all observe what this mysterious charge does but no textbook can explain where it comes from?

I believe it is crucial to understand what a dipole is. Of course it is something with two poles. If the poles have a balanced potential, there is no movement possible. I think we can agree on that. If one potential is higher and one lower, then there is obviously movement capability. I think we can agree on that too.

Now, lets look at the most common dipole that we use all the time. A battery.

It is claimed that the electrolytes in a battery create some chemical reaction that produces an electrical charge and this electrical charge is what goes out of the battery and over the wires and powers whatever is connected to the battery. This would of course be a bare bones explanation of what a battery is.

Is this really what is happening?

It is important to understand what the Aether is. Michaelson/Morlay spelling?? have already been disproven long ago. They have also been proven to have miscalculated what they were doing when they "proved" there is no Aether, which is absolutely ridiculous. So in fact, there is an Aether just as Einstein predicted. In fact, the Aether does exist as Tesla knew way before and at a much higher level than Einstein ever did.

We know that there is unlimited vacuum energy...infinite potential available in 3d space and time. It is

everywhere and we are immersed in it like a fish is in water. When I say vacuum, I'm not talking about a tube with atmosphere sucked out. All space is literally the vacuum. It is a misleading word because it causes people to think it is empty when the opposite is true. In essence, more accurately, it is a Plenum (having an infinite abundance).

Mathematically, E.T. Whittaker showed in 1903 the unlimited potential available. In conventional physics/math, what they all show the potential to be is this: take a cup and scoop out a cup of water from a flowing river in a moment in time. That is what they call the potential? That is totally nuts! What about the rest of the infinite river? That has caused so many problems it isn't even funny. The basics of these physics and math are so fundamentally flawed, they are useless when dealing with devices that do not operate according to manmade self-proclaimed "Laws."

<http://www.cheniere.org/misc/Whittak/ORIw1903.pdf>

Now, we are immersed in a sea of energy...then what? This sea of energy is filled with virtual photons - called virtual because as soon as they are there, they instantly disappear. So they are in a state of flux...popping in and out at ridiculous speeds. Perhaps they are traveling like a Mobius strip...1/2 here and 1/2 there, wherever that may be. Anyway, by the fact that they have a positive charge, there must be a virtual negative charge as well for obvious reasons. How do we tap this energy? We do it all the time and don't even know it.

When you have a battery with electrolytes, the electrolytes do ONE thing only. That is to separate internal charges so that + is on one side and - is on the other side. Each terminal on a battery is connected of course to each side of the electrolytes by connections. The terminals will be + and -. That is a potential difference and that is what makes a battery a dipole. The electrolyte charges that were separated are NOT the charge carriers of some mysterious charge that goes out the battery to power something. That is a myth. They only establish a dipole.

Now that we have a dipole, then what? The vacuum energy is very symmetrical in nature. Pretty much the same throughout in all directions (generally). With a battery - a dipole - sitting inside of 3d space and time where this Aether or vacuum energy is, the symmetry of the photon (different from regular light photon that we see) energy is broken. One polarity of the Aether goes to one pole and the opposite to the other pole. If nothing is connected to the battery, the Aether radiates outward spherically in all directions at the speed of light.

If a light bulb is connected to the battery, you close the circuit. The Aether at the + terminal flows over the wire towards the - terminal and induces the electrons to flow that pile up at the filament of the bulb and turn to photons that radiate out as light. There is ALSO the opposite polarity flow that goes out the - terminal towards the + terminal butting heads against the flow. This is what breaks apart the electrolyte charges so that the strength of the potential difference of the electrolytes gets less and less. This is what kills the battery because the loop was closed and the circuit is caused to kill its very own dipole. It was not killed because some mysterious charge was used up in the battery.

This flow is called the Poynting flow usually designated as $j \cdot \phi$ I believe. Heaviside also knew of this flow but he actually got the vectors right. I'm please to see that Dave understand Heaviside. Also, the amount of flow that goes over the wires...only 10 to the -13th power (1/11 trillionths) of it gets diverged into the wire to move electrons to the surface from the copper atoms 3rd electron field. Imagine that!

Every atom is literally a perpetual motion device. Where do you think the electrons get the energy potential to sustain their perpetual motion? Look at the mass of the electron, it sure wasn't given some incredible push that keeps it in motion. It is sustaining by interacting with the Aether.

Once something is set into motion, it will stay in motion unless it is acted upon by something else. This literally permits perpetual motion.

It never said that once something is in motion that it will stay in motion until something acts on it, which most definitely will happen.

Anyway, overunity doesn't have to have a single thing to do with perpetual motion.

anyway, That is where the flow comes from to light a light bulb and NOT some charge carriers inside the battery. I don't blame you for your explanation of that because that is in fact what is taught. Does that mean that they are correct? They first tell you that is what holds the charge and turn around and tell you it is a mystery where the source charge comes from.

Take a bathtub, fill it up and put a plug in the hole. It is all nice and symmetrical. pull the plug...make a potential difference and the water goes towards the hole and down the pipe. You broke the symmetry of the water. This is EXACTLY where the battery gets its source charge from except not a pipe..flowing over a wire at light speed while the electrons that are induced into movement only move at inches per hour literally!

You can read Lee and Yang's presentation speech as they were given the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1957.

<http://nobelprize.org/physics/laureates/1957/index.html>

"for their penetrating investigation of the so-called parity laws which has led to important discoveries regarding the elementary particles"

It is because of their work that we understand that a dipole breaks the symmetry of the Aether. That is where the source charge comes from and not electrons.

The Aether moves like a gas under pressure. It is a conductive gas that is conductive to + and -. If you have a battery and you put a voltmeter on it, you get a volt reading. 12vdc for example. That reading has nothing to do with a charge in the battery. When connecting the leads to the meter, the Aether flows to the terminals and over the wires on the meter and that induces electron flow in that circuit. You are literally taking a pressure reading of the gas. Voltage is nothing more than the pressure of the flow of the Aether over wires. It has NOTHING to do with electron charge.

To clarify, a battery can be charged with hot current..electron current and you will have electrons piling on plates. You CAN also charge a battery in a superior way by charging it with cold current, which is void of electrons. This is a fact. The battery never warms and either does the circuit charging it.

Likewise, you can charge a cap with hot current or electron flow and those pile on the plates. Depending on the potential difference between the plates because of the electrons you will get a potential difference. That is true. However, you can charge a cap with "cold electricity", which is void of electrons by spiking the cap with PURE VOLTAGE POTENTIAL and NO ELECTRONS and the cap WILL charge up. The pressure of the aether here is what is measured when using a voltmeter. It is not measuring a potential difference between plates on the caps based on electrons on one plate. You can charge the cap both ways. One, you will have a cap that will be warmed up and one will be room temp.

Think about this. You have a little bitty battery and you have a monster battery. They obviously would have an enormous difference in the amount of charge if it was like the establishment teaches. Both batteries can read 12volts brand new. Therefore, it is not really measuring a charge at all because if it was, the bigger the battery, the bigger the charge and the reading would be higher. We know that is not the case.

I hope this clarifies what voltage potential really is and what a dipole is and what the voltage is NOT. This understanding jeopardizes oil money as it has all along. Remember, Morgan said to Tesla...that's nice Mr. Tesla, but where do we put the meter? They want everyone to believe energy must be a non-renewable consumable and have everyones mindset tuned to scarcity and lack of instead of abundance.

qiman13

Posted: Sat Sep 11, 2004 3:46 pm Post subject: inductor frequency

My understanding may be off on this. I'll put a scope before the blocking diode and check the frequency and put one after the inductor. I guess that will be the easy way to really tell what the difference is in frequency if any at all.

If the frequency is not increased after the inductor, that means the collapsed field is seamless with the initial applied pulse. I find that hard to believe but maybe that is what is happening.

If that is what is happening, that means there may be a steady DC flow to the water cell and that means that no matter what frequency you put to the water cell, there will be only steady dc if the inductor is not giving a separate pulse on the collapse. If it is seamless.

Another possibility is that on the applied pulse, the water gets hit. When the pulse is off, the inductor collapses seamlessly at the end of the initial pulse so the pulse given to the water is longer than the initial pulse by itself and the voltage goes up. When the collapsed pulse is done, then another applied pulse comes and does the same thing so the frequency wouldn't increase but yes the voltage would.

qiman13

Posted: Mon Sep 13, 2004 1:57 pm Post subject: inductor test

Gary,

I read page 1-1 in Meyer's book. First line "Using VOLTAGE POTENTIAL." I think nothing else is necessary to read in that book. I will though. That is the whole secret. That is time impulses, which are unidirectional dc longitudinal impulses. That is what POTENTIAL is. All his info is only about how he is creating voltage potential to pump into the water. If you know what voltage potential is, you got it.

If electrons pile on plates and this makes the difference between the other plate and this is what the voltage is. Please explain this. With X amount of volts and X amount of amps going into the water cell, you're going to get X amount of electrons piling on one side. However, when putting an inductor after the blocking diode, you can get a higher voltage with less amps. The inductor reduces the electrons in the cell but the voltage can be higher? The voltage is not directly tied to electrons on the plates. Doesn't this simple thought experiment show that voltage doesn't have to have anything to do with a certain amount of electrons on a plate that has a certain so-called "charge?"

On page 1-2, Meyer says the LC circuit "tuned" to resonance @ certain frequency...

This doesn't have anything to do with LC resonance. This is what he means: Based on a given cap and a given inductor, there will be a certain frequency that the whole system will operate at "peak efficiency" meaning that at that frequency, the minimum amount of current is used meaning the minimum amount of electrons. That would be EXACTLY Tesla's definition of resonance. For a given cap and inductor, there will be a frequency that minimum amount of amps is used. To see what the resonant frequency is for a given setup. Monitor amps input. Turn the frequency up and down. Whatever frequency the amps is at minimum going to the cap from the

inductor, that IS your resonant frequency and will be different for everyones setup.

qiman13

Posted: Mon Sep 13, 2004 2:50 pm Post subject: inductor test

I got results that were unexpected. The frequency was not increased after the inductor that I used. The interesting thing was that the voltage remained identical. However, it was negative spikes on the output of the inductor of the same voltage.

qiman13

Posted: Mon Sep 13, 2004 3:19 pm Post subject: schematic #1

[img]<http://hydrogenpower13.tripod.com/schematic1>[/img]

The wire going to the resistor that goes to the base of the transistor is 26 gauge (trigger wire). The other wire is 23 gauge (power wire). Both wires are wrapped together at the same time around an iron core the exact same amount of times. The resistor for example could be 10ohm, transistor 2n3055, diode 1n914. coil can be about 500 turns on a 1/3 inch diameter core that is 1.5-2 inches tall. Make sure the spool ends are large enough so the windings do go past it.

This is NOT the 1:1 coil I mentioned before. It would basically be this coil with a 3rd wire wrapped in reverse also an identical amount of turns and the same wire thickness as the power wire. We'll get to that later.

Place a rotor over the coil core. 4 magnets every 90 degrees and all are facing NORTH outwards. connect as shown to a 12v dc battery.

Before I show the advanced schematics that are identical to Meyers, please tell me what you all think happens when you grab the rotor and give it a very slight turn?

Meyer's circuit is based on electronics that are NOT conventional. Please don't use conventional electronics understanding to explain them because they do NOT apply. Only some of the basic concepts. Meyer's is using voltage potential. Show me one text book that explains about charging a capacitor with voltage potential and no or little electrons.

qiman13

Posted: Mon Sep 13, 2004 3:21 pm Post subject: p.s. on schematic #1

The rotor can be a roller skate wheel with good bearings and magnets taped to the rotor. Probably the easiest way to do it. I'm not asking anyone to build this. Just look at the schematic and figure out what is happening. When I show the other schematic and yet another one, you will see EXACTLY what Meyer's is doing.

johnh

Posted: Mon Sep 13, 2004 7:32 pm Post subject: Re: inductor test

qiman13 wrote:

SNIP

If electrons pile on plates and this makes the difference between the other plate and this is what the voltage is. Please explain this. With X amount of volts and X amount of amps going into the water cell, you're going to get X amount of electrons piling on one side. However, when putting an inductor after the blocking diode, you can get a higher voltage with less amps. The inductor reduces the electrons in the cell but the voltage can be higher? The voltage is not directly tied to electrons on the plates. Doesn't this simple thought experiment show that voltage doesn't have to have anything to do with a certain amount of electrons on a plate that has a certain so-called "charge?"

SNIP

.

I haven't read one conventional textbook that said that a certain amount of electrons was tied to voltage. amount of electrons is defined as a coulomb and coulomb per second as Amp - neither has anything whatsoever to do with voltage.

Voltage is how much pressure the electron is under to move or maybe how active the electron is or how far it is removed from the nucleus of the atom of the substance it is in - all amount to the same thing.

But the fact is in the conventional understanding of electrical theory you can have a high voltage potential with few electrons on a plate or a low potential voltage with a very large number of electrons on a plate.

Regards

JohnH

DORRO

Posted: Mon Sep 13, 2004 11:06 pm Post subject: Secrets of the Water Cell Explained!!!

Hi all also v. new to the forum! 

Monopole motor perhaps???

ROAM** ???

If am right, ope i dunna get kicked off already!! 😊

DORRO

Posted: Mon Sep 13, 2004 11:26 pm Post subject: Secrets of the Water Cell Explained!!!

Wot about harnessing energy from "the vacuum" ??

is this a possible angle??

instead of recharging batteries, generate h2??

if so, would like more info(all ya got)

Gary

Posted: Tue Sep 14, 2004 6:00 am Post subject:

Hi John, voltage is not needed in electrolysis calculations that's why it doesn't crop up much.

Because its the current that determines the amount of gas given off (or substance deposited) it doesn't matter what the voltage is. It just means that for any given system, the higher the voltage the higher the current flow per second, more coulombs - a faster reaction. The current flowing might be dependent on the voltage, but as long as we know how much current flowed, and for how long, voltage is redundant in the equation.

Somewhere above Qiman dismisses voltage as not being of any relevance at all, by comparing a large lead-acid battery to a small dry cell and saying that the lead-acid batter- should have a lot more potential if voltage made any sense.

This is wrong, and Qiman - no disrespect intended, but your science here really is flawed.

Two dissimilar metals in an ionic solution, ie zinc and copper will provide a given voltage irrespective of whether the electrodes have a surface area of 2" or 2ft. It is to do with how electropositive the metals are.

For example, zinc is strongly electropositive (-0.76 volts to be exact), while mercury is far less electropositive at

(+0.80 volts). Connecting a wire between a rod of each placed in an ionic solution (electrolyte) will cause the zinc to happily give away electrons, while the mercury happily collects them - a current flows to try to balance the potential difference.

This goes on until the supply of ions in the electrolyte are all used up.

Add the two electrochemical charges above together and you have a potential difference of 1.56v. What we know as standard zinc/mercury dry cell 1.5 volt battery.

Put 8 of these batteries in series and we get our 12 volt potential difference. Remember a lead-acid battery has 6 cells each providing around two volts, all placed in series.

The bigger the battery the greater the current that can be delivered because more electrode surface is in contact with a larger quantity of electrolyte.

The potential difference between the electrodes is always the same given any (or no) current flow because it is not determined by the amount of charge that can sit on an electrode, but by the electrochemical potential difference of the metals used. There are no charges on the electrodes in a battery until placed in a circuit. If there was, the current would just flow internally until the charges were at equilibrium.

You following me on this, John?

It is simply that a larger capacity battery, such as a car lead-acid has much more electrode area to react with the ions in the solution so enabling higher current flow, and a much greater capacity of ionic solution to draw charge from before it is exhausted.

I'm not a big aether fan Qiman. It seems to be used a lot when other explanations fail. Many people of the time blamed the aether for spreading the plague!

Of course, Qiman you can carry on regardless, but I rather hope that what I've said above starts to make some sense to you!

regards, Gary.

qiman13

Posted: Tue Sep 14, 2004 10:05 am Post subject: voltage source

Hi Gary,

Yes, I understand exactly what you are saying. When you were talking about electrons piling on plates and creating a difference of potential between the plate w/out electrons, it seem like you were claiming that the voltage is from electron charge. I was in no way saying what you think I said comparing a large battery to a small battery...I was only using that as an example to show that the so-called "electron charge" had nothing to do with the voltage. Reading my message, it would be obvious that I fully understand that.

I must insist that it is not ions being used up from electrolytes that kills a battery. It has always been a mystery where the SOURCE CHARGE comes from and it is NOT from the electrolytes. A battery is a dipole and the

dipole breaks the symmetry of the aether. This is an established fact. It is possible that you and/or your sources are correct and that the leading energy physicists in the world are incorrect but they know better. You have to realize that the leading truth will never make it to mainstream for years and years.

Try this. Based on a certain battery, there will be a certain amount of electrolytes. Based on whatever chemicals are used, it will have a certain amount of "ions." Translate this chemical energy to electrical energy. Now run the battery and power a light bulb...a resistive load and not an inductive load. Measure the joules of work you get out of the battery. You will find that they are NOT remotely related. Are you willing to prove this to yourself? I don't see anyone else performing these calculations because they will find that it just "ain't" so. What they will find is that the electrochemical energy in the electrolytes are only enough to separate their own charges, which pull + to one side and - to the other side. If those electrolytes provided the charge to power a bulb, etc... they would NOT be able to hold themselves apart and the battery terminals would come to equilibrium in a VERY SHORT period of time. This is a fact.

Study Myron Evans. He is probably the #1 most advanced physicist today that has solved the grand unifying field theory equations and is at a level many levels above what Einstein was at. No disrespect to Einstein. He only made the foundation and Myron Evans took all his work to a whole new level. This cannot be argued with. <http://www.aias.us/>

Check this website. Just look at the people who edify his work. That speaks for itself and he is indisputably the most advanced physicist hands down. It is not Hawkings or any other "celebrity" physicists. Tesla? He was the #1 in what he did but Edison is the one who got all the praise and is the one that is taught in the textbooks. At least in the US he is. What about Tesla? I just hope in the future, we know who Myron Evans is. He has the equations that link it all together seamlessly.

I'm sorry if you're not a fan of the Aether but it is already a known fact. Dipoles break the symmetry of the Aether. I already sent you a link to the Nobel winners Lee and Yang. It isn't necessary to study them but I just give a reference to how a dipole breaks symmetry. I also gave you a reference to E.T. Whittaker showing the unlimited energy potential in vacuum space. You seem to not comment on those. I hope I am on the right board to share this information. You may not be a fan of it for whatever reason but that doesn't mean it isn't true. Please don't take offense to my rebuttal but I've spent too many years showing working devices that violate everything the books show. For example. Over 100% efficiency.

I don't believe anyone can comment accurately on anything that Meyer was doing because his technology is 100% straight forward Tesla technology. Sending unidirectional longitudinal pulses into water. If Tesla isn't fully understood at least to some basic degrees, it is IMPOSSIBLE to see what Meyer was doing. Get the book SECRETS OF COLD WAR TECHNOLOGY. Chapter one is incredible. It was used as a Rosetta Stone to crack some Gray patents which cracked some of Tesla's patents. Therefore it is credible. If anyone wants to know what Meyer was doing, read this chapter over and over.

Just check over this link. It is a small summary of that book.

<http://www.padrak.com/ine/SOCWT.html>

Focus on the text about radiant electricity.

Meyer was using unidirectional impulses and no reversal of the impulse is allowed. Don't you think that it is a good idea to see it from the INVENTOR of this concept's point of view...Tesla himself?

Meyer was copying Tesla as all the other great devices from different inventors out there are doing and have done.

Read what I wrote again. I obviously know that voltage isn't from the "electron charge." Your message to me seems to say that you are the one who believed that the electrons on one plate made the potential difference and this is where the voltage came from.

Anyway, my science is not flawed. You're using the language of greek to decipher egyptian hieroglyphics. Conventional electrical theory is greek and Meyer was speaking in Egyptian. I speak Egyptian if you get what I mean. Tesla was speaking Egyptian. All the info you quote is from Greek textbooks. Secrets of Cold War Technology is the translation book.

Meyer was using voltage potential. You're telling me for a fact that electrons are piling on plates when getting hit with voltage potential. You said it was a fact. I say that it can't be farther from the truth. You can send spikes that appear to be voltage potential but has a small bit of current (electrons flowing) and charge a cap so in that instance, yes, electrons are piling on the plate.

Now, if it is true voltage potential - clean voltage potential without electrons...I'm talking about true radiant spikes, there are NO ELECTRONS. What has Meyer been telling us all this time? When you pulse a coil for example with a certain v and amp, you get a certain amount of watts. Those watts x seconds are of course joules and joules are work. I don't think we have a disagreement here.

Now this is important. The collapsed spike is high voltage no amps because that work in joules has been converted back into nothing but pure potential. Do you see this? Voltage potential is called potential because it has the potential to do work. If you perform work from potential and this goes to the water, there is nothing for the water to absorb. You have to supply water with POTENTIAL and when the water absorbs this potential radiant energy, it then has absorbed energy that will be able to perform work when ignited, etc...

The true voltage potential is NOT work, meaning it is not joules of energy meaning it has no watts meaning it has no amps meaning it has no electrons meaning that those voltage potential spikes are charging a capacitor WITHOUT ANY electrons piling on the plates and the capacitor WILL charge WITHOUT electrons.

This is EXACTLY what Meyer was saying and is EXACTLY what he was doing. He is putting potential in water. By the very fact it is potential directly implies it is not work but has the capacity to do work. Potential is the capacity to do work. Energy is NOT the capacity to do work. Energy is the act of potential converting to work. If it is not work, then no electrons are piling on any plate of the capacitor. His capacitor IS charging up to a high voltage and no electrons are piling on the plates. Of course based on efficiency, there could be a small amount of electrons that made it through the circuit to the plate or tube but only a small teeny tiny little fraction of what would be there if there was current going to the plates.

Also on the collapse of a field around a coil, an electromagnetic negative pressure zone is created at the top of the coil which electromagnetically attracts/sucks the vacuum energy into the coil and this is diverted to the reverse wound wire that goes to the capacitor or water cell. This is just one example of an extra gain mechanism. That is extra voltage potential (pressure of the aether - nothing to do with electrons) that is added to the circuit that did NOT come from the battery or other input "source."

The high pressure voltage potential (aether) can be slowed down and intercepted by "charge carriers" electrons that are induced to flow, thereby reducing the pressure of the aether (giving it some drag) - reducing voltage and suddenly amps are measurable. This is the conversion of potential back to work.

If energy is the CAPACITY to do work, that implies no work is done only the capacity to do work at some given time. Therefore $E=0$ and NOT $E=MC^2$. By this very fact, the definition of energy in all the books is WRONG because E is NOT 0. If energy is only the capacity to do work, then $E=\text{Potential}$ and we know this is NOT correct. Energy and potential are in fact opposites of course.

Please don't take me the wrong way. I am very open minded but what you are quoting, I've been there and done that and it doesn't apply to Meyer's circuit. I would hope you are open enough to follow up on all the sources that I've already given.

This link will tell you the facts about vacuum energy WITH sources/references included. Tom Bearden does an

incredible job. He does have some quirks, so please don't kill the messenger. Look at what he is saying. Look at the sources he quotes. Maxwell equations...all BS. This is a known fact, etc... so many flaws in conventional electrical theory it is ridiculous.

<http://www.cheniere.org/articles/clean%20electrical.htm>

Anyway, lets just move forward.

qiman13

Posted: Tue Sep 14, 2004 10:08 am Post subject: dipole info

http://www.cheniere.org/techpapers/on_the_principles_of_permissible.htm

http://www.cheniere.org/techpapers/on_extracting_EM%20energy.htm

qiman13

Posted: Tue Sep 14, 2004 10:24 am Post subject: Hi Dorro - unipole

Dorro,

I'm not Roamer but know who he is. He has also duplicated what I'm talking about if you he is who you're referring to.

Anyway, every device is already harnessing vacuum energy. Closed systems harness it in a way that kills the dipole and the systems dies going to equilibrium. An open system harnesses it in a way that the circuit isn't closed so the dipole isn't killed. EVERY overunity system is an open system built OUT of equilibrium.

Meyer's system is an open system...the water cell is the part of his system that is open and is NOT a closed system in equilibrium. The water is open to the vacuum.

Anyway, that schematic...yes it is a unipole "motor" but in reality it is a mechanical oscillator. It is not a motor or a generator. The coil oscillates at high speed producing strong radiant spikes. I don't have a wire wrapped in reverse to capture the radiant spikes into a cap, etc... just a fun toy. I'll show the other ones later. solid state oscillating coils pulsing at ridiculous speeds producing enormous radiant spikes. I'll include schematics.

By spinning the rotor, it will "start the engine" and the rotor will speed up all by itself to maximum speed until it hits RESONANCE. This is a SELF ORDERING mechanism. It is SELF ROTATING. The circuit stays COLD and never generates heat.

qiman13

Posted: Tue Sep 14, 2004 11:50 am Post subject: pics & videos

<http://hydrogenpower13.tripod.com/>

check this out

fannta

Posted: Tue Sep 14, 2004 11:51 am Post subject:

Hi there 8-)

I am realtivly new to this forum but i hav ebeen following your posts and I find them very intresting .

What i have been leraning at highschool has of course been "classical" physics stuff .

I however am pretty open minded and as i meintioned before , i find it very intresting and already have started reading through your links , so guys , please don't stop posting , i gues a lot of other people are also reading these posts !

best whishes to You all !

Gary

Posted: Tue Sep 14, 2004 12:11 pm Post subject:

My apologies Qiman, if I came across a little strong. It's just that the "classical" physics I've grown accustomed too does not exactly fit in with a lot of the theories and ideas yourself - and Meyer - subscribe to.

I'll spend time looking in more detail at your posts and links and try to be a bit more open minded. All very interesting.. and mysterious really. And nothing like a bit of mystery to get the thought processes in gear.

regards, Gary.

qiman13

Posted: Tue Sep 14, 2004 4:43 pm Post subject: more info

Thanks Fannta and Gary!

No prob Gary. I'm really not trying to come off as a "know it all." However, using "voltage potential" really is what I have been doing exclusively with the circuits I'm working with for several years. I would recommend that anyone who wants to know the truth from the perspective of Tesla who invented unidirectional DC pulses (the concept of it and application of it) should read Secrets of Cold War Technology.

I really believe that book will clarify everything that Meyer was doing. It is written in very simple and straightforward terms that anyone can understand. It takes several readings to really get it but it is all right there in the 1st chapter of that book.

It goes into a lot of detail of certain resistive elements Tesla was using to restrict electron flow, etc... It goes into good detail on how he went from ac polyphase motor experimentation to the unidirectional dc impulses and shows the difference and why it is superior. It shows his progression getting higher and higher frequency and higher and higher voltage impulses while all the time he is progressing in getting better and better at restricting electron flow. Everything 100% that Meyer was doing. Same thing as Edwin Gray with his Gray tube converter. Same thing. Same thing as the circuits I'm working with, which in no way am I wanting anyone to believe I invented or innovated. I just happen to have teachers who get results and I've duplicated them to satisfactory levels (mine and his/theirs)

That book will unlock just about every single thing Meyer ever said about his methodology.

You don't know how much it means to me to find open minded people. I really think we can make some progress working together. You all seem to have a lot more hands on experience with the actual water cell technology. I've used the "voltage potential" in other applications so I am really new at applying it to the water cell.

I've had some short clips of Meyer's technology for about 5 years but it never excited me. I thought it was incredible and thought I knew what Meyer was doing. The path I was guided thru was in the battery charging technology. After becoming proficient in getting results and finally coming to an understanding of what the energy really is and where it comes from, everything clicked. It took me little over a year just to be able to understand the dipole and how it breaks the symmetry of the virtual photon energy. I persisited and finally got it and everything finally made sense of how the devices really worked. I got some ok results and used conventional explanations to explain it to myself. From the understanding I thought I had, it kept me from getting even better results. When I finally "got it" with really knowing what Tesla was talking about, my results skyrocketed. About 2 months ago, I rewatched the clips I had on Meyer and I damd near fainted.

"High voltage pulse frequency restricting the amps." Without ever hearing it from his mouth, I knew it was "voltage potential." Ok, now I'm interested in his technology. I knew EXACTLY what he was talking about. Ahhhh, so that is what he was doing. Now it all makes sense. Secrets of Cold War Technology by Gerry Vassilatos unlocked the whole thing for me and many others. Remember, it was used to crack Edwin Gray's patent, which revealed exactly in simple terms what Tesla was doing. I just read chapter one again last week and it just amazes me everytime.

You can get the book on Amazon or anywhere else. This link is an Amazon link
<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/0932813801/yokotahighschool>

Anyway, I posted the schematics to one little fun "roller skate motor" that holds all the keys to this whole deal. I'll post one more after that that shows the actual capturing of the radiant spikes and then after that, I'll show another. This 3rd one will be identical to Meyer's schematic and is doing the same thing with the same type of 555 frequency controller. The difference is the voltage levels and frequencies. Meyer's is using higher voltage output to the cell. That is the main difference.

Then, I'll post a schematic on how to make it solid state...letting the circuit find it's own resonance without a rotor being needed to trigger the transistor. Very exciting! This setup upscaled for the voltage Meyer is working

with can be done. The output can be put to the cell.

Anyway, thank you for your message. If anyone has any questions, I'll be more than happy to share what I have with you but get that book. It will answer just about everything. If not from that above link, find it elsewhere. It holds the answer.

qiman13

Posted: Tue Sep 14, 2004 4:44 pm Post subject: p.s.

I did post some things in Dave's cell area before. I'll concentrate on putting my input here.

DORRO

Posted: Tue Sep 14, 2004 11:27 pm Post subject:

Hi qiman13

Sorry if i offended you in any way with my incorrect guesswork, with your "two cents" remark i felt sure that you were roamer as this is his cathphrase on one of J Bedini's pages.

Any how,

I am very interested in your thoughts, and those of Bedini and roamer, so i would like to learn more about radiant energy.

The problem is I am bound by the constraints of conventional teaching, $v = I * R$ etc., and do not really understand this revolution!

Which brings me quite nicely to my next point:

Again i do not wish to offend but how can Gary suggest that your science is flawed when it has niether been proven or disproved?

Not so long ago it was deamed impossible for man to fly, now we can put men on the moon! maybe we should open our minds a little and do what the human race does best....learn and adapt.

Perhaps with a different view we stand a chance of looking after this planet, after all we are only guests here.

As far as my own experiments go with water as fuel, on J L Naudin's webb site he has made progress with submerged carbon arc (i know strictly speaking this method is cheating as the carbon is consumed during the reaction) but it does produce enough gas to fuel a small ice. Maybe if carbon rods are cheaper than gasoline we can stuff one up the fuel giants in the process!!! l.o.l.

Many thanks for the forum gentlemen

I wasn't sure how a newkid on the block would be received however i need not have worried

thankyou.

Gary

Posted: Wed Sep 15, 2004 3:22 am Post subject:

Qiman, I've had chance to look through some of the material via your links, and realise now that we were thinking on two different levels.

I don't actually think my physics that is flawed in respect to the level I was working on, its just that you are a level or so up... in the realms of quantum physics!

Basically as I understand things, quantum mechanics can pretty well explain everything, but as its so complicated lower levels of physics are kept far simpler by avoiding where possible the complex quantum nature of the universe.

I remember being taught something in school and thinking I knew and fully understood the principle. That was until I went to college where the science was more detailed and I was told, "Well.. no it doesn't really work like that, it actually works like this!" I remember it well because I felt more than a little annoyed at my school physics teacher, feeling that I'd been mislead.

Some interesting reading on your links Qiman.

regards, Gary.

DORRO

Posted: Wed Sep 15, 2004 5:29 am Post subject:

Sorry Gary,

I really must learn to keep my stupid big mouth shut!!

have just read your last post and now feel a bit silly,
mind you i did post my thoughts after a 12H nightshift and 4 cans of stella!!!, not the best time for being objective.

i don't yet grasp quantum theory but i have a nice little book to help me on my way,.....i'd better stick to reading than theorizing!.....
.....and poking my nose in!

Some time ago i read about a fellow called John C. Bedini and his research, a found it both fascinating and difficult to understand,
we really are not taught this kind of electromagnetism at school,
maybe some peolple do not want us to know.

I downloaded everything i could find about this man and his theory,
about 15Gigabytes in all, then one day my hard drive failed and i lost the lot 😡

So now I am trying to start from scratch and i need all the help i can get, after all i am only a maintenance engineer in a curry factory!

From small acorns eh?

One other thing:

fakes and hoaxers do not last long, they soon get bored.
Although he has been quiet for some time, John has been proving traditional science wrong since at least 1984, according to his pages.
This kind of work, standing up in front of the world and saying it's got it wrong, takes dedication and passion, not a quality shared by many cranks.

Hope i didn't waffle too long please bear with me

many thanks

Gary

Posted: Wed Sep 15, 2004 9:44 am Post subject:

No probs Dorro, the main obstacle on forums like this is that we are all often coming from completely different angles depending on our level of education, knowledge and understanding.

It often makes for fiery debates but it does no harm - in fact only good can come from it really.

Getting a grasp of quantum physics is not easy, as like Qiman understands, you have to almost dismiss what you think you already know about the physical universe and start from scratch thinking along completely different lines.

regards, Gary.

qiman13

Hi Dorro, I'm not offended. You pegged it perfectly where the schematic came from.

The bingo fuel cell you're talking about from Naudin's page I guess is a legitimate overunity hydrogen device. However, it seems to be more novelty than anything. The carbon probably gets burned up pretty quick and there would be problems with constantly regapping the gap, etc... However, it does work. Of course, the Meyer method is practical.

Gary, the "conventional" electrical engineering explanations do quite well when working with devices that are "closed systems," which every electrical device commercially made in the world is designed as a closed system. I mentioned before that the water in Meyer's cell is what is open and not closed. When putting impulses into water, there is no current therefore the loop is not closed. No current is put to one side and taken to the other so the loop can't be closed. If it was electrolysis and there is a current...that current would close the loop because it would connect one side to the other. Conventional understanding applies to electrolysis, but not on open systems.

I would say that it is definitely unnecessary to understand quantum physics to understand the water cell. The most simple way to understand it is to really see the connection between everything by way of the Aether, which would be in the realm of the quantum I suppose. Secrets of Cold War Technology explains it perfectly.

Here is a summary of the unified field: (with my interpretation and much of this is not written but quite a bit is in Secrets of Cold War Technology) The TIME explanations down below are mine I admit and I can't prove it but it seems like common sense based on what we do know. Einstein laid the foundation of course.

As described before what the Aether is and it's relationship to a dipole. That is how the battery taps the Aether attracts it and diverts it over the wires to power things. So this is the vacuum energy to electricity connection.

That aether flowing over wires around an electromagnetic coil would of course create a magnetic field. That is a connection between the vacuum energy, dipole, "electricity" and electromagnetism.

Every atom acts as a dipole in a way and every electron sustains movement from the aether as a battery taps it.

When standing on planet Earth, there is no gravitational pull. There is only a gravitational push and we are pushed to the ground. The aether flows like a gas under pressure. Earth is a mass in 3dspace/time. The aether is displaced by a certain volume you could say. The aether tries to push back to the area that it was displaced from. If you have a balloon and push your finger into it, the finger would be the Earth. The balloon tries to push back to the space that your finger is occupying. The Aether is pushing back towards the center of the Earth. An extra effect is that the spinning sphere actively attracts it even more and a spinning magnetic field even more. As it goes to the center of the Earth, it becomes dense I guess you could say and bonds together to create electrons, etc... and the electrons rise to the surface of the Earth and this is why there is an abundance of electrons on the surface of the Earth. This is where it comes from. From all the density of the Aether, etc... a lot of heat is created and this is the source of geothermal heating.

Why we are pushed to the ground is because we are made of certain mass. Certain elements have different "atomic matrixes"...the atoms have electrons with "fields" that resist or attract the aether. The "spacing" of the atoms are different. If we put a block of lead on the ground, it is tightly packed so the aether can't flow thru very well and this is why it appears to be more "heavy." If we have a block of wood, the atomic structure is not as packed and the aether can flow through easier towards the center with less resistance and the wood appears "lighter." If we take a net and have spacing so tight that it is nearly solid, this would be like lead. Swoosh that net through the water back and forth and there is a lot of resistance. Take a net that has large spacing and swoosh it the same way and there is less resistance.

As you are standing still there is no inertia. As you increase speed, there is an "apparent" densening of the aether relevant to you and you would feel this resistance. This is what inertia is. It can only go through at a certain rate.

Gravity is basically inertia. Standing still on a big mass like the Earth, the aether is moving to where it was displaced from so it is the same thing as if we were moving against the aether. But we don't have to move. In outer space away from a mass, being fairly motionless, the aether is in an ambient state I suppose you could say and there is no gravity or inertia.

I guess gravity could be defined as a mass resisiting aether as the aether is moving through the mass towards a certain direction. Inertia could be defined as a mass resisting the aether as the mass is moving through the aether towards a certain direction. These are my definitions.

Now, as we are fairly still or slow moving, time clicks fast. As we speed up to high speeds and the aether is getting reletiviely very dense, time slows down. Slow down and the less dense aether area..time speeds up.

non-"dense" aether, from its own movement or our movement against the aether, time can "unravel" very fast.

dense aether from it's own movement or our movement against the aether, time "unravels" very slow because there is more resistance that the POTENTIAL has to work against to convert to work. Joules in my opinion is a measurement of decompressed time energy.

The speed of conscious awareness is the exact same speed as the speed of light. The speed of light is dependent on the density of the aether. Time will always appear to be moving at a "normal" speed if we are moving fast or slow, but relevant to each other, they are of course different. It will appear to be normal no matter what speed we are going to our own conscious awareness because if we are standing still and the aether is not as dense, the potential energy doesn't have much resistance and therefore time clicks fast and light can move more freely. Based on the speed light is going when it is going fast, we are consiously aware at the same rate and the clock ticks and it seems to be moving at normal speed.

Light doesn't have a constant speed. The speed of light that is always quoted is in reality a AVERAGE based on the measured speeds. There is no such thing as a constant speed of light. When I refer to light speeding up or slowing down, we would know no difference because we are subject to our own conscious awareness of it and it always seems to be at "light speed."

If we move really fast, aether is more dense relevant to our movement, there is more resistance to work against and potential has more resistance to work against to become work and time clicks slower and the light slows down in this dense aether, therefore, our conscious awareness is only as fast as the speed of light, therefore, the clock appears to be ticking at normal speed of course. An of course the light would always appear to be moving at the "speed of light."

Now, if we take a "ship" and if we divert the aether from the front of the ship around the ship sort of like a faraday cage, the aether cannot go through the ship and therefore we can travel at light speed or infinite speeds with zero inertia and go to far galaxies and come back and our family and friends are still alive. If we have no inertia, then time clicks the same as if we are standing still.

The other way would be to act as a valve where the aether is drawn into the center of the ship and channeled through it and out the back. There would be a negative pressure zone around the front of the ship since it is pulled in faster in the front center than around it, there would be no inertia possible in any area of the ship around this valve.

The big bang theory should be called the big bang hoax in my opinion. Anyway, as our universe is

expanding...at the farther edges it seems to be accelerating violating entropy. As it expands, the aether throughout the universe is becoming less and less dense. Therefore time is speeding up. We are consciously aware of it because we are subject to it. Our unconsciouness is not subject to it. We can feel that time seems to be speeding up. Anyway, it will get to a point that the acceleration of time is exponential until time ticks infinitely fast and at that point, everything will convert to pure potential energy. This is my opinion of what happens to the universe.

Hope this doesn't open a can of worms for anyone. 😊

qiman13

Posted: Wed Sep 15, 2004 1:21 pm Post subject: p.s.

I believe the truth is simple and beautiful. No need for complicated mathematics to see it or deep understanding of quantum mechanics, etc... Just try to see, feel and understand the concepts conceptually. Get an intuitive feel of how it works together.

I'm not claiming that my explanations of TIME are correct but to me, it is the only thing that makes sense and seems to be common sense based on known variables.

Take care!

Gary

Posted: Wed Sep 15, 2004 2:00 pm Post subject:

OK Qiman, just to get a bit more on the practical side here, and my problems with old Stan. I've got the complete works - thanks to Murray - and within the first few pages Stan quotes the dielectric constant of water to be around 78. Great, I agree, but this is pure refined water and very hard to achieve in reality. Tap water has nothing like this figure. But stan insists he is going to make his water capacitor with just plain old water. So you see straight away I'm at odds with this fellow. And there are other serious errors in his writings that further dents any confidence in what he is saying, to a point in fact where I dismissed his science as pure fantasy.

However, if we assume that Stan did get his wfc to work as he stated, but simply formed his own hypothesis on how it worked because he lacked the full understanding behind the science, then where do we go from here.

I am still fascinated to know how we are going to pump charge the plates without electron flow. How exactly do we produce this pure voltage potential and induce it onto the wfc plates without any current flowing through the water - or the cct? Stan seems to think that we can charge the plates to a high potential with minimum or no charge carrier movement, and without this charge simply conducting through the water - how does/can the cct do this??

regards, Gary.

qiman13

Posted: Wed Sep 15, 2004 4:43 pm Post subject: reference to Stan

From my experience with the circuits I've experimented with, I don't find it hard to believe Stan's claims. Of course I can't say 100% he did do it. For all I know, he had a big power supply hidden that pumped a lot of current to his cell making it look really impressive. I don't think that was the case. I've communicated with several people briefly that knew him personally and witnessed it and/or worked with him. I don't know if they are telling the truth. There is someone that I do trust that tells me it really worked. That is the only source that I can put my faith in. Still, I don't know personally.

I would focus on things we do know. We know for sure 100% positive that the inductors do reduce the amount of current flow regardless of it changing the frequency and/or voltage. Even if after the inductor the frequency and voltage is unchanged, it does reduce electron flow since it restricts current but still lets the voltage potential come through. Current still flows through but less than what is available at the front end.

Inductor definitely further restricts current that can come through the negative electrode to ground so it makes sense to have an inductor (variable for fine tuning) on that end as well. Tesla used things such as carbon resistors to do the exact same thing, etc...

In Edwin Gray's conversion tube, the top electrode (low potential) had a carbon resistor to keep current from flowing to that side only letting voltage impulses slam into it. These examples show us that the principle is sound. This tube is designed for a regular high voltage capacitor discharge to physically explode the voltage potential away from the electrons. Not the same thing as Meyer but it definitely had a resistor on the low potential side.

So, inductor before the cell and after the cell is definitely helpful.

Another thing to restrict electron flow is the frequency itself.

For example, if a coil is pulsed at a certain frequency there is a certain impedance. If the frequency gets high enough, the impedance is so great that no electron flow can happen but the voltage potential is still available at the output. I don't know if I've seen too many references to the connection between high frequency through an inductor the limiting of electron flow but permitting voltage potential to get across in reference to Stan's work. I only printed the first 2 "chapters" so far.

Instead of focusing on 100% inhibiting electron flow, maybe we should focus on limiting it as much as possible and if we happen to get no amps detectable, then yahoo!

I believe the Holy Grail (or at least close) of the water fuel technologies would be to have the output of a Gray Tube going to the water cell. That would be guaranteed to be nothing but 100% pure radiant blast to the water. Not only that, the amount of potential exiting the tube dwarfs anything Meyer has ever done by a longshot. That is a totally different project. At least the Gray Tube has been duplicated with results.

Anyway, have you or anyone else monitored amps going to the cell while playing with frequency? Increasing the frequency should reduce the amps as well and not just the fact of having an inductor. Inductor + higher frequency = even more electrons restricted.

I guess the inductor is to invoke the Lenz effect or Lenz law intentionally and using it in our favor. As the

frequency increases, the applied field and the collapsed field is happening off and on quicker and quicker. Eventually, the applied field is applied before the collapsed field can totally collapse and the collapsing fields aren't totally collapsed before the next applied field is applied (at a high enough frequency). Eventually, they meet in the middle somewhere at a high enough frequency and they butt heads so there is no current movement and no electron flow. No matter what the impedance, the voltage potential is still available on the output to the cell.

Anyone's thoughts on this?

qiman13

Posted: Wed Sep 15, 2004 4:51 pm Post subject: inductor heating

p.s. If the frequency is too high and there is too much current going to the inductor, the inductor will get super hot. To prevent this, as little amps as possible have to be pulsed to the inductor. That is what Stan is trying to do with the VIC. Not only just getting high voltage, but by doing so, the voltage spikes are high but the time of each spike is very small, therefore, very little amps. So, getting high voltage spikes with low amps going through the inductor is ideal. That way, the inductor won't be heating up. Maybe a little bit but with those spikes, it shouldn't very much. In addition to having those low amp spikes hitting the inductor with high frequency, the high frequency furthermore restricts electron flow.

emmett

Posted: Wed Sep 15, 2004 5:02 pm Post subject: re: secrets of the water car explained

Hi, I've been into several Bedini motors and extensive Boyce hydrogen experimentation and am very interested in what you're doing. How do I find and look at the schematics you're talking about?

DORRO

Posted: Wed Sep 15, 2004 11:28 pm Post subject:

Hello all,

Yes qiman13 in the bingo fuel cell the carbon is combined with some of the oxygen creating CO..BAH!, and some is burned away and lost.....double BAH!!!! 😊

I have been working on a current measuring circuit and stepper motors to index the carbon rods towards each

other as the current decreases...next phase will be an automatic cassette style rod feeder.

I know this forum is about water cars and electrolyzers but would anyone mind if I asked qiman13 a question about magnetic motors?

Would you mind qiman13?

After all it does not matter whether the electrolyser is powered by the alternator, or a bank of RECHARGED BATTERIES does it?

I have my own theory behind Bedini's schoolgirl motor, and i would like to run it past you qiman13 but I do not wish to dilute this thread further without the permission of other users.

Would anyone mind???? 😊

Having read and re-read John bedini's pages I am satisfied that his machines work however controversial, otherwise he would have quit a long time ago, it is up to the rest of us to play catch up with him. I read he had been frustrated by silly questions and sceptics that has now stopped him from helping others. This is such a shame although I do not blame him. The problem is, In order to teach others one has to accept that not everyone has such a good understanding, I mean there are no schools for such theories so where would be a good place to start for willing but somewhat stupid student?

Kind regards,

Dorro

Ps Gary,

If someone does get Stanley Meyer's cell to power an ice then why not reclaim some of the h2o from the exhaust and along with water from an on board tank and distil it with a stove wrapped around the exhaust manifold???.....just an idea.

Gary

Posted: Thu Sep 16, 2004 7:22 am Post subject:

Could do Dorro, but its far easier just to carry water on board - its not like there is any shortage of the stuff. At this point I wouldn't bother with the extra complications.

The important thing is to get a bloody wfc working over Faraday first, as Dave seems to have done on his thread. And then develop it into a viable and practical unit.

I'm in the process now of buying some test and measurement gear in order to set up a proper test facility. Equipment includes: Oscilloscope, digital frequency counter, function generator, and quality PSU. I already have multimeters, but with this new equipment I can actually see my various pulsed waveforms and monitor results in quite some detail.

regards, Gary.

DORRO

Posted: Thu Sep 16, 2004 9:30 am Post subject:

Hi Gary,

yep, lets walk b4 we run eh?

trouble is, you can easily get carried away with yourself.

I don't know if it will help, but if you need to make prototype pcb's, i find that a laser printer image on photo paper(clay coated) works very well, when ironed on to the copper at a low heat setting and for at least 2 minutes.

you have clean the copper first with wire wool and soak afterwards to remove the paper. i have had some quite accurate circuits using this method, it's quick and easy.

Using this method I made a simple variable freq. p.w.m. supply for a friend, using ss plates in a wfc. still awaiting results though

sos i dunna have anything more constructive to add.

cheers

dorro

DORRO

Posted: Thu Sep 16, 2004 11:15 am Post subject:

Hi all,

Yeah I know, back again like a bad penny!

This form stuff is kinda new and it's a bit like a new girlfriend, at first you can't keep away but after a while the novelty will wear off and I'll have something interesting to post.

In the meantime, got a problem with link <http://hydrogenpower13.tripod.com/> just get error not found. Same w
[img]http://hydrogenpower13.tripod.com/schematic1[/img]

Think I know what the schematic is though, but would like to be sure.

Any other way of me getting my grubby little paws on it??

Just a thought qiman13.....your user name.....is it Qi man13 as in QI the life energy???

Us westerners don't understand but the Chinese have had it dotted sine 1300 bc.

Just a thought

Cheers,
dorroagain.....and again.....and again.....l.o.l.

qiman13

Posted: Thu Sep 16, 2004 2:11 pm Post subject: suppression

This is the message I get when going to the Tripod site. I had only about 4 pics and 2 video clips. No porn or anything. I think there are some eyes in this site that are trying to nip real progress in the bud. Violated Tripod's terms my ass!

Think about it, if I chose to self-delete then I wouldn't get that message because I could go back into that directory and reload everything. It would just be a fucking empty directory!

Please Note: You are no longer an authorized member of Tripod. You have been removed because your web site violated our Terms of Service or you chose to self-delete. For more information, click here.

Anyway Dorro, good luck on your mechanical method of keeping the rods in the bingo cell spaced correctly. Seems a little complex but if it works, then it works. That is more than most people get.

I agree with Gary. Get it over Faraday.

One interesting thing to note in Yull Brown's patents is that the more cells (+ & - plate combos) you have, the less current is necessary. Check it out.

Dorro, it doesn't matter if an "electrolyzer" is powered by an alternator, battery bank, gerbals in a wheel, solar cell, etc... Just as long as the output gets into a form that is pulsed correctly to get high enough voltage spikes and each spike of course should be as quick as possible to prevent amps. Then take those spikes and put them into a primary so the secondary on that second "transformer" to get even more pure potential, then send it to the water. The second transformer or (vic) is only to get more clean radiant spikes free of electrons.

Don't consider yourself a stupid student. If anyone of us are really that smart, we would have a working Meyer's device. We're all smart enough to try but still ignorant of how we can manifest a working device.

There is no school for this, but the best #1 text book to give a good primer that explains PERFECTLY the concept of what Meyer is doing is in Secrets of Cold War Technology. I can't state that enough. Are you willing to get that book and study the 1st chapter? That is the beginning.

The inductor limits current. Any thoughts on the fact that higher frequency creates impedance that further

restricts electron flow? Everyone seems to think the frequency has (only) to do with just getting some magical frequency that makes water do its thing.

Dorro, why don't you see if Roamer will post his schematic here? I know of him but don't know him.

qiman13

Posted: Thu Sep 16, 2004 2:18 pm Post subject: Meyer's videos

Has anyone been able to upload his Video's online? If so, I'll bypass the 2nd schematic, 3rd, etc... I'll get to the point and post that schematic. Deal?

If anyone has it in avi mpeg or whatever, I could get it from you on Kazaa or something or just put them in a file here.

Gary

Posted: Sat Sep 18, 2004 12:56 am Post subject:

Hi Qiman, just a quick note about the dirty brown scum accumulating in my hydrolyser, and me blaming my tap water.

Seems you were right, that's not the problem. Even though I have used ss for everything submerged I still get it.

However, I recently acquired some neodymium rare earth magnets to experiment with and guess what... although they show no attraction at all to my ss plates, they are attracted to my submerged ss nuts & bolts. I guess the quality of the nut & bolt ss is not up to much, containing too much ferric material.

Problem sorted!

regards, Gary.

LaserLine

Posted: Sat Sep 18, 2004 2:06 am Post subject:

Gary wrote:

Hi Qiman, just a quick note about the dirty brown scum accumulating in my hydrolyser, and me blaming my tap water.

Seems you were right, that's not the problem. Even though I have used ss for everything submerged I still get it.

However, I recently acquired some neodymium rare earth magnets to experiment with and guess what... although they show no attraction at all to my ss plates, they are attracted to my submerged ss nuts & bolts. I guess the quality of the nut & bolt ss is not up to much, containing too much ferric material.

Problem sorted!

Great to see you found it Gary and how. Good to keep in mind for others building their electrolyzer.

Gary

Posted: Tue Sep 21, 2004 12:48 pm Post subject:

Interesting reading some research about the implosion of combusting stoimetric proportions of Hydrogen and Oxygen - as produced by normal electrolysis.

Basically I think we can pretty well dismiss the implosion of the combusted gases as non-relevant in terms of our ICE. It seems that experiments to show that combusting the two gases produced water and so created a vacuum only happens - and of course thinking it through logically it makes perfect sense - on a cold cylinder. The two gases combust producing the one gas, water vapour, which then condenses on the cold cylinder walls, so creating a vacuum, plus a few drops of water. But this only happens on the 1st ignition - thereafter there is enough heat within the cylinder to prevent condensation.

I was also reading about a man called Hare, who invented a hydrogen welding torch in the early 1800's. So how this arrogant arsehole 'Brown' had the outright nerve to put his name to the mixture of hydrogen and oxygen, claiming it to be a new discovery and call it "Brown's gas" is beyond me!

I must say that when I first heard of "Brown's gas" I assumed it was something special - its not even one gas as such! Just regular H₂ and O₂ mixed together in their stoimetric proportions to form water upon combustion.

Just airing my thoughts.

regards, Gary.

Attos

Posted: Tue Sep 21, 2004 3:26 pm Post subject: New and impressed

Qiman, Gary, and Dorro,

I want to say that I am kinda new on all this -as perhaps everybody is at some point in time- but I also want to let you know that I have been following pretty closely all that has been said on this very forum and I am very impressed with the various concepts disclosed here -specially yours, Qiman. I really hope this thread continues for I have learnt more on this spot than what I have learnt in many years by looking around and asking here and there.

I have been playing with some experimentation on my own for some time already. At this point, however, I have a question I would like to share. Does anyone of you know what the outcome of the cell would be if the entire sinoidal wave is input into it? This instead of just half of it.

Gary

Posted: Tue Sep 21, 2004 10:43 pm Post subject:

Attos, in normal electrolysis, the ions in the water must reach the electrodes to give up or take on electron charges. If the current was alternating, as in a sinusoidal signal, then the electrodes would be continuously changing polarity.

This means the ions would be trying to move back and forth within the electrolyte, but with not many actually getting to an electrode to gain/lose a charge. At high frequencies the ions would remain fairly static.

Hope that helps.

regards, Gary.

fannta

Posted: Wed Sep 22, 2004 12:09 am Post subject:

@Gary ,

In theory that should not be a problem .

The H₂ / O₂ (gas) would move up to the surface and the next water molecule would get in contact with the electrode , so there is no need for the ions to travel from one electrode to the other .

Changing the polarity of the electrodes at a high enough rate , H₂ and O₂ would be set free at all electrodes right away .

Of course the recombination of the two gases should be inhibited .

johnh

Posted: Wed Sep 22, 2004 1:28 am Post subject:

fannta wrote:

@Gary ,

In theory that should not be a problem .

The H₂ / O₂ (gas) would move up to the surface and the next water molecule would get in contact with the electrode , so there is no need for the ions to travel from one electrode to the other .

Changing the polarity of the electrodes at a high enough rate , H₂ and O₂ would be set free at all electrodes right away .

Of course the recombination of the two gases should be inhibited .

I thought that too Fannta however I had to admit I was mistaken

See my red face posts last month on OUpower . the problem is I think inhibiting the recombination - It seems to me the recombination happens before enough gas has been generated to form bubbles even. In other words AC 50 Hz (voltage to suit the cell) does not make any gas in my electrolyser - The current is consumed and the cell heats up at around the right rate for resistance heating

Further reading makes me believe this will be true up to mHz above this there may be other effects. At very low frequencies one or two Hz There will be standard DC gas production as there is time for the molecules to form clusters (bubbles).

With DC I have tried half wave with one or two diodes and full wave with a bridge rectifier with and without a smoothing capacitor and it does not seem to affect the gas production much (I would not say there is no effect but the difference is a few % and not orders of magnitude.) With standard electrolysis Faraday probably knew what he was talking about 😊

Regards

JohnH

Gary

Posted: Wed Sep 22, 2004 7:35 am Post subject:

You've got to consider here too, that the water is effectively only the ion carrier. Basically only the impurities in the water are allowing the process of electrolysis in the 1st place - remember that pure water is an extremely good insulator with stand-off voltages of, I think, Kvolts per cm!

On a slightly different note. Today I acquired at 20MHz dual scope, 5MHz function generator, 5Mhz pulse generator, 10MHz frequency counter and a digital stabilised psu.

Just need to make some space now, in order to set up some fairly detailed experiments. Looks like my old 10ft x 10ft gardening shed is in for a clear out!

Will keep you posted on experiments and results.

regards, Gary.

qiman13

Posted: Wed Sep 22, 2004 10:35 am Post subject: Brown's gas

Hi All,

I believe Meyer's gas was Brown's gas. I believe Meyer just happened to have the most efficient way of producing it.

William Rhodes was the first to get a patent on a fuel from water device that did not separate O & H into separate compartments like the Brown's gas. However, his gas was just O & H separated and kept together in one area. I believe the properties do NOT do the same as Brown's gas. This Rhodes character obviously is very conventional thinking and is really pissed that Brown tries to take credit. I don't blame him for thinking that but they are not making the same gas, so Brown deserves the credit. Not Rhodes and not somebody in the 1800's that was using a mixture of H & O. Brown's gas is not a mixture.

<http://www.keelynet.com/energy/oxyhyd1.htm>

Occult Ether Physics is an interesting book. I don't think the author really knows what he is talking about but he is in the right direction. Anyway, the back of the book talks about energy from hydrogen and an old atomic hydrogen welder. Just fyi...wouldn't really recommend the book, but that is one reference to the really old h welder.

Brown on the other hand, his gas is of course kept together in the same area. The kicker is that Brown's gas is NOT separated O & H that are kept together in the proper ratio and then burned. That is NOT what is happening. It is a different water molecule that is fully intact. Instead of the Mickey Mouse shaped HOH molecule, it is HHO. Still a water molecule but of an enormous energy potential. When it is "burned" it releases its energy and collapses back to a visible water molecule. Still HHO but not "swollen" from the potential. It takes on the form of a vapor when made but is still two hydrogen atoms and one oxygen atom COMBINED.

My thoughts on why it is rearranged is:

When the VOLTAGE POTENTIAL goes from the + to - electrode in an IMPULSE, this is what is happening. The oxygen is jerked towards the + electrode and the hydrogen is jerked towards the negative electrode. Electrons are freed up from the covalent bonding. Some of the electrons are jerked towards the + electrode and some of the electrons are following the + charged hydrogen. Some of the hydrogen will become negatively charged by having a total of 2 electrons. As soon as this happens, it will attract a + charged Hydrogen in its vicinity. Now you have 2 hydrogen atoms attached, when the pulse is off, which prevents anything from really reaching the plates in the first place since the off/on is so fast, some electrons and the oxygen are jerked towards the middle, the hydrogen and electrons that followed the hydrogen are also jerked towards the middle as well as the double hydrogen. The double hydrogen, one is - and one is +. Much of the + hydrogen will attach to an oxygen. That is what makes the HHO.

Now, this rearranged water molecule is "created" in the middle between both plates and not at the plates. That HHO is what is going out the top of the cell to be "burned."

George Weisman at www.eagle-research.com has an idea of an "expanded" water molecule but he is not the first to come up with this explanation of what Brown's gas really is. He thinks he is, but that is ok, he is doing incredible work. Either way, he made a clear cell so he could see the "electrolysis" in the Brown's gas maker. He noticed that exactly in the middle between the plates was a wall of bubbles that were so dense, it looks like

another plate. That is the brown's gas. My explanation above explains what is most likely happening. Read all his info carefully on Brown's gas. My vote is for Yull Brown. He had a unique gas. Rhodes did not. Rhodes may have had the first patent for a non-separated H & O mixture, but Brown's gas is NOT separated O&H that is in a proper ratio.

Forget about all the stoichiometry non-sense.

Gary

Posted: Wed Sep 22, 2004 12:58 pm Post subject:

Ah! Stoichiometric - knew I hadn't spelt that right!

Where did you read about "Brown's Gas" being a rearranged molecule Q? Can't say I've seen any reference to that before.

Not sure about this though - but then you know what a "Doubting Thomas" I am!

Firstly, I've always wondered how the "Mickey Mouse" water molecule was determined and why it would maintain that alignment with the electrons buzzing around like flies! However your HHO molecule surely can't exist like this as the valencies are no longer fulfilled. The oxygen molecule for a start is now effectively an electron short and so unstable.

If as you say the gas is like water vapour with different properties, one being that it will not condense immediately back to liquid, this should be easy enough to test.

The first thing that is apparent is that we should have only one third of the overall gas produced by normal electrolysis due to Faraday's law. Instead of $2 \times \text{H}_2$ and O_2 we have just one molecule of HHO!

I'm very skeptical about this Q, as I've never seen any figures for gas production or heard mention of HHO. I thought it was supposed to be varying proportions of parahydrogen and orthohydrogen that created by the pulsing?

regards, Gary.

qiman13

Posted: Wed Sep 22, 2004 2:49 pm Post subject: good question

I don't know if I spelled it right myself??

The below sites all refer to the same thing. I don't know where they get their info from.

How does anything hold its form, piece of lead or wood or our eyeball when the electrons are in constant

movement? I think it is a matter more of consciousness and our intent to observe it. our awareness collapses anything probable into being. it is already a known fact 100% that the movement of electrons depend on the intent of the observer. 1 million observers can "expect" for it to be here, there, wherever in a chamber experiment and they will all be 100% right, it will be where they expect proving 100% beyond a shadow of a doubt that our mind can influence energy at a distance.

I think this place might be related to Dennis Lee the scammer.

http://secure.northrim.net/e3/kuest/catalog/item_number/100030

Brown's Gas is a revolutionary new technology in which water can be "burned" as a fuel. Through a patented process, water is safely separated into hydrogen and oxygen gases, and then molecularly rearranged to create a new, "stoichiometric" mixture, called Brown's Gas. It is now HHO, rather than HOH, the usual molecular structure of water.

<http://www.browns gas.com/>

<http://www.rangeguide.net/prodinfo.htm>

This site says HHO goes back to HOH when burned. When burned and the browns gas turns back to visible water...which we do know does happen. that means its memory has been reset and it should be quite vibrant and that is probably why it makes plants grow better, etc...unless a collapsed hho is visible water then that may be why it has different properties than water.

<http://www.energyoptions.com/tech/browns.html>

Do away with heavy and dangerous oxy-acetylene tanks, as well as the expense of them. The physical properties of Brown's Gas make it a very safe mixture. It is the only material known that implodes, rather than explodes! The machine makes gas by using a relatively small amount of electric current and a spark ignites a flame as the HHO (gas) goes back into HOH (water).

So what if one hydrogen had 2 electrons and the one next to it had 3, the one with 3 would be + and would attract the O?

Things seem to do funny things when exposed to VOLTAGE POTENTIAL, which is a time reversed energy.

Example: cold fusion, in negative time, like attracts and opposites repel. the strong force holding the nucleus together is bound tight in forward time, when being exposed to negative time (very short bursts only are necessary), which is VOLTAGE POTENTIAL, the bond reverses. 2 up quarks and 1 down quark per proton and 2 down quarks and 1 up quark per neutron (or the other way around). when they pull apart from the negative time, if one of the down quarks in a neutron flip and the negative time (time reversal zone) decays, the strong force pulls them back together and if only 1 downquark in a neutron flips, it becomes a proton and bumps it up 1 element in the table. of course it is not predictable like this and the quark flipping is a "random" event. It does happen from the time reversal zones.

If the hydrogen atoms retain enough VOLTAGE POTENTIAL, which is time reversed, they could remain attracted with the same number electrons. when that voltage potential is used, it collapses back to normal. this would be more probable if it has nothing to do with the amount of electrons different H atoms have.

it sounds weird, but it is a fact that time reverses in very small areas..atomic scale...I'm not implying that our whole universe is going to be pumped backwards ruling out time travel into our past, which of course is a possibility but I don't see how at this point.

your thoughts?

Gary

Posted: Wed Sep 22, 2004 4:29 pm Post subject:

Back with the Quantum Physics again eh, Q! Quantum physics seems to make anything possible, and I suppose nothing should be discounted, but frankly I don't think that we are providing anywhere near enough energy from an electrolyser to reform the water molecule and maintain it in a new shape!

Though the arrangement of atoms within molecules can provide one compound with very different properties to another which has the exact same elemental make-up, but just differently arranged, water being of only 2 elements does not have this luxury.

A proton is composed of 2 up quarks and 1 down, but can have no real bearing on what we are doing. If a neutron was converted to a proton by changing an up to a down, it would need to react with either a positron or an electron neutrino - we are talking energy levels in excess of 1MeV!

These kind of energy levels are only achievable by design, within massive particle accelerators... certainly not a 120W electrolyser!

I favour looking for other explanations... at present anyhow.

regards, Gary.

qiman13

Posted: Thu Sep 23, 2004 9:09 am Post subject: energy requirements

Hi Gary,

Time energy (voltage potential) has totally different properties than forward moving current energy (joules).

I think the neutron would have to have a down changed to an up instead of an up to a down to change to a proton.

It isn't true that particle accelerators are the only thing that meet the energy requirements for these changes. They are a waste of time, money and energy. A particle accelerator is like using a tidal wave to wash your face. Totally useless.

Look at cold fusion. It is a fact and not theory that it works. It has been duplicated HUNDREDS of times around the world at "credible" universities as well as private labs. It can be done very cheap and with relatively very low power. All of this can be done on a desk in your workshop and a power source that plugs into your wall. It is a known fact that a transmutation of elements happens and therefore, quark flipping is occurring at these low power levels. The (time reversal zones) do pull apart the strong force enough for the quarks to flip and the trv decays and the strong force pulls it back together and a neutron has changed to a proton.

Again, using time energy (time energy conserved within the voltage potential) is not comparable to energy requirements you quote that are measurable in joules. Voltage potential is not measurable in joules since no amperage is available. realistically, there may be a very small amount of amperage since our technological limits keep us from pulsing something with zero time. It can be in fractions of a nanosecond but not much quicker. ideally, there would no time per pulse.

For time energy, it doesn't happen this orderly probably but for example. each time you half the time of a pulse, the voltage doubles. (just for example). you can keep halving the time and doubling the voltage. theoretically, there are an infinite number of halves that the time can be reduced by going towards zero time and an infinite number of doubling of voltages towards infinite voltage potential. getting to zero time in a pulse has a theoretical infinite voltage potential. all the time energy is conserved within the voltage potential itself. the less time, the more voltage potential, the more time the less voltage potential. If a pulse had an infinite pulse width, the voltage would be zero.

example, speeding up towards the speed of light, energy increases towards infinity according to $E=mc^2$. speeding up (faster pulse), there is less time ticking because all that time energy is being absorbed by the mass (absorbing voltage potential - pressure of the aether or a relative resistance to it based on speed of a mass through it, this is inertia...inertia is the conversion of time energy directly to mass) and the mass takes on that time energy. this is a direct conversion of time to mass (matter). E really equals absorbed time energy.

it is a totally different energy from voltage X amps = watts X seconds = joules x duty cycle = joules (adjusted for duty cycle). This is the energy you refer to as being necessary to pull apart the strong force.

Using voltage potential or time energy is not comparable. time energy dwarfs "wasted energy" and wasted energy is what joules are a measurement of.

Freedomfuel

Posted: Fri Oct 01, 2004 12:31 pm Post subject: Re: voltage source

[quote="qiman13"]Hi Gary,

I must insist that it is not ions being used up from electrolytes that kills a battery. It has always been a mystery where the SOURCE CHARGE comes from and it is NOT from the electrolytes. A battery is a dipole and the dipole breaks the symmetry of the aether. This is an established fact. It is possible that you and/or your sources are correct and that the leading energy physicists in the world are incorrect but they know better. You have to realize that the leading truth will never make it to mainstream for years and years.

[quote]

It looks like someone has been reading Tom Bearden. Now we getting somewhere! This very interesting thread will need to be studied carefully before I make my contribuion

qiman13

Posted: Fri Oct 01, 2004 4:14 pm Post subject: Hi Freedom Fuel

Glad you know Bearden. The Father of Scalar Electromagnetics deserves a lot of credit because he really nailed the source charge problem.

So, it's probably very obvious to you that Meyer was pulsing longitudinal impulses into the water keeping it an open circuit verses current, which would close the circuit. This is definitely the method behind the whole deal.

Would love to hear your take on this thing.

qiman13

Posted: Sat Oct 02, 2004 12:16 pm Post subject: more out than in

I think I stated it before, but not sure. Meyers cell is an open circuit and not a closed one.

This is essential to understand. Any system that is open with its environment can freely output more energy than the operator inputs. Any system that is closed to its environment will dissipate all its energy until it comes into equilibrium with its environment.

The laws of thermodynamics do not apply to Meyer's cell. However, the laws of non-equilibrium thermodynamics do.

A closed system is a child's top that is spun. X energy in and there is no more access to any energy input. The top will spin dissipating its energy back to the environment and will come to a stop when all the energy is used. Then it is in equilibrium with its environment. The laws of equilibrium thermodynamics apply to this system and this is the thermodynamics that all of learn in the school books.

A diesel generator is a closed system. X amount of diesel in a tank, the engine runs and the electricity produced is less joules of work that the joules in the diesel. So if 10 parts go in, maybe 5 parts is usable in the end. That would be 50% efficient for simplicity sake. When the diesel is used up (no access to other energy from the environment since it is closed) the engine will stop meaning it has come into equilibrium with its environment.

An open system: A tree. You plant an apple tree, you get a seed put it in the ground and water it. You do a little mainenance. When the tree is full of apples, those apples will equal a hell of a lot more energy than what you put into the tree. The tree had free access to energy from its environment. Sun, air, rain, soil nutrients, etc...

An open system doesn't mean the output is more than the input. I said the output is more than the operator inputs. There is other input but we don't have to do it, nature does it. So if the tree planter person puts in 10 parts energy, the apples could wind up with 1000 parts energy. This is WAY over 100% efficient and is totally possible with an open system. This is an open dissipative system. The laws of equilibrium thermodynamics do NOT apply to these systems. Never had never will. Only non-equilibrium thermodynamics apply, which easily permit over 100% efficiency.

An atom. H has one nucleus with an electron spinning around it. It is absolutely ridiculous to believe an atom is a closed system. If it was, the electron moving would have to sustain on nothing but pure momentum from some

initial push. Very ridiculous. It is open and the electron has access to the Aether to sustain it. Every atom is an overunity device as is a tree and as is any electric circuit that is an open circuit.

A human being...open system.

Electrolysis = current bridging a gap from one plate to another closing the circuit. The laws of thermodynamics apply here.

Voltage potential = pulsing longitudinal impulses into water. no current bridges a gap. the pulses are pulsed and shut off very fast. It leaves the circuit completely open with its environment. The water cell receives a "charge" and it turns it into a dipole. That dipole has free access to the Aether. Every water molecule is also an open system. This is an open dissipative system. The laws of non-equilibrium thermodynamics apply here. Why? Because an open system keeps dissipating energy but cannot come into equilibrium with its environment.

Learn about the laws of thermodynamics that applies to the WFC and not the laws of thermodynamics that apply to closed systems!

Ilya Prigogine: The Nobel Prize in Chemistry 1977

"for his contributions to non-equilibrium thermodynamics, particularly the theory of dissipative structures"

<http://nobelprize.org/chemistry/laureates/1977/index.html>

Study his Nobel Lecture:

Called: Time, Structure and Fluctuations

Available on pdf here: <http://nobelprize.org/chemistry/laureates/1977/prigogine-lecture.html>

The voltage potential spike moves from one direction in the cell to the other, it gets the electrons to flow in the opposite direction in a quick pulsed fashion. The spike is shut off and the electrons don't make it to the plate. H doesn't make it to the plate, O doesn't make it to the plate. When it is shut off, they'll go back together in the middle of the cell. This has just happened with voltage potential and current wasn't necessary.

Freedomfuel

Posted: Tue Oct 05, 2004 12:53 pm Post subject:

Qiman has introduced so many interesting ideas that it is hard to know where to start. Sorry if this post is going to be long, but here goes.

Qiman is absolutely right when he says that Stanley Meyer's water fuel system is Tesla technology. I am not sure if Stanley was consciously influenced by Tesla or if he independently stumbled upon the same approach. Unfortunately, some of the valuable, if unconventional ideas of Stanley that Qiman has noted have been overlooked because much of what he said was bullshit. Here are some of the characteristics that I have observed with energy devices of this type, some of which may apply to the Meyer water fuel system:

- 1) Low level nuclear reactions without the expected reaction products
- 2) The production of charge clusters.

- 3) A glow discharge in the air around the device or in the electrolyte
- 4) The device runs cool
- 5) The device may have antigravity properties
- 6) The application or induction of high voltage pulsed DC within the device
- 7) The device appears to run backwards. For instance it may become cooler as more power is drawn from it. It may exhibit negative resistance, i.e. as the current increases the voltage across it may decrease. Electrons may travel in the opposite direction of the voltage gradient. The device may exhibit negative entropy. For instance matter usually attains greater entropy, or disorder, as heat is applied to it, i.e. solid => liquid => gas. Browns gas on the other hand passes from gas to liquid as heat is applied to it. Charge clusters are an example of a self organising system in disequilibrium with it's environment (an open system, in other words).

Here is a clarification on what Qiman has written about longitudinal and transverse EM radiation. There is nothing in Western textbooks to indicate that longitudinal EM waves exist so unless we have access to some sophisticated and unconventional measuring equipment we have to accept Tom Bearden's account of what it is. According to Tom EM radiation has both a vector component which is the transverse radiation and a scalar component which is longitudinal radiation. The transverse EM wave consists of a magnetic and electric component in phase with each other and perpendicular to each other and the direction of travel. According to Tom if two such waves, travelling in opposite directions, 180 degrees out of phase, and with the B and E fields in the same plane, are superimposed on each the vector components would cancel out leaving the scalar component. Sceptics might say that as there would be no electric or magnetic fields associated with this longitudinal EM wave there would be no way of knowing that it exists. Actually it's existence is could be demonstrated dramatically by such phenomenon as the 'Hutchinson effect', not to mention certain weird WMDs possessed by the Russians. In fact the Russians are probably way ahead of us in EM theory and longitudinal EM waves are mentioned in their open literature. For instance check out the experiments and patents associated with Avramenko's ideas for single wire electric transmission and the 'Free Electron Pump' at JL Naudin's site.

<http://jnaudin.fre.fr/html/afep012.htm>

<http://jnaudin.free.fr/html/fep01.htm>

The single wire transmission concept is interesting because it may give some insight into how Stanley's water fuel system really works. The schematic shows a high voltage, pulsed DC generator supplying a single wire feeding a Xenon strobe light. Impossible according to conventional physics but if you accept that the wire transmits a longitudinal EM field to the load it makes sense. As Qiman has made clear there is more to electricity than moving charges. Bill Beatty at www.amasci.com has devoted a section to misconceptions about electricity including the almost universally held belief by non-scientists that it is electrons carrying little packets of energy which they give up to the load. It may be useful to ask a dumb question like 'why do electrons have to move in order for electricity to do work?'. Conventional wisdom says that static electricity cannot do work yet in the 1970s Tesla fan Edwin Gray powered an EV largely with static electricity much to consternation of physicists at the time. Perhaps we should accept Beatties view that electrons have a role analogous to air particles in the transmission of sound. It seems to me that if the Avramenko circuit really does do what he says it does then there would not be a flow of current through the transmission wire. Instead the wire would be more like a waveguide around which longitudinal EM field travels. The fact that power to the load was undiminished by making the wire very much thinner tends to support this theory.

Qiman says that the Meyer water cell should be regarded as an open system in disequilibrium with the environment much like a windmill for instance. The turning of the windmills sails could be seen as the way in which it constantly attempts to regain equilibrium with it's environment. What is the equivalent of the turning of sails in the Meyer water fuel cell? The clue may be provided by the Avramenko schematic. One important component is an antenna for capturing free electrons, which are used to trigger the Xenon strobe. There is something like this going on with certain Joe Cells, which have been observed to exhibit a pink or blue glow discharge in the air around them. This is not the same as a corona discharge, which would require millions of volts for an object of this size. Such a phenomenon was utilised by Patrick Flanagan in his patent for an Electron Field Generator.

<http://homepage.ntlworld.co/ufophysics/efg.htm>

This is a device which uses the phenomenon of 'dielectric absorption' to induce an electron cascade in the air around the device. If such a mechanism can exist when water is the dielectric this could explain the glow discharge seen surrounding the water cells. In this case of the water cell could also be regarded as antenna capturing free electrons to trigger some kind of discharge within it.

Qiman is absolutely right when he states that the Meyer cell produced what we now know as Browns Gas. It is clear from reading the resume of Stanley's speech at the SEET 94 event that he knew that it was water going into his engine. You can obtain a video of his speech at www.nutech2000.com. It is also obvious from the Dingel videos that the white mist rising out of his reactor is water. The Joe Cell guys are also adamant that they are not separating Hydrogen and Oxygen from water in their cells. Let's face it -the water car is not a Hydrogen car. Qiman's account of how Browns Gas is formed is interesting but I find it hard to accept that merely re-arranging the Hydrogen atoms in the water molecule could raise it's potential energy to such an extent. Also Browns Gas implosion cannot be a normal chemical reaction. It could not even be an abnormal chemical reaction. What we have here is something very potent and without parallel in science. The hypothesis I am working on is that Browns Gas has charge clusters suspended within it and it is these that give it it's unusual properties. Charge clusters are billions or even trillions of densely packed electrons held together by one of the strongest forces in the universe, if not the strongest force. Here are some papers on the subject:

<http://www.lenr-canr.org/acrobat/ChiceaDelectroncl.pdf>
<http://svn.net/krscfs/Charge%20Clusters%20In%20Action.pdf>
<http://svn.net/krscfs/nev%20clusters%202.pdf>

The electric spark between metal electrodes is nothing more than the ionized trail left by charge clusters in the air. Ask yourself also why Tesla coils require a spark gap.

We use Browns Gas rather than Hydrogen because it stores more energy per unit volume, because removing the membrane between the electrodes to separate the gases induces BG production as does pulsing the DC supply.

The advantages are an improvement in performance, much lower fuel consumption, clean emissions and best of all it's FREE!

qiman13

Posted: Wed Oct 06, 2004 3:32 pm Post subject: wow!

Freedomfuel, you understand the longitudinal vs. transverse better than me.

I'm happy you see the Brown's gas connection. I'm definitely not sure if the arrangement of the h₂o is changing or not or if it is just sucking up a lot of the voltage potential to "swell" up the water molecule.

Something very interesting that I think I mentioned before is that George Wiseman at www.eagle-research.com build a BG cell that is plexiglass or something. When looking at the plates, directly in the middle of the plates are a sheet of bubbles that are so dense it looks like another steel plate. That sheet of bubbles is the BG. The effect is definitely not happening at the plates, but directly half way in between the plates.

It is definitely not a chemical reaction when Brown's gas burns. It is an electrical flame and not a fire flame...so it is an electrical reaction. Aluminum is a fairly good conductor and when putting the flame on it, it can conduct the voltage potential away from the flame pretty good so it doesn't melt at the "flame" spot and water is produced on the spot. A rock is a poor conductor of "electricity" so the voltage potential cannot be dissipated away from the flame and this is why the rock melts into a puddle.

Instead of electrons building in the water, I'm looking in the other directions. I think the water molecule, regardless of its arrangement, is absorbing pure voltage potential (the Aether) without extra electrons.

When it is swelled up and ignited, the voltage potential swelled up in the h₂o is transferred to the material is it "cutting," the molecule shrinks back down to size and turns into visible water.

It seems from Meyer and others that there are various levels of energy that the water can get to. But basically, the stage 1 - pretty powerful, #2 - extremely powerful, #3 - just plain ridiculous (Hypergas)

I don't think I can really buy into the ortho and para hydrogen deal. Has that been proven or is that concept just an idea? I see a lot of people commenting on it but they seem to be just regurgitating what they read.

One comment I would like to make about the "free electrons" is that Gray's tube didn't work with free electrons. Normal hv with current (electrons) went into the tube. When the switch was closed at the top of the low potential rod, the hv potential that were built up in the tip of the hv potential rod would jump across, slam right into the carbon resistor. The electrons would stay in the circuit. 90 degrees perpendicular to the current direction, the Aether component of the current (without electrons) would radiate 90 degrees outward and this is what the grids intercepted. That Aetheric component would be carried out to the inductive load (pulsed coils on the motor) and back to ground. It was really like popping a balloon. The air would go out and that would be the Aetherial component and the rubber left behind would be the electrons. It is literally breaking the "electric" and "magnetic" component of electricity apart.

"SPLITTING THE POSITIVE" this is an interesting subject that only one person I know of has been showing it for years.

If we take a balloon that is highly pressurized (high voltage) and push our hand on it against a wall, the balloon flattens. The pressure is directed 90 degrees perpendicular to the direction that we are pushing the balloon. Eventually, the balloon pops and the air (aether - voltage potential) is released from the current (balloon rubber) traveling outwards to the grid. The balloon rubber is still there in the circuit (rods is the hand and the wall).

In Gray's circuit, instead of the circuit creating straight radiant potential, it made regular HV in the HV cap and the tube split the Aether from the electrons. This was the exact method.

I think the "Holy Grail" of water fuel production would be a Gray tube discharging into a water cell. It would make Meyer's technology look like a feeble attempt I believe.

Has anyone got the Meyer videos online yet?

Freedomfuel

Posted: Thu Oct 07, 2004 11:05 am Post subject: Re: reference to Stan

qiman13 wrote:

We know for sure 100% positive that the inductors do reduce the amount of current flow regardless of it changing the frequency and/or voltage. Even if after the inductor the frequency and voltage is unchanged, it does reduce electron flow since it restricts current but still lets the voltage potential come through. Current still flows through but less than what is available at the front end.

Inductor definitely further restricts current that can come through the negative electrode to ground so it makes sense to have an inductor (variable for fine tuning) on that end as well. Tesla used things such as carbon resistors to do the exact same thing, etc...

So, inductor before the cell and after the cell is definitely helpful.

Another thing to restrict electron flow is the frequency itself.

For example, if a coil is pulsed at a certain frequency there is a certain impedance. If the frequency gets high enough, the impedance is so great that no electron flow can happen but the voltage potential is still available at the output. I don't know if I've seen too many references to the connection between high frequency through an inductor the limiting of electron flow but permitting voltage potential to get across in reference to Stans work. I only printed the first 2 "chapters" so far.

Instead of focusing on 100% inhibiting electron flow, maybe we should focus on limiting it as much as possible and if we happen to get no amps detectable, then yahoo!

Anyway, have you or anyone else monitored amps going to the cell while playing with frequency? Increasing the frequency should reduce the amps as well and not just the fact of having an inductor. Inductor + higher frequency = even more electrons restricted.

There has been much speculation about the function of the inductors in the Meyer patent and Qiman has suggested that they were intended to restrict current through the cell. From what I know of electrical theory it does not seem possible to me that you can alter the current through an inductor independently of the voltage across it. I suspect that these inductors were added to the schematic to foil would be imitators. There seems to be a consensus that Ed Gray made deliberate mistakes in his patents to prevent imitations

The voltage across an inductor is directly proportional to the rate of change of current with respect to time, ie:

$$v = L \frac{di}{dt}$$

The current through an inductor is directly proportional to the time integral of the voltage across it, ie:

$$i = \frac{1}{L} \int v \, dt, \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty}$$

Therefore voltage across the inductor is proportional to inductance and current is inversely proportional to inductance. Increasing the inductance to restrict current will only increase the voltage drop across the inductance. It could be that with high voltage pulsed DC weird things happen and the normal rules of electromagnetism do not apply. The reference to the Ed Gray circuits being verified by others is interesting. Does anyone know anything about this?

qiman13

Posted: Thu Oct 07, 2004 5:25 pm Post subject:

Freedomfuel,

On one of the very first "tests" just to see what the inductor did, this is what I got. For an inductor, I just used magnet wire wrapped around a plastic spool. I wasn't concerned with how much inductance, just the general properties when applied to the circuit.

I used a variac and put it through a bridge for pulsed DC 120hz. I put that through a blocking diode and to the cell.

Without the spool of wire inductor - at about 7volts, it was drawing about 5 amps.

With the spool of wire inductor - I could turn it up to about 50 volts, while it was drawing 5 amps.

Of course, this is more power than we want but it demonstrates a concept. It shows me that with an inductor, higher voltage for the same amperage is possible. Of course with that amperage, the inductor got hot as hell but I could still get higher voltage.

If Meyer did use inductors, I don't think heat was a problem. If he was using 35 volts at 350ma or something like that, that would heat it up. Besides, I really believe the key is to send radiant spikes into the inductor to begin with and the inductor won't get hot. Actually, it should stay room temp or even get cooler than room temp if it truly radiant spikes.

My initial thought on the inductor is that it would increase the frequency. Pulse in is one pulse to the cell and the inductor gets charged. Pulse off, the inductor collapses into the cell since it can't go backwards. So 2 pulses for the price of one. When I measured it on a scope, the inductor didn't increase frequency.

I also thought on the collapse, the collapsed voltage would be higher than the applied pulse, but it showed on the scope that didn't happen either.

What did happen was that the voltage and frequency coming from the inductor to the cell was unchanged. However, it was totally inverted. It was all negative voltage of the same + voltage, just inverted.

I asked someone credible about the inductors specifically on Meyer's circuit. All he said was that he wasn't sure that Meyer ever used on on the negative side of the wfc.

I think he most likely used them but I think he really may have been producing radiant spikes and those radiant spikes were going into the inductors just to "clean them up a bit" or as an extra precaution to eliminate electron flow.

I believe that if real good radiant spikes are put into the cell to begin with, the inductors are definitely not needed.

In Gray's patent, it seems that the deliberate missing info was the circle in the bottom right of the basic tube schematic. What was missing in the circle was the overspark "points" to shoot the voltage back to ground. Seems Peter Lindemann figured that out I believe.

Gary McGrattan (spelling??) duplicated the Gray tube discharge. I received all the tech reports from him. I believe he did it, but he doesn't understand what he did. He is trying to explain it in conventional terms and is WAY off. It is very obvious. Just goes to show that people can duplicate results without knowing really what is going on.

I've duplicated various devices and didn't really figure out what was really going on for several years afterwards.

qiman13

Posted: Sun Oct 10, 2004 2:59 pm Post subject: oops

If he was using 35 volts at 350ma or something like that, that would heat it up.

I meant to say that that input would not heat it up.

Freedomfuel

Posted: Sun Oct 24, 2004 10:49 am Post subject:

I have been interested in anomalous physics and 'impossible' energy devices for only a few weeks and so I have not had as much time to form my ideas as Qiman. My first impression of this research was 'this is crazy stuff!'. Nevertheless I was sufficiently intrigued by what I read at the John Bedini and Tom Bearden websites to continue my research into the subject. I now believe that we are at the eve of a revolution that will overturn much of the certitudes of physics and completely change the way we live. The catalyst will be the accumulation of anomalies that can longer be ignored; thus leading to a crisis in physics that can only be resolved by fundamentally revising theory.

It is often claimed that Tesla is the father of this revolution having discovered scalar longitudinal electrodynamic waves, or 'scalar waves' for short, which formed the basis of his ideas about 'cold electricity'. If it is true that Meyer also utilised such scalar waves in his WFC it would provide a more plausible explanation for how the device worked since we have established that an electric field will not have much effect on the covalent O-H bond at strengths below which arcing will occur. All that we could expect from such an electric field is for the Hydrogen bonds in water to be broken making the water less viscous. There is research, probably classified, to show that scalar waves exert a mechanical stress in a medium through which they pass much as sound waves do, since sound waves are also longitudinal waves. This suggests that the mechanism for gas formation within the Meyer WFC could be analogous to air bubble formation in water due to ultrasound, with charge clusters forming within the bubbles due to charge separation. Note that such a hypothesis is a long way from conventional ideas about electrolysis based on ion transport between the plates. Here is a brief account of Tesla's work on 'cold electricity':

Adrian Akau. Longitudinal Waves and 'Cold Electricity'

<http://www.faraday.ru/14-15.pdf>

This and the Linderman book on the Secrets Of Cold Electricity are interesting as historical accounts of Tesla's work but what is required to convince the sceptics is some experimental proof of the existence of longitudinal electodynamic forces and waves. A good place start is the instructions for repeating the Avramenko experiment to demonstrate single wire transmission using longitudinal waves given at JL Naudin's site:

<http://jnaudin.free.fr/html/afep012.htm>

This uses a 555 square wave generator, a power transistor and a car ignition coil to feed power to a Xenon bulb via a single wire. By modifying the circuit to make the lengths of the pulses variable this would be a good starting point for investigating 'cold electricity'. I have not studied the theory behind this device but I assume that as this is an open loop there are no moving charges on the line and there is a potential wave and a longitudinal electric field moving either just beneath the surface of the wire or in the space around it. It is interesting to note that the capacitor in the circuit has its potential raised without its plates being charged. This is exactly what Qiman says should happen with the Meyer water capacitor when fed with high voltage, pulsed DC. Also note that the diodes indicate that this potential wave changes polarity. It could be interesting to see what happens if we feed a Meyer water capacitor with this single wire transmission device. It might not be free energy because during the leading edge of the pulse work has to be done to oppose the induced emf in the primary of the ignition coil and during the trailing edge of the pulse stored energy is transferred to the secondary of the coil. What happens to this energy after that is a bit of a mystery.

In this paper by Lars Johansson he examines research into longitudinal electrodynamic forces beginning with Ampere:

Lars Johansson. Longitudinal Electrodynamic Forces
<http://www.df.lth.se/~snorkelf/LongitudinalMSc.pdf>

He describes Nasilowski's experiment with current pulses in the kiloamp range used to explode wires that were similar to Tesla's wire exploding experiments using capacitor banks. Another example of such longitudinal forces is provided by water explosions caused by underwater arcs that cannot be explained by expanding gases. The existence of such longitudinal forces in conductors was implicit in Ampere's original formulation of his law on the forces between current carrying conductors. According to this formula there would be a longitudinal repulsive force between co-linear current elements. According to this paper by Kouropoulos such co-linear current elements would exist as 'charged loops of magnetic flux' near the surface of a conductor, which organise as bound vortices of electrons rather like charge clusters but with lower density and electrostatic energy.

C.P. Kouropoulos. Classically Bound Electrons - EV's, Exotic Chemistry, and 'Cold Electricity'
<http://www.mypage.bluewin.ch/Bizarre/EVs.htm>

Since these electronic vortices would be formed during the trailing edge of the pulse then continuously repeated pulses with the pulse width progressively reduced would inhibit normal conduction and leave most of the mobile electrons in the conductor as static, shrinking electronic vortices. Under this condition all that would travel along the wire, or around it would be a scalar potential wave with a longitudinal electric field in the direction of propagation. This interpretation supports Qiman's conception of 'pure voltage potential with no current'.

It is significant that Tesla continued his cold electricity experiments using an electric arc that was deflected with a rotating permanent magnet in order to adjust the pulse width by deflecting the arc. This device was used to supply the primary of the giant Tesla coil in his Magnifying Transmitter, a monstrous scalar wave transmitter with which he intended to achieve world domination. According to Ken Shoulders a spark is nothing but the ionised trail left by charge clusters or EVs as he calls them as they erupt from tiny cracks in a cold cathode subject to high voltage negative pulse. According to Ken these charge clusters should behave as tiny scalar wave emitters.

‘Ken Shoulders also has suggested that the EV is a spherical monopole oscillator. As he describes it in the conclusion of his book EV: A Tale of Discovery, "This [monopole oscillator] is the perfect generator for vector and scalar potential waves without contamination from either E or B fields. These waves can be thought of as longitudinal waves in the vacuum. They are largely undetectable by standard E and B detecting means but are readily accessible to the monopole world.’

R.A. Nelson. Ken Shoulders’ Electrum Validum

<http://www.rexresearch.com/ev/ev.htm>

The real breakthrough has come from an experiment by Monstein and Wesley to demonstrate the existence of scalar waves using a spherical antenna.

Monstein and Wesley. Observations Of Scalar Longitudinal Electrodynamic Waves

<http://www.astro.phys.ethz.ch/papers/monstein/7210.pdf>

This has caused quite a stir because hitherto such scalar waves had been thought impossible by everyone outside the black project community. A normal antenna at the simplest level is a dipole in which mobile charges move together and cross over at the middle of the dipole before moving apart to a maximum before moving together again. A spherical antenna is the equivalent of a single point charge that decreases in magnitude to zero then changes polarity before increasing in magnitude to a maximum before starting to decrease again. As there are no moving charges on the antenna there is no transverse B and E fields. Instead there is a scalar potential wave with a longitudinal electric field in the direction of propagation. Another interesting observation is that electrical energy can pass across a capacitor without the plates being alternatively charged and discharged. It is only a small step from this to conclude that a capacitor can be raised in potential without an increase in charge on the plates, as Qiman maintains.

Kouropoulos has analysed in some detail the overunity battery charging system by William Alek known as the ‘motionless shock charger’ (see above).

Motionless Shock Battery Charger

<http://www.nuenergy.org/pdf/charger.pdf>

Kouropoulos relates this device to other free energy devices like Bearden’s MEG and the Floyd Sweet device. Their common feature, in his opinion is that they utilise a coils linked to ferrite magnets to produce a back emf greater than the applied emf from continuous pulses. Once again normal conduction is inhibited by pulses inducing the production of static, shrinking electric vortices surrounding the wire, but just below the surface. These electronic vortices shrink towards the centre of the wire, according to him, and drive the back emf by converting some of their mass into energy. The shrunken, disordered Torii need to absorb thermal energy in order to be restored as usable free electrons. Thus the coil cools making this an endothermic process. Studying the circuit diagram above we can speculate about how the Meyer schematics should be redrawn and the inductor re-designed. I suggest that the inductor should be in parallel with the water capacitor and the blocking diode between the inductor and the water capacitor. You could experiment with linking the coil(s) to a magnet as in the battery charger.

Finally I have re-read Tom Bearden’s thoughts on the subject and I realize that what I wrote about scalar waves being formed by superimposing normal EM waves 180 degrees out of phase is an over-simplification. John Hutchinson has demonstrated that super-imposed EM waves will produce a scalar potential wave but it is rather more involved than I thought.

I am still not convinced by Qiman’s account of aether energy, but there is a growing consensus that a pure vacuum devoid of mass and energy does not exist. Although there may be a background energy that keeps the Hydrogen atom in it’s ground state no one is suggesting that this is the source of all EM energy. In my opinion, based on the Kouropoulos paper in the link above, charge clusters are the key that will unlock everything; free

energy; antigravitation; cold fusion; and EM healing. Not only are the physics of these entities mindboggling but so is their technological potential. Study this paper assiduously. Don't worry if you don't know what anti-Stokes Lasing is because I don't know what it is either!

Dave

Posted: Sun Oct 24, 2004 5:13 pm Post subject: Aether

Hi Freedomfuel

I believe the Meyer WFC uses aether vortex spin

for its anomolous behavior,here is some true info.<http://www.energyscience.org.uk/index.html>

Best Regards Dave 😊

Freedomfuel

Posted: Mon Nov 01, 2004 1:03 pm Post subject:

I have heard the 'aether vortex spin' theory with regard to the Meyer cell but I am unconvinced. It seems to me that the 'aether' is too readily invoked when people encounter some anomolous excess energy that they cannot account for when it could have some more mundane source like sunlight. The Kouropoulos paper

C.P. Kouropoulos. Classically Bound Electrons - EV's, Exotic Chemistry, and 'Cold Electricity'

<http://www.mypage.bluewin.ch/Bizarre/EVs.htm>

refers to various states of matter in which electrons are bound together by short range forces to overcome their coulomb repulsion which I believe has some relevance for understanding Browns Gas. In the case of bound electrons as charge clusters he puts forward the theory that they are electronic vortices that implode and draw in heat from surrouding electrons in the conduction band. This is an endothermic process in which heat is converted into electricity, although there may be more to it than that. If I am right about this then what we have here is really a form of solar energy

I have seen the Aspden site you referred to but I found the esoteric subject matter of little relevance to building real overunity devices.

Dave

Posted: Thu Nov 04, 2004 4:49 pm Post subject: Patents

Quote:

I have seen the Aspden site you referred to but I found the esoteric subject matter of little relevance to building real overunity devices.

Hi I suggest you check out some of Harold's patents ,that is pretty revelent to overunity.I have to say I don't go much on scientific maths I`am just a engineer and practical,.I spent to much time in High energy physics and looking for exsotic particles to be faffed with it .as for the Aether there has been so good practical worke to show it is real.

Best Regards Dave

Attos

Posted: Mon Nov 15, 2004 2:06 am Post subject:

Quote:

If I am right about this then what we have here is really a form of solar energy.

Freedomfuel, can you elaborate a bit more on this, please?

Freedomfuel

Posted: Wed Nov 24, 2004 12:13 pm Post subject:

Attos wrote:**Quote:**

If I am right about this then what we have here is really a form of solar energy.

Freedomfuel, can you elaborate a bit more on this, please?

One of the most noticeable things about these so-called free energy devices is that they run cool. Sometimes they are so cool that their temperature goes below freezing and ice forms on them. From this it would appear that they are converting ambient heat into electricity. This is not such a strange idea when you consider that heat pumps do more work than their energy input because they are drawing energy from ambient heat. Dennis Lee even claims to have made free electricity from ambient heat using a heat pump.

I think that it was Geoff Egel at Energy21

<http://fortunecity.com/greenfield/bp/16/orgone.html>

who said that people had observed ice on the radiators of water cars. What this means is that the radiator of the water car acts as a tremendous heat sink because there is a large temperature gradient between the radiator and the surrounding air. The second law of thermodynamics, about which I know very little, states that for heat to do work there must be movement of heat from a high temperature source to a low temperature sink, so clearly these free energy devices do actually conform to the second law of thermodynamics. Nothing revolutionary there then.

There are several questions we should consider from this; Is the potential rate of heat flow through the radiator enough to supply the vehicle with 50kW of power? I am not an engineer so I do not know how to do the calculations for this, but it seems highly unlikely that ambient heat would be sufficient to power the vehicle alone. That is why I am sceptical about claims of having powered a vehicle with just the product of water electrolysis. There could be some other more obscure source of energy from the environment like 'zero point energy' but there is no way to test this hypothesis with our present measuring devices.

Engineer and author Moray B. King has spent 25 years studying these devices and his conclusion is that most of them depend on a phenomenon called 'charge clusters'. This is a very obscure subject about which very little has been written in mainstream physics literature and I am not sure that the physics establishment even recognise the existence of charge clusters. When Ken Shoulders tried to tell the great physicist Feynman about them his initial reaction was to the effect 'get out of here!', but later he changed his mind. Here are some links that might help you understand what is going on. The first link provides a hypothesis of how charge clusters may draw energy from ambient heat:

<http://www.mypage.bluewin.ch/Bizarre/EVs.htm>

http://padrak.com/ine/FB97_1.html

<http://www.svn.net/krscfs/nev%clusters%202.pdf>

<http://svn.net/krscfs/Charge%20Clusters%20In%Action.pdf>

<http://blake.montclair.edu/~kowallskil/cf/48clusters.html>

<http://www.rexresearch.com/ev/ev.htm>

Remember that all the answers to these questions were discovered years ago by the black project scientists working for the US military and we are a long way from catching up with them.

mel

Posted: Tue Dec 07, 2004 6:49 pm Post subject: electrolyzer

ok i am a machineist i can make the chambers but could never make the electronics who can make me a board that works off 12v dc and how much will it cost. btw if your going to run a car off hydrogen the timing must be moved to 8 deg past tdc for gasoline it is 5 deg before and just running the gas from the electrolyzer to the engine will be a disaster ive seen it already when hydrogen and oxygen burn on thier own they implode air must be injected into the motor so that it can be super heated and expand to make the motor work the way it should. my ultimate goal is to supplement gasoline with h2o to avoid embrittlement of the engine and rusting out the exhaust 5-10% gas should be fine i like the idea of getting 200mph

LaserLine

Posted: Wed Dec 08, 2004 2:30 am Post subject: Re: electrolizer

mel wrote:

ok i am a machineist i can make the chambers but could never make the electronics who can make me a board that works off 12v dc and how much will it cost.

I don't want to volunteer for him, but you may want to ask chemelec. He is very knowledgable with circuitry and has made some for some group members in the recent past.

al

Posted: Thu Dec 09, 2004 7:46 pm Post subject: Re. Electrolyzer

Chemelec,
can you make a board that works off 12v dc and how much will it cost.
Thanks Al.

chemelec

Posted: Thu Dec 09, 2004 8:41 pm Post subject:

Quote:

Chemelec,
can you make a board that works off 12v dc and how much will it cost.
Thanks Al.

Al, The simple pulse generator on my site will run at 12 volts. But Remember, I make No Claims as to How much hydrogen can be Generated. There are Too many other factors involved.

<http://www3.telus.net/chemelec/Projects/Projects.htm>

I also Prefer Not to assemble any of these projects, as my site is "Supposed to be for Hobbist interested in doing projects themselves". But "Sometimes I make Exceptions".

I Just Want Everyone knows where I stand on this.

Anyone can Email me direct at chemelec@hotmail.com

But the word "Electronic" MUST appear in the "Subject Line".

qiman13

Posted: Sat Dec 11, 2004 5:50 pm Post subject: The Solution - What you've been waiting for

To the mechanic - build the cell and just connect 3 fully charged car batteries to the cell, it will make gas. After you make the plumbing all right and safe (back flash bubbler) , etc... step #1 - just make a flame burn steadily.

To the rest of you. I have already posted the answer as to how the Meyer cell works you don't listen. Meyer was sending unidirectional longitudinal IMPULSES to the water cell. PERIOD!!! He is sending radiant impulses to the water. Do you get it? I've already succeeded in duplicating it...you're all wasting time.

Here is a shortcut. http://peswiki.com/index.php/Directory:Bedini_SG

Check out that circuit in the schematics...it is what Meyer had but more simplified in a way that even most of you can do it. Look at the concept of what is happening. Bedini is sending the SAME IDENTICAL EXACT types of impulses to batteries as what Meyer was sending to the water cell. If you all don't get it, then give up because you're not paying attention. Goto that website and learn about this circuit.

I can't believe nobody has duplicated it as I have. It took me 3 months to make more progress than many people have spent 10+ years on!!! Forget all the resonant lc circuit crap because that is 100% for sure NOT what the circuit is.

Just make one single concentric tube setup and just hook a couple car batteries to it. Just get the mechanics of down and make the plumbing right...you can get enough info to be able to have the gas output go to some nozzle to burn a steady flame safely!

Just do that first! If you can't even do that, then forget about it. One and only once you have that, then look into various ways of improving the efficiency of the input NOT BEFORE! Otherwise, you'll never get anything done. You'll all just be wasting time figuring out what Meyer's was doing and you'll never get started on anything.

Also, if you never got the book, Secrets of Cold War Technology by Gerry Vassilatos, then you're not serious. Just get that book and read chapter one about 10 times. You'll then understand EXACTLY what Meyer was doing!

If you all do that and post results, I'll send you to the next step but you don't deserve then answer before that. I spent too much time and effort to give it to anyone that didn't work for it.

al

Posted: Tue Dec 14, 2004 9:40 am Post subject: H-O mix requirement

qiman13,

I am getting 24mi/gal at constant speed of 65mi/hr from my 1990, 4.9l, V8 Eldorado.

Converting to liters (3.78 l/gal) my car uses 2.708 gal/hr or 10.24 l/hr.
Gasoline weighs 1.55291 lb/l, converting 10.24 gives 15.6 lb/hr fuel consumption.

At 14.7A/F (Air to Fuel) ratio my engine uses 233.7 lb/hr of Air (14.7*15.6).
Note that the engine has PFI (Port Fuel Injection) therefore little air is displaced by atomized gasoline. 233.7 lb/hr represents the “volume” of air that my engine is capable of sucking-in at constant speed of 65 mi/hr.

NACA 1383 Figure 5 shows that most efficient burning is for 30% hydrogen in AIR by volume.
Air, specific weight is 0.076474 lb/ft³ at sea level.
Converting 233.7lb/hr of AIR to volume gives 3056 ft³/hr (233.7/0.07647) or 86539 l/hr (3056*28.31685 l/ft³).
30% of 86539 are 25962 l/hr or 432 l/min of Hydrogen gas that my engine may suck-in.
Gasoline has 9000Whr/l of energy.
My car consumes 9000* 10.24l/hr = 92160 W in an hour (123.6hp in an hour).
At Standard Temperature and Pressure Hydrogen Gas has only 2.7Whr/l of energy.

H-gas-AIR Mixture

Thus at 0.3 Hydrogen/Air ratio, 25962 l/hr times 2.7 gives 70097W of energy (less than 92160W consumed).
Therefore, my car will not run on Hydrogen and Air mixture at 65mph, unless it is introduced directly into cylinders at higher pressure than atmospheric (my car has PFI only). Are there on-board electrolyzers that can produce 432 l/min of H gas?

H-gas-O-gas Mixture

NACA 1383 Figure 5 also shows that at 1atm H-gas and AIR flame temperature is 2400° K or 2127°C.
Normal hydrogen-oxygen welding yields temperatures of around 3315°C.
Hydrogen-oxygen mix (Brown’s gas) melts tungsten at 5660°C.
Assume that the hotter the flame, the greater the amount of work thus, higher pressures in cylinders.
Using Brown’s gas may increase energy by a factor of 2.7 (5660/2127).
Thus Brown’s mixtures should have over 7.27Whr/l of energy.

Paper p36r0.pdf (see below link) shows Ta values for various H-O combinations.
<http://reaflow.iwr.uni-heidelberg.de/~crs96/Program/Contrib/Paper/p36ro.pdf>
H₂+O₂=2OH Ta= 28789degK or 28516°C.

Assume that 2OH mixture has 36.2Whr/l (2.7*28516/2127)
At constant speed of 65mph my car consumes 92160 W in an hour.
Therefore, it needs 2546 l/hr of H₂-O₂ mixture (92160/36.2) or 42.4 l/min and NO AIR.

One (1) liter of water yields about 1840-liters of gas-mixture.
This equals to 1.38 liters of water per hour (2546/1840).

1. Anything wrong with my calculations and assumptions?
2. What is energy requirement to dissociate 1.38 liters of water using efficient electrolyzer?
3. How many plates or SS tubes the electrolyzer should have to produce 42.4 l/min of H₂-O₂ mixture to run my car at 65 mph (some posts claim to produce 20 l/min)?
4. Who experimented with “nitrogen hydroxide” (nitrogen hydrogen and oxygen combined) see <http://www.cyberspaceorbit.com/hfsystems.html?>

Thanks, Al.

Freedomfuel

Posted: Tue Dec 14, 2004 12:20 pm Post subject: Re: The Solution - What you've been waiting for

qiman13 wrote:

To the mechanic - build the cell and just connect 3 fully charged car batteries to the cell, it will make gas. After you make the plumbing all right and safe (back flash bubbler) , etc... step #1 - just make a flame burn steadily.

To the rest of you. I have already posted the answer as to how the Meyer cell works you don't listen. Meyer was sending unidirectional longitudinal IMPULSES to the water cell. PERIOD!!! He is sending radiant impulses to the water. Do you get it? I've already succeeded in duplicating it...you're all wasting time.

OK, but where is the experiment? I have seen so many statements of this kind before and I am beginning to get a bit cynical about it all. If you were a scientist you would publish a carefully documented description of an experiment with precise instructions on how it was done so that other scientists could confirm your results by reproducing the experiment. The fact that you do not means that I cannot take you seriously. Prove to us that you are not another Frank Roberts.

qiman13

Posted: Tue Dec 14, 2004 4:13 pm Post subject: proof

I already posted schematics, video clips, pictures, etc...EVERYTHING
Some a**hole from here went in and deleted everything.

Besides, for someone needing proof before they build the actual cell w/bubbler is someone who will never get anything done anyway. They wait around and comtemplate to consider to evaluate to finally make a decision to get started about 10 years later. I'm not wasting my time with those people. If someone has the guts to make a decision to do something with this, make the cell, bubbler, etc... then get to the next step.

Regardless of how the gas is produced, you might as well have the setup ready to receive the power no matter how it is produced don't you think?

For anyone that wants gas to play with...the do the batteries, if that is too difficult for you then get a variac, put the output through a bridge to turn it into pulsed dc. Put that output to the cell. 35 volts at 4 amps will give you enough gas to impress yourself. LOL Not very efficient but enough for you to make a cell to handle that volume. AFTER you get the cell built, then work with the power supply. I can tell you that no matter what power supply you have, Meyer's type or other, if your cell isn't sealed right and the magnetic fields from the wire are intefering with the gas produced, etc... you will NOT get results. Make the cell correctly FIRST.

Simon

Posted: Tue Dec 14, 2004 7:57 pm Post subject: Re: proof

qiman13 wrote:

I already posted schematics, video clips, pictures, etc...EVERYTHING
Some a**hole from here went in and deleted everything.

get Eric to stick them up in the files section! im sure he wont delete it....

al

Posted: Wed Dec 15, 2004 10:11 am Post subject:

[Regardless of how the gas is produced, you might as well have the setup ready to receive the power no matter how it is produced don't you think?

quote]

giman13,

my car has only 80amp generator, has 4.5l V8 not 1l, and there is no room in the engine compartment. If your H-O mix has 4 times the energy of H-Air mix than I need 42.2 l/min to run my car at 65mph. Anything less you have inadvertently created Joe's Cell.[if your cell isn't sealed right and the magnetic fields from the wire are interfering with the gas produced, etc... you will NOT get results./quote]

Or you are producing "nitrogen hydroxide" see <http://www.cyberspaceorbit.com/hfsystems.html>

Thanks, Al.

mike140366

Posted: Wed Dec 15, 2004 11:52 am Post subject: Hello, just read these 6 pages

Really good discussion. I wish I could understand it all. I am more than happy to duplicate the experiment. A question? Has anyone read kanarev and his version of low voltage electrolysis? His conclusion:

"Thus, the voltmeter shows a capacitor charge voltage value, and the oscillograph shows a value of its recharge, which characterizes the energy consumed by the cell from the line. It appears from this that in order to calculate energy consumed by the low current electrolyzer cell from the line it is necessary to use voltage, which is registered not by the voltmeter, but by the oscillograph. As a result, energy consumption for hydrogen production from water in case of low current electrolysis are reduced not 12fold, but almost 2000fold. The correspondence of the water electrolysis process during low current electrolysis to its electrolysis process

taking place during photosynthesis is confirmed by intensive production of gas bubbles within several hours after the electrolyzer is disconnected from the mains.

CONCLUSION

The method of conversion of electric energy into thermal energy with energy efficiency index of more than 100 folds has been found.

Thus, the convincing theoretical and experimental proofs of existence of a method, which reduces energy consumption for hydrogen production from water 1000 folds and more, have been got. Such reduction of energy consumption for hydrogen production from water affords ground for an assumption that low-current water electrolysis is similar to its electrolysis, which takes place during photosynthesis.

The way of a transfer to economical and environmental friendly power engineering is opened. But it will not be an easy one. There will be a lot of work concerning optimization of the parameters of the global energy generators."

I hope the above helps.

Mike Taylor

Mike Taylor

Life is....4 kids and no sleep!

bluespark

Posted: Thu Dec 16, 2004 2:17 am Post subject:

Hi, Quiman

I am beginning to replicate your experiments.

Thanks for your help.

I readed the chapter one of the bok that you suggested and agree with You about the central idea behind Meyer's work and radiant energy.

I constructed the cell with two concentric inox tubes and with my variac and a bridge I will test it.

What electrolyte do you recommend ?

Gino

qiman13

Posted: Thu Dec 16, 2004 10:07 am Post subject: electrolyte

Glad to hear it. No electrolyte. I only use tap water.

You could use potassium or sodium hydroxide if you are using current and want more conductivity. You'll get a

LOT of gas. Not super efficient, but you get effective results for sure.

You can get great results with using regular current. If you can at least get all that down, then move towards the radiant production.

Anyway, as far as calculating how much gas everyone is going to make etc..., in my opinion it isn't a good way to go. With the pulsed unidirectional impulses to the cell, it doesn't follow Faraday's law anyway and to my understanding, there isn't a simple formula you can easily whip out to tell you what you're going to wind up with. You need to understand math models that relate to open systems or at least partially open systems. Not necessary for results.

So without the math involved, just get some good gas production and put it in a vacuum line to the intake and check the results. Then go from there. Forget all the percentages of how much is supposed to give such and such results. When looking at it like that, like Tesla said, that math isn't going to create anything based in reality. You have to just do it basically and later on, use the math to see what you got but not to find out what you need to make. That isn't true science. True science is doing it hands on and then figuring out what happens afterwards.

Basic results can be had by taking the alternator output without going thru a regulator and then thru a bridge and to the cell. That is the most crude way to do it that still gives results. It might be harsh on the metal in the tubes or plates but with that amperage, it would do that.

For the radiant, you definitely want square wave pulses going to the cell. An alternator isn't going to give you any clean and crisp square waves. You could take the output of an alternator (before) the voltage regulator and simply make sure it is thru a bridge so it is DC and charge up a capacitor bank. From the capacitor bank, simply square wave pulse that directly to the cell. Since the bridge has diodes on the lead end anyway, you don't need an extra "blocking diode." That diode's ONLY purpose is to prevent a reversal in the polarity....it automatically shows everyone that it is NOT an LC circuit. That isn't even debatable.

Anyway, alternator to caps to square wave pulser to cell.

The most simple radiant machine you can build is Bedini's in my opinion. So, alternator to cap bank, cap bank to Bedini's circuit and that circuit straight to the cell instead of to a dead battery. The schematics for Bedini's circuit (that he released in the last couple months) is shown to be a single coil, you can have multiple coils and multiple transistor setups, that improves the radiant transfer to the output diodes. Have them all come back together and hit the water cell with that. You will have a simplified version of Meyer's method and it should blow away xogen's results.

http://peswiki.com/index.php/Directory:Bedini_SG

http://peswiki.com/index.php/Directory:Bedini_SG:Schematic

Join this group and study the messages, you'll learn quick about radiant energy

http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Bedini_SG/ This of course would be what Meyer was producing.

bluespark

Posted: Fri Dec 17, 2004 5:48 pm Post subject:

Hi, Quiman

I'm grateful for your nice explanation.

In order to simplify the composition of parts, is it plausible to replace the capacitor bank and alternator by one or more batteries ?

If positive , what voltage do You recommend for the square waves pulses and the relation on/off time ? 1:1 ?

Is the bicycle wheel of the Bedini device self-propelled or driven by a motor ?

Can I use neodimium magnets to assemble the Bedini device ?

Thanks in advance for your encourage.

Gino

qiman13

Posted: Fri Dec 17, 2004 5:59 pm Post subject:

Yes, you can replace everything and just power the cell by a battery bank. I would use 3 car batteries that are each charged over 14 volts. That is a truly charged 12 volt battery. A 12 volt battery at 12 volts is literally a dead battery.

That would be a 36volt battery bank but would really be a little over 40 volts if the batteries are charged up.

For the duty cycle, I would start with 50% (half on half off). check those results and then adjust higher and lower to compare results with trial and error. I've seen lots of comments about what the best duty cycle is but it really seems to depend on the entire system as a whole...different for everyone in other words. (I would tend to go over 50%)

That bicycle wheel is turned by an electromagnet pulsing and the magnets around the wheel are repelled by the magnets to get going. Once the circuit is in resonance, the scalar component (super south pole) is being attracted to the electromagnet.

Neo magnets are good if you want torque on the wheel but for good efficiency, I would use regular ceramic magnets. I wouldn't use a bicycle wheel, I would use an aluminum rotor maybe 5" in diameter. Once learning that circuit, it can be easily modified to be solid state (no rotor needed), it will just produce high frequency radiant impulses that you can send to the water cell.

bluespark wrote:

Hi, Quiman

I'm grateful for your nice explanation.

In order to simplify the composition of parts, is it plausible to replace the capacitor bank and alternator by one or more batteries ?

If positive , what voltage do You recommend for the square waves pulses and the relation on/off time ? 1:1 ?

Is the bicycle wheel of the Bedini device self-propelled or driven by a motor ?

Can I use neodimium magnets to assemble the Bedini device ?

Thanks in advance for your encourage.

Gino

bluespark

Posted: Sat Dec 18, 2004 4:27 am Post subject:

Quiman,

The ceramic magnets are ring, cylinder or disc magnets ?

The rod inside the coil is ferrite or silica plated steel ?

If I use a scope with two channels and connect the first to the input coil and the second to the input water cell , is the radiant impulses detected by it when in resonance ? Via what channel ?

When in resonance , any kind of change in the waveform is noticeable ? Or resonance means only the max output gas ?

Sorry ... many questions ...

Thanks for all

Gino

chemelec

Posted: Sat Dec 18, 2004 9:26 am Post subject:

qiman13

Quote:

Posts: 38
Joined: 07 Sep 2004

Posted: Fri Dec 17, 2004 5:59 pm

Yes, you can replace everything and just power the cell by a battery bank. I would use 3 car batteries that are each charged over 14 volts. That is a truly charged 12 volt battery. A 12 volt battery at 12 volts is literally a dead battery.

Almost Immediately after removing a car battery from a charger, the Voltage will Fall to around 12.6 to 13 Volts.

Actually a 12 Volt Battery is Considered Dead at 10.5 volts Under a Typical Load.

A 12 volt battery should be charged to about 14.5 volts for Cycled Use or to about 13.5 volts for Continuous Standby Use.

Continuous Charging at 14,5 volts will damage the battery.

Anyone can Email me direct at chemelec@hotmail.com
But the word "Electronic" MUST appear in the "Subject Line".

qiman13

Posted: Sat Dec 18, 2004 6:51 pm Post subject: magnets

Just use plain square or rectangle ceramic magnets. Rectangle about 1.5" long, .75" wide and .25" thick rectangle magnets from radio shack for example work fine. Put them around the rotor. You can find plenty of examples of motor setups in that website I referred you to.

At minimum, the motor is a UNITY motor, meaning it is 100% efficient. The rotor is @ about 25% meaning the motor is 125% efficient at MINIMUM since all the work in the shaft is FREE.

For the coil, use bundled up iron welding rod cut to the length you desire.

On a scope, you will see high voltage spikes that look just like up and down lines but there is virtually no time component to any of them spikes. 12volts in and the spikes will be about 300 to 500 volts and this is WITHOUT any stepup transformer action. There isn't any device that will directly measure the radiant energy itself. Devices only measure wasted energy.

bluespark wrote:

Quiman,

The ceramic magnets are ring, cylinder or disc magnets ?

The rod inside the coil is ferrite or silica plated steel ?

If I use a scope with two channels and connect the first to the input coil and the second to the input water cell , is the radiant impulses detected by it when in resonance ? Via what channel ?

When in resonance , any kind of change in the waveform is noticeable ? Or resonance means only the max output gas ?

Sorry ... many questions ...
Thanks for all

Gino

qiman13

Posted: Sat Dec 18, 2004 7:00 pm Post subject:

chemelec wrote:

Almost Immediately after removing a car battery from a charger, the Voltage will Fall to around 12.6 to 13 Volts.

Actually a 12 Volt Battery is Considered Dead at 10.5 volts Under a Typical Load.

A 12 volt battery should be charged to about 14.5 volts for Cycled Use or to about 13.5 volts for Continuous Standby Use.

Continuous Charging at 14,5 volts will damage the battery.

I don't know if I could agree with you there.

Bedini is one of the leading authorities on battery charging and his results are more meaningful than what is "supposed" to be the case.

Anyway, charging a battery to 14.5volts will only damage the battery if there is a lot of hot current.

If you send the impulses to the battery to charge it, there are NO big bubbles on the plates you only see fine champagne fizz. That alone is priceless. There is NO heat in the battery, it remains stone cold. There is NO destruction to the plates, only a fine powder coating appears. The more the battery is drained from that kind of charge and then charged up again, it gets more and more efficient up to a certain point. You can take the battery, charge it with the radiant impulses and it will be MORE efficient than a brand new battery. It can power something longer, the battery isn't being destroyed and will last virtually indefinitely.

You know the difference between a 24 month and 48 month battery? The only real difference is that there is

more space at the bottom of the battery to catch more crap that has fallen off. If nothing falls off to begin with for example like a battery charged with the radiant impulses, it will last forever. (not the load powering capability from one charge, I'm talking about the physical integrity of the battery)...no more replacing batteries on a home unit, etc... ever!

Meyer sent these exact radiant impulses to his cell. There is NO current involved.

Current will bridge one plate to the other or in a battery, current will make a closed loop from one terminal to the other. That automatically make a current charger or a regular electrolysis cell. If you send it impulses, the loop stays OPEN and no electron flow can happen. The water in the cell or the insides of the battery soak all of it up like a sponge.

This is what you all need to do to copy Meyer's method.

Simon

Posted: Sat Dec 18, 2004 7:53 pm Post subject:

qiman13 wrote:

Meyer sent these exact radiant impulses to his cell. There is NO current involved.

Current will bridge one plate to the other or in a battery, current will make a closed loop from one terminal to the other. That automatically make a current charger or a regular electrolysis cell. If you send it impulses, the loop stays OPEN and no electron flow can happen. The water in the cell or the insides of the battery soak all of it up like a sponge.

This is what you all need to do to copy Meyer's method.

when you say to use the schematic you posted for the berdini SG motor, do you have to use the coil as well of just that circuit.... sorry if its a dumb question 😊 im trying to figure this out in my head.

DORRO

Posted: Sun Dec 19, 2004 2:42 pm Post subject:

Hello again Qiman13

DAM GOOD to here from you...thought you had gone for good but probably just very busy

You were right, the peswiki site holds an awfull lot of important information, even more so in the last few days

I think it's fair to say that after Xmas there will be somebody in England with a front wheel missing...lol

thanks again for all your posts....they seem somehow familiar...?

Oh! btw it's Bedini...and the coil is very important.

it's not my place to be picky however....no one likes a smart ass.
no offence meant

merry xmas to all....and all the best for the new year!

Freedomfuel

Posted: Mon Dec 20, 2004 1:04 pm Post subject:

Somehow I do not think that Qiman has figured out how to give the world clean abundant energy but he could be getting close to it.

THEORY

In my opinion the type of techniques that Qiman is interested in involve using ambient heat which is converted to useful energy in the form of 'radiant energy' as he calls it. This is not as fanciful as it may sound because the paper below by Monstein and Wesley shows experimental proof for the existence of Longitudinal Electrodynamic Waves which could be the basis of current-less electricity. As ambient heat ultimately comes from the sun this technology could be regarded as a form of solar energy and thanks to global warming there could be giga-joules of excess solar energy in the atmosphere to be exploited.

Although the second law of thermodynamics expressly forbids the use of ambient heat to do work I think that it is possible in systems in thermodynamic disequilibrium with their environment which have the property of negative entropy.

That is entropy change $dS = -k \ln W = -dU/T$

where W is a measure of disorder in the system, U is heat input, k is a constant and T is temperature.

In other words heat input into the system gives a decrease of temperature and an increase in order. In practice this occurs during abrupt discontinuities such as those caused by pulsed magnetic and electric fields. In the example of 'free energy' machines electrons organize themselves into clusters with a definite structure. A practical overunity device should thus exhibit a temperature difference compared to ambient temperature in proportion to the ratio of it's input to it's output. If someone did an experiment with a calorimeter that confirmed that this is right it would disprove that the source of excess energy is 'zero point energy'.

PRACTICE

I cannot for the life of me see how the Bedini schoolgirl motor could be utilized in the electrolysis of water. Is this idea of Qiman based on experience or is it conjecture? As I have written elsewhere the underlying physics of Adams style pulsed motors and static electromagnetic over-unity devices could be the same but this is not much use if you need a practice schematic, which Qiman has not supplied yet. The fundamental principle involved is that the back emf from a collapsing magnetic field is greater than the applied emf when the coil is linked to a ferrite magnet. Bluespark would do better to examine William Alek's Motionless Battery Shock charger which could be applied to electrolysis with little modification. In my opinion this setup in which the coil/magnet are in parallel to the load could be how Meyer really obtained the results he did. Remember you need a diode in the circuit to ensure that the forward emf is blocked from the load (an electrolyzer in this case). Below is a link to the Adams Motor Manual which describes in detail several experimental pulsed motors and static devices with one successful experiment described in enough detail that it could be replicated (at last!).

Finally the figures that al has supplied would make sense to a highly experienced technician but they are mindboggling to me so it will take some time to figure out a reply.

REFERENCES

Adams Motor Nexus Article:

<http://www.geocities.com/CapeCanaveral/Lab1287/>

The Adams Motor Guide

<http://www.fortunecity.com/greenfield/bp/16/adamsmotorguide.htm>

Motionless Shock Battery Charger

<http://www.nuenergy.org/pdf/charger.pdf>

Monstein and Wesley. Observations Of Scalar Longitudinal Electrodynamic Waves

<http://www.astro.phys.ethz.ch/papers/monstein/7210.pdf>

Joe McClain and Norman Wootan. Magnetic Resonance Amplifier

<http://www.sumeria.net/free/mraintro.html>

<http://www.sumeria.net/free/mraop.html>

<http://rexresearch.com/mra/2mra.htm>

On the Mystery Of Differential Negative Resistance

<http://home.uaic.ro/~seba/the%20mystery%20of%20NDR.pdf>

Adrian Akau. Longitudinal Waves and 'Cold Electricity'

<http://www.faraday.ru/14-15.pdf>

Freedomfuel

Posted: Mon Dec 20, 2004 1:15 pm Post subject: Re: electrolyte

qiman13 wrote:

For the radiant, you definitely want square wave pulses going to the cell. An alternator isn't going to give you any clean and crisp square waves. You could take the output of an alternator (before) the voltage regulator and simply make sure it is thru a bridge so it is DC and charge up a capacitor bank. From the capacitor bank, simply square wave pulse that directly to the cell. Since the bridge has diodes on the lead end anyway, you don't need an extra "blocking diode." That diode's ONLY purpose is to prevent a reversal in the polarity....it automatically shows everyone that it is NOT an LC circuit. That isn't even debatable.

Anyway, alternator to caps to square wave pulser to cell.

I think that there is more to 'radiant energy' than just square waves. High voltages seem to be involved and in the case of the Bedini and Adams motors there seems to be an electronic emission from the magnets themselves when pulsed with a magnet field of the same polarity. John Searl and Floyd Sweet regarded this emission as consisting of micron sized plasma rings or charge clusters which, according to Ken Shoulders, act as monopole radiators emitting scalar potential waves or 'radiant energy' as you call it. Incidentally surely this would demagnetize the magnets?

Freedomfuel

Posted: Mon Dec 20, 2004 1:24 pm Post subject: Re: proof

qiman13 wrote:

I already posted schematics, video clips, pictures, etc...EVERYTHING
Some a**hole from here went in and deleted everything.

Regardless of how the gas is produced, you might as well have the setup ready to receive the power no matter how it is produced don't you think?

I can tell you that no matter what power supply you have, Meyer's type or other, if your cell isn't sealed right and the magnetic fields from the wire are interfering with the gas produced, etc... you will NOT get results. Make the cell correctly FIRST.

Great, but how do you recommend a cell should be made before venturing into complicated electronics? I don't think that I am asking for too much if I expect to see your statements backed up with some plans, photos or at least a detailed written description of a successful cell as others have done in this forum. I should say that I do intend to do some experiments with my own cell so but I am not going to get much help from you.

Also, you raised the subject of the influence of magnetic materials in the cell which is also a subject that concerns the Joe Cell builders. Can someone explain why residual ferro-magnetism should effect the function of

the cell?

Freedomfuel

Posted: Mon Dec 20, 2004 1:27 pm Post subject: Re: H-O mix requirement

al wrote:

qiman13,

I am getting 24mi/gal at constant speed of 65mi/hr from my 1990, 4.9l, V8 Eldorado.

Converting to liters (3.78 l/gal) my car uses 2.708 gal/hr or 10.24 l/hr.

Gasoline weighs 1.55291 lb/l, converting 10.24 gives 15.6 lb/hr fuel consumption.

Thanks, Al.

Great post al, but your figures are mind-boggling for someone who is not an experienced technician. I think that you deserve a reply but it could take me a while to figure it all out

bluespark

Posted: Mon Dec 20, 2004 2:48 pm Post subject:

Hi, freedomfuel

For me, seems that Quiman just want to help us with his experience (remember that he claims that successful had replicate Meyer's cell).

But, if you read attentively and perceive his philosophy (and it's absolutely accurate), we need to merit his efforts.

How many guys in this forum answered his call to start experimentation and let's the math and physics for afterward?

The physics only explains the results. It's impossible to achieve results only by theory. Is necessary experimentation.

A genius is 10% inspiration and 90% transpiration.

Tesla worked in his lab not with theories but with arduous experimentation.

Quiman convoke us to follow him through this work.

He declared that we need start in order to merit more information.

The Bedini device isn't the ultimate way to replicate Meyer.

It's the more simple device that we can build in order to experiment radiant energy.

We need to start to get more !

Come on guys.

DORRO

Posted: Tue Dec 21, 2004 5:05 am Post subject:

I am experimenting with a rather crude attempt at the monopole motor of John c. Bedini

can anyone tell me how to upload a few photos to this thread?

Thanks[/img]

djbANKs

Posted: Tue Dec 21, 2004 6:52 pm Post subject:

2 cents:

You could upload your images to a <http://geocities.yahoo.com/> briefcase or maybe here:
<http://www.imageshack.us/> then you would use the tag pointing to your image in your reply.

Good luck I hope this helps.

DORRO

Posted: Wed Dec 22, 2004 6:28 am Post subject:

Thankyou djbANKS

Here is my attempt.....warts and all!

any comments?



am i getting warmer Qiman13?

Simon

Posted: Wed Dec 22, 2004 10:54 am Post subject:

how big is the gap between the coil and the magnet attached to the wheel?

DORRO

Posted: Wed Dec 22, 2004 5:03 pm Post subject:

Hi simon,

The coil to magnet gap is about 15mm.

The magnets are cylindrical and very powerful!!!

My first attempt used square magnets, but they caused too much air resistance. The results were nearly the same but the r.p.m. was less.

These round magnets fit perfectly in 20mm holes bored in the wheel and cause little or no air movement.

May i just say, I now realise that there is no such thing as free energy.....the other day a magnet lept from it's mounting and smashed clean through a double glazed window unit costing me £150.00gbp.!!!!.....good job nobody was walking past eh?.....Wheel r.p.m. approx 2000.

Glad to answer any more questions.

Dorro.

Simon

Posted: Thu Dec 23, 2004 10:10 am Post subject:

wow that looks pretty impressive! 😊 what is it made out of? some kind of plastic? it looks like the cutting board plastic....

DORRO

Posted: Thu Dec 23, 2004 4:50 pm Post subject:

Hi simon,

The base plate and rotor are made from dense acetal resin,
the side plates and timing pulley are made from
polyethelene....mostly because working in the food industry
that's all i could beg, borrow or....ehem.....steal!

most of the information is at http://peswiki.com/index.php/Directory:Bedini_SG

if you fancy a look.



Cheers and mery Christmas to to those that do....and seasons greetings to those that don't

qiman13

Posted: Sat Mar 05, 2005 8:05 pm Post subject: radiant energy - wfc

Hi All,

Glad to see someone try the Bedini energizer. Good job DORRO!!!

http://peswiki.com/index.php/Directory:Bedini_SG

http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Bedini_SG/

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/bediniprocess/>

Those 3 pages are probably the best besides John's personal homepage:

<http://www.icehouse.net/john34/>

Regarding the mathematics to see what is happening, you need to understand quaternions, which I do not understand and it is not really necessary to understand to have something that works.

Regarding freedomfuel's explanation of ambient heat turning into "radiant energy" or the excess energy. The answer is no.

If you take two magnets opposing each other and force them together, what is squeezing out from between them? That IS a scalar field. If south is opposing each other, what is squeezing out from the sides is a "super south pole" and if it is north opposing, then it is a super north pole. That super pole is 4 TIMES the strength of the attracting power if north was attracted to south. Get that 4 TIMES THE STRENGTH!!!

If you have magnets around a rotor, north facing out, all the south poles on all the magnets are facing inwards towards the center axle. All of those south fields are repelling each other are that SUPER SOUTH POLE is squeezing out in between each magnet. That super south pole is what is being ATTRACTED to the coil and that is what spins the rotor. The coil SUCKS that super south pole scalar field into the circuit transforming that scalar field into something usable in a battery that it is being taken to. That is not the only place the energy comes from but it is a very significant part of it.

One the rotor is up to speed and gets to resonance, the coil's pulse is not repelling the magnets on the rotor to turn it, the super south pole is being attracted to the coil. What is happening is backwards from what everyone wants to believe.

The radiant energy is the heaviside component, which is the total energy flow over the wires that usually induces electron flow to begin with, which is usually only measured as the poynting flow.

Bedini's motors don't have the electron flow and that is why they stay cold. You could say the radiant energy, WHICH STANLEY MEYER WAS USING TO PUT INTO HIS WFC, is the heaviside component void of electron flow.

The radiant output can be directly applied to a wfc or can be put in caps then rapidly pulsed into the cell.

Look at Bedini's SG circuit and meditate on it. Look at Meyer's circuits and meditate on it. They are producing the same thing for different applications. Bedini's is simpler, yet more effective in producing the radiant without all the chokes, etc... Follow all the messages in the posts in the above boards and you will learn EXACTLY what Meyer was producing to send to his wife.

Bedini's can be scaled up if you know what you're doing. The output CAN be applied to a WFC.

DORRO, glad you even tried the Bedini motor. Doing the SG circuit eliminates the need for a timing rotor with pulley to discharge caps and even eliminates the need for caps. Since you at least made that one, get into the bediniprocess group (linked above) and send them your pic. You'll be in the group in a flash. Bedini personally posts to that group and the bedini_sg yahoo group as well.

I haven't had time to read the other threads in this website to see the progress others are making with their ideas, but I just hope they're still not stuck on seeing Meyer's circuit as being an LC resonant circuit on the wfc side. Blocking diode prevents the resonance. UNIDIRECTIONAL LONGITUDINAL RADIANT IMPULSES TO THE WFC. That is the EXACT answer to what Meyer was doing everyone. Take it or leave it.

IMPORTANT - Meyer's circuit IS an open circuit and NOT a closed circuit. The radiant is unidirectionally pumped to the water and shut off before the polarity reverses. The water absorbs the radiant (over and over and over). It is the EXACT thing Bedini is doing with the batteries he is charging. The battery is receiving unidirectional longitudinal impulses and it is shut off before there is any reversal. The battery just absorbs the radiant (over and over and over).

If Bedini's or Meyer's circuits were closed loops, then there would be current that would actually bridge the gap inside the battery and inside the wfc forcing it back to its own ground meaning that the loop got closed and that lets electrons flow in the circuit in the opposite direction killing the power source.

The motor is unity motor but the EXCESS (over 100% energy) winds up in the battery being charged. NOT measurable in the circuit. Nobody will measure excess energy in Meyer's circuit either! It will only show up in the water or at least in the work that comes from the gas in the end.

I've repeated the above over and over because it is the truth.

Also, I can't emphasize enough, get SECRETS OF COLD WAR TECHNOLOGY by GERRY VASSILATOS and read chapter 1 over and over. You will see what everything I have said is true. It will be just too obvious.

2 main components to the project. One is a circuit to produce the radiant. One is the actual wfc with all the plumbing. Get them both right separately. If you want to build the wfc first, forget about how to produce the radiant. Just hook a variac thru a bridge and put the output to the wfc with concentric steel tubes. You will impress yourself with the gas production. You can't not get those results. It isn't efficient, but who cares. You have gas production. Now get the system to be safe and get the back flash bubbler setup, etc... and just make sure the plumbing is all safe and sound. Eagle Research's Brown's gas books are good for building a safe cell. Get them books!

After you have all the plumbing safe and you can produce gas that goes out a nozzle and you can have it burn a steady flame, then you have a good wfc for safe experimentation. Use your common sense and use all safety precautions. Eagle Research's Brown's gas books have already saved my life. Literally! I didn't realize how powerful this gas is.

Don't do this: I put a few drops of dish soap into the wfc and applied the power. Got a good big bubble. My friend dropped a match on it and it was louder than an M80 going off in front of your face. Anyway, there is no question that you will have a very powerful explosive gas.

Anyway, after you have all the plumbing safe on the cell, then learn how to build a radiant circuit. In the links above is all that is necessary to do that. Or build a radiant circuit first then do the cell. Just get one done right first then do the next.

If you just build a circuit and put it to a cell, well, that is just kinda halfed ass. Anyway, MANY people are getting incredible results with Bedini's radiant circuits. Over 100% efficient is no problem. Remember, you won't measure it in the motor you'll see it in work that is done with the batteries that you charge. Not only that, that doesn't even account for about a 25% in work at the rotor that doesn't even cost any work to do! Minimum 125% efficient including the work at the wheel that PLUS the excess in the batteries you're charging.

Just picture a wfc in place of batteries you're charging or both!

You won't produce enough radiant with small one coil setup. You'll need multi coils, etc... Just follow the info in the links above and you'll see what I mean. This is the real deal and is probably the easiest true radiant circuit that anyone can build without all the BS.

Good luck everyone!

Freedomfuel

Posted: Sun Mar 06, 2005 12:37 pm Post subject:

I want to try one of these overunity motors out of curiosity but if I do it will probably be a variant of the Adams motor which is quite similar to the Bedini Monopole motor. Here is a link showing lots of home made Adams Motors you can copy which would give even the most hardened sceptic hours of fun:

The Adams Motor Guide

<http://www.fortunecity.com/greenfield/bp/16/adamsmotorguide.htm>

DORRO used insulating materials to build his motor out of necessity but according to this article it is necessary to use insulating materials for the rotor to get the best results. I believe that this is because when a pulsed magnetic field is applied to a dielectric it produces an electron cascade in the surrounding air which is visible in the dark as a pink or blue glow around the motor. The stripping of electrons from O2 molecules is strongly endothermic and cools the air around the motor thus contributing to the cool running of successful motors. The fact that these motors can actually cool below ambient temperature suggests that they are able to convert low grade heat into useful energy which is supposed to be impossible. Here is a link to one of Hal Puthoffs experiments showing this electron cascade visible in a glow discharge panel:

<http://www.earthtech.org/experiments/gdp/cursory.html>

Most of QIMAN's interpretation of what is going on in these devices is probably correct except for the bit about magnets which I have not seen before. My interpretation is based on remarks made by Sweet concerning his VTA device. According to Sweet when an opposing magnetic field is rapidly applied to a ceramic or ferrite magnet stresses inside the magnet produce an effect like fracto-emission in which electrons are released as toroidal or vortical clusters. As they decay they emit scalar longitudinal electric waves which in his device are picked up by a non-inductive bifilar wound coil and travel along the outside of conductors as if they were wave guides. Since this excess energy is not electricity it cannot be measured directly but it is possible to measure the work it does in heating a filament in a calorimeter for instance. I think that it is this fact which the sceptics cannot understand when they demand evidence of overunity as more current out than comes in.

Here is a rather fanciful discussion of the physics involved in this kind of device:

C.P. Kouropoulos. Classically Bound Electrons - EV's, Exotic Chemistry, and 'Cold Electricity'
<http://www.mypage.bluewin.ch/Bizarre/EVs.htm>

I am considering building this really easy overunity battery charger which has been successfully replicated by at least two others:

M Charly's SEBCAR
<http://peswiki.com/index.php/Directory:SEBCAR>

I have already bought materials for a Browns Gas Cell so I could use this circuit as a pulsed supply to obtain 'radiant energy.

LET THE EXPERIMENTS BEGIN!

qiman13

Posted: Mon Mar 07, 2005 8:49 pm Post subject: radiant

Hi Freedomfuel,

The Adams motor is actually not overunity no matter what the data says. One important thing to understand is that the radiant energy in a radiant circuit is not even measurable. The meters can only measure the voltage potential and/or the current involving electron flow. The meters therefore are only measuring current of energy that is being wasted. When many of these people show meters showing more output current than input, that is not measuring any of the excess radiant because that is impossible with the meters. The radiant can be considered neutral therefore no meters will read it. The meters showing more out than in is nothing more than a metering trick that the inventors don't even understand that they are not getting an accurate reading. See the modified Marcus Wagner circuit in the Bedini boards and you will see a classic example of this.

Here is the only true test to validate if a device is overunity. Bedini's motor is actually a unity device and is not overunity. The overunity shows up in the battery being charged. Actually, Bedini's motor does have overunity because there is work being done in the rotor that does not cost any work from the input battery and it is about 25% in torque...but we don't count that...we count what the battery being charged can deliver in actual real work.

1. measure in joules the work that the input battery expended over x time.
2. measure work in joules that the battery getting charged can do until it gets to the voltage where it was before it was charged with the radiant energy. When you see more joules in work delivered from the battery getting charged, then you can confirm overunity. This of course can only be done AFTER the battery is charged. There is no measuring anything while the energizer is running because no meters can read the radiant heaviside component.

meters on the motors like adams, etc...those are not overunity devices. They are very efficient pulsed motors and

stay very cool, but they are definitely not overunity. Remember, it is a metering trick. I can make the meters show what I want but they don't tell what is happening.

None of the Bedini motors have insulated rotors. There is however a point to consider...if the rotor is metal, use non-ferrous metal like aluminum or use plastic. If the rotor is iron, etc... it will interfere with the magnetic fields, etc...

Interesting about the electron cascade you mention with the rotor. I suppose it is possible. The radiant (almost the entire amount of radiant that is usable in the end) comes from the scalar component of the opposing magnetic fields.

there is some validity to the heat you mention. Bedini and others don't mention it but with entropy or resistance, heat is emitted in the form of photon energy (infrared for example). With negentropic motor or negative resistance, which is what the Bedini motor exhibits, photon energy can probably be diverged towards the circuit, which yes is "supposed" to be impossible. I'm sure the effect is there but not sure how much it accounts for.

See Bedini's patent on his cd clarifier that uses opposing magnetic fields, the scalar component hits the cd surface and "aligns" the material on the disk so the laser can read more accurately what is on the disk. That is just one application. John had it on his website in detail when it focused on quaternions for a bit, but he took that off for now.

Floyd Sweet by the way was one of Bedini's mentors. Bedini wound his coils for him, etc... Bedini was VERY close to Floyd Sweet.

I saw that before about the cold electricity. Don't know if I agree with that person's explanation but it is interesting.

Kemeny Tibor I believe has an interesting patent on a circuit that has the cold electricity (heaviside component with no electrons, therefore no detectable poynting flow).

I don't believe the Sebcarr is overunity. Please don't go by the meters. Measure input joules and measure the joules that the battery getting charged can produce AFTER it is charged. If it is more than the input joules, then it is an overunity producing device. That is the ONLY true test. joules vs. joules - meters mean nothing.

I'll post something interesting in the near future. 😊 Stay tuned.

Witht he

qiman13

Posted: Mon Mar 07, 2005 8:55 pm Post subject: wfc measuring

In the wfc, meters mean nothing as well and volumes of gas mean nothing either.

1. measure input joules over x time.
2. measure joules in work that the gas produces AFTER it was produced
3. if joules in work from gas is more than input joules, then that confirms overunity gas production.

meters, volumes of gas, etc.. mean nothing.
joules vs. joules is the ONLY true measurement to verify overunity.

qiman13

Posted: Tue Mar 08, 2005 2:02 pm Post subject: THE answer to the radiant circuit

small excerpt from <http://www.icehouse.net/john34/index.html>

Study that page if you want the real answer to the radiant circuit.

This is the #1 page on the entire internet to explain exactly what the radiant energy in a circuit is AND how to build one.

Contained below are the 2 most important statements ever made regarding energy in circuits and Gabriel Kron made both.

Gabriel Kron was a mentor of Floyd Sweet. Floyd Sweet was a mentor of John Bedini.

Gabriel Kron 1901 to 1968

Kron, Gabriel. "...the missing concept of "open-paths" (the dual of "closed-paths") was discovered, in which currents could be made to flow in branches that lie between any set of two nodes. (Previously — following Maxwell — engineers tied all of their open-paths to a single datum-point, the 'ground'). That discovery of open-paths established a second rectangular transformation matrix... which created 'lamellar' currents..." "A network with the simultaneous presence of both closed and open paths was the answer to the author's years-long search." Gabriel Kron, "The Frustrating Search for a Geometrical Model of Electrodynamic Networks," Journal unk., issue unk., circa 1962, p. 111-128. The quote is from p. 114.

Lamellar currents, these are branch currents flowing along the nodes in layers, they may be tapped off to form real EM power once transformed. The only way I have found to capture these currents is when the inductors become negative value, the same for semiconductors. They are thin currents of zero potential under measurement. Lamellar currents when transformed in branches become very powerful in charge.

John Bedini

Kron, Gabriel. . "When only positive and negative real numbers exist, it is customary to replace a positive resistance by an inductance and a negative resistance by a capacitor (since none or only a few negative resistances exist on practical network analyzers.)" Gabriel Kron, "Numerical solution of ordinary and partial differential equations by means of equivalent circuits." Journal of Applied Physics, Vol. 16, Mar. 1945a, p. 173.

THIS IS THE ANSWER ALL YOU MEYERS FANS NEED TO UNDERSTAND HIS CIRCUITS.

(fyi...Kron was REQUIRED by the censors to insert the words "none or" above.

THE INDUCTANCE THAT REPLACES THE POSITIVE RESISTANCE IS THE PRIMARY COIL IN THE

CIRCUIT! In Bedini's or Meyer's circuits.

THE CAPACITOR IS THE BATTERY BEING CHARGED OR IT CAN BE A WFC, WHICH MEYERS CALLS A ***CAPACITOR***.

A capacitor is meant to absorb energy and an electrolysis cell is meant to be a bridge for current.

The WFC ABSORBES the radiant impulses and it is not an electrolysis cell because current doesn't bridge the gap. If it bridged the gap, it would close the loop and electron flow would be permitted in the opposite direction. This doesn't happen though and it is why the circuit actually stays open.

These radiant circuits turn chaos into order. Most circuits that produce heat take something in order and dissipate it into chaos.

So instead of high potential moving to low it takes low potential and moves it to a high potential.

http://www.cheniere.org/techpapers/on_the_principles_of_permissible.htm

The "Final Word" On the Conservation of Energy Law
Some arch skeptics are fanatically die-hard—and a real pain in the neck as well.

To be absolutely precise, they have no leg to stand on, if they accept what physics ultimately says on the subject of energy conservation.

Before one gets too adamant about the universality of energy conservation, here's a most astonishing thing, but quite true: In general relativity there is at basis no such thing as conservation of energy at all, unless one first makes some assumptions to inject it artificially so as to avoid facing the sheer terror of the collapse of energy conservation!

The great Hilbert pointed this out shortly after the advent of Einstein's theory of general relativity. E.g., quoting from Logunov and Loskutov { [42] }, p. 179:

"In formulating the equivalence principle, Einstein actually abandoned the idea of the gravitational field as a Faraday-Maxwell field, and this is reflected in the pseudotensorial characterization of the gravitational field that he introduced. Hilbert was the first to draw attention to the consequences of this. In Ref. 2 [D. Hilbert, Gottingen Nachrichten, Vol. 4, 1917, p. 21] he wrote: 'I assert... that for the general theory of relativity, i.e., in the case of general invariance of the Hamiltonian function, energy equations... corresponding to the energy equations in orthogonally invariant theories do not exist at all. I could even take this circumstance as the characteristic feature of the general theory of relativity.' Unfortunately, this remark of Hilbert was evidently not understood by his contemporaries, since neither Einstein himself nor other physicists recognized the fact that in general relativity conservation laws for energy, momentum, and angular momentum are in principle impossible."

<http://www.cheniere.org/correspondence/052303.htm>

So one must understand that a "permanent magnet" is actually a permanent broken symmetry in the fierce flux

of the vacuum, and it thus continuously extracts and outpours real, observable magnetic energy, from the very definition of broken symmetry.

We point this out because rigorously this process reveals that the permanent magnet is actually an active dynamics system, or what is called in thermodynamics a nonequilibrium steady state (NESS) dissipative system. As such, the known thermodynamics of such systems far from equilibrium with their active environment does permit and allow any of five "magic" functions. Specifically, such a NESS system can (1) self-order (produce energy seeming from nowhere), (2) self-oscillate or self-rotate, (3) output more energy than the operator inputs (the excess energy is freely received and transduced from the active environment), (4) exhibit self-powering (all the energy is freely received and transduced from the active environment), and (5) exhibit negative entropy. Simply things out on dissipative systems in the recent book, Kondepudi and Prigogine, Modern Thermodynamics: From Heat Engines to Dissipative Structures, Wiley, 1998 (published with corrections in 1999).

Further, the second law of thermodynamics has known violations, one being sharp gradients (Kondepudi and Prigogine, *ibid.*, p. 459. The exchange force is just such a sharp gradient, and it does violate the received form of the second law of thermodynamics (which has many other violations as well, as recently shown). About such sharp gradients, Kondepudi and Prigogine state dryly that "Not much is known either experimentally or theoretically".

qiman13

Posted: Wed Mar 09, 2005 5:49 pm Post subject: continued in other group

This topic is continuing here: <http://www.icubenetwork.com/forum/viewtopic.php?t=223>

Focusing on the radiant production. Not just talk...I'll show you step by step how to make it. Plain and simple.

qiman13

Posted: Fri Mar 11, 2005 11:24 am Post subject: wfc test...only 1 tube connected.

From last september...

<http://icubenetwork.com/files/watercar/non-commercial/qiman13/celltest.mpg>

harvich

Posted: Sat Mar 12, 2005 7:36 am Post subject: V & A Inputs?

Is this input voltage and amperage data available and is it Pulsed DC?

Harvich

Tesla Research Group; Pioneering the Applications of Interphasal Resonances

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/teslafy/>

qiman13

Posted: Sat Mar 12, 2005 1:42 pm Post subject: data

Please go here for the continuation of posts for this group.

<http://www.icubenetwork.com/forum/viewtopic.php?t=223>

Freedomfuel

Posted: Sun Mar 13, 2005 12:39 pm Post subject: Re: radiant energy - wfc

qiman13 wrote:

Regarding freedomfuel's explanation of ambient heat turning into "radiant energy" or the excess energy. The answer is no.

If you take two magnets opposing each other and force them together, what is squeezing out from between them? That IS a scalar field. If south is opposing each other, what is squeezing out from the sides is a "super south pole" and if it is north opposing, then it is a super north pole. That super pole is 4 TIMES the strength of the attracting power if north was attracted to south. Get that 4 TIMES THE STRENGTH!!!

If you have magnets around a rotor, north facing out, all the south poles on all the magnets are facing inwards towards the center axle. All of those south fields are repelling each other are that SUPER SOUTH POLE is squeezing out in between each magnet. That super south pole is what is being ATTRACTED to the coil and that is what spins the rotor. The coil SUCKS that super south pole scalar field into the circuit transforming that scalar field into something usable in a battery that it is being taken to. That is not the only place the energy comes from but it is a very significant part of it.

One the rotor is up to speed and gets to resonance, the coil's pulse is not repelling the magnets on the rotor to turn it, the super south pole is being attracted to the coil. What is happening is backwards from what everyone wants to believe.

Your ideas concerning the importance of like magnetic poles being forced together are interesting because the significance of this in these kinds of devices is usually overlooked. I am not sure about the 'super south pole' you believe results from this arrangement. Surely this super south pole would be in the middle of the rotor and hardly affected by the pulses from the electromagnet outside it's perimeter? My interpretation of what is happening here is that by forcing magnetic like poles into opposition you are creating a certain stress like a spring being compressed so that only a small pulse can cause the domains to toggle back and forth. This toggling could actually be an example of negative resistance because like a toggle switch as force is applied there is no movement until a point where it suddenly yields and the applied force decreases with an increase in distance. The PAGD device by the Correias exhibits this quality as shown by their graph in this paper:

<http://www.aetherometry.com/PAGD/PwrfromAEemissions.html>

Your comments could be a valuable insight for pulse motor builders. Maybe they should make the disc of the rotor a smaller diameter so that the like magnet poles are closer together in the middle of the rotor.

Your ideas about magnets being 'nonequilibrium steady state (NESS) dissipative systems' are new to me and I think I should do some research into magnet theory to catch up with you. Here is a link to papers on magnets that includes the basic theory they teach at college as well as the things they don't want you to know:

<http://www.intalek.com/Index/Projects/Library/Library.htm>

I take my understanding of what is happening in the magnets according to the teachings of Moray King in his books on the subject of free energy. According to him what occurs in the magnet that gives it this property 'non-equilibrium steady state dissipative system' occurs only when the magnet is stressed in certain ways and this property belongs not so much to the magnet as to electron clusters that are released inside it. He supports this hypothesis by citing the work of Floyd Sweet who deliberately conditioned the magnet by stressing it in order to open up microscopic fissures within it.

The two most obvious ways in which these Bedini and Adams pulsed motors could be taking energy from the environment are that they are drawing upon ambient heat and electricity. This is supposed to be impossible according to the second law of thermodynamics because a homogenous, randomly orientated radiation cannot be a source of energy. There has to be a gradient so that more energetic radiation can move down to a low energy sink in order for work to be done. Likewise randomly distributed electric charges cannot be a source of energy until they are separated and a potential gradient formed. It is rather like water flowing downwards to sea level. I hypothesise that these are indeed negative entropy devices and their cooling below ambient temperature is like a thermal well into which ambient heat flows and they are also electric potential wells causing an electric field that accelerates positive and neutral particles towards the device evident as a glow in the air around it in low light. There is also a third more important way in which they take energy from the environment but I have not figured that out yet. I take my understanding of what is happening at this deeper level from the teachings of Moray King in his books on the subject of zero point energy. He hypothesizes that electrons as toroidal or vortical clusters cohere the homogenous, randomly orientated zero point radiation. Others hypothesise that electrons in this extreme state continuously experience an interchange between mass and energy. Ken shoulders has suggested that electron clusters give up some of their binding mass as excess energy.

Anyone who has read this far will probably be wondering what any of this has to do with water cars. Since Brown's Gas is the crucial catalyst required for 'extreme mileage' and it is not produced by movement of ions within the water by regular electrolysis then it is possible as Qiman says to use these 'cold electricity' techniques to increase the efficiency of Brown's Gas production. Once electricity is freed from its kinetic component it becomes much more efficient in its applications - more than 100% efficient it seems. Even if you could use these techniques to make Hydrogen from electrolysis at more than 90% efficiency it would be a great boon for mankind and could make you incredibly wealthy.

You are giving us some great posts QIMAN with plenty of new ideas to chew over. Now let's see what it is you are doing right with your electrolysis experiments.

qiman13

Posted: Sun Mar 13, 2005 2:53 pm Post subject: reply

Hi Freedomfuel, I replied here:

<http://www.icubenetwork.com/forum/viewtopic.php?t=223&postdays=0&postorder=asc&start=0>
