

Free Energy—fact or fiction?

By Maurice Cotterell

In 1938, Otto Frisch announced that he could make a bomb 1,000,000 times more explosive than a conventional bomb. Everybody laughed. Some said he must be mistaken. Others called upon the Laws of Physics, in an attempt to defend their beliefs, claiming that such a bomb would violate the '1st Law of Thermodynamics'. And they continued to laugh for 7 years, until the bomb was dropped on Hiroshima.

We now understand how the 'atom bomb' works, but are left asking how such, ostensibly, educated sceptics of the day could have been so wrong with their fallacious arguments.

I have discovered how gravity works and, as a result, can explain how to make hydrogen gas [an estimated] 1,000,000 times cheaper than the method of 'electrolysis' used by Industry today. Adoption of this new technology would allow cars to run on virtually-free energy and preclude the need for power-station electricity generation and distribution, bringing an end to man-made global warming. But, just as in 1938, sceptics, mistakenly, insist that such a gain in hydrogen-generation 'efficiency' is impossible, that it would 'violate the '1st Law of Thermodynamics' and, again, we are left asking how they could be so wrong.

The '1st Law of Thermodynamics' is a branch of Physics dealing with the *transformation* of heat into, and from, other forms of energy. It states that 'Energy can neither be created or destroyed, heat and mechanical work being mutually convertible'. [i.e. 'We cannot get something for nothing', or, 'we cannot get more energy 'out' than we put 'in''].

It is important to appreciate that the Law concerns itself only with the *transfer* of energy. And herein lies a problem of misinterpretation; no rational person would deny that the 1st Law of Thermodynamics holds true for the *transfer* of energy, but some critics, when considering the possibility of energy gains, mistakenly, confuse the *transfer* of energy with the *release* of energy—where the energy in question is in fact 'liberated energy' set free by a 'proxy catalyst'. Released energy does not, and was never intended to fall within the aegis of the 1st Law of Thermodynamics, as the following examples show:

1. Dispelling the myth that 'released energy' is constrained by the 1st Law of Thermodynamics:

Example (i). 8 fluid ounces of petroleum, used in a chain-saw, can be used to sever a 100-ton oak tree from its root. The energy *stored* in the oak tree could be 1,000,000 times more than subsists in the 8 fluid ounces of petrol. The 8 fluid ounces of petroleum has nothing whatsoever to do with the energy stored in the 100-ton oak tree. The tree may be burned, independently of the chain-saw, to release the energy stored, or contained, in the tree.

Example (ii). A conventional bomb can be used to detonate a nuclear bomb. The conventional detonator-bomb simply crushes-together the plutonium fuel, causing a chain-reaction that releases massive amounts of energy *stored* in the plutonium. The explosive potential of the atom bomb can be 1,000,000 times more powerful than the explosive potential of the detonator. The amount of energy in the detonator has nothing whatsoever to do with the energy stored, or contained, in the plutonium.

Example (iii). Antigravity energy can be used to de-couple, i.e. sever the hydrogen/gravity bonds between hydrogen atoms and oxygen atoms in water, using 1,000,000 times less energy than conventional electrolysis. The energy used to de-couple the hydrogen bonds has nothing whatsoever to do with the energy *stored*, or contained, in the hydrogen and oxygen atoms.

The above examples demonstrate that the 1st Law of Thermodynamics does not apply in cases where latent energy is liberated (i.e. released) by a proxy catalyst.

2. Dispelling the myth concerning *efficiency*:

Free-energy deniers argue that an increase in electrolysis efficiency, beyond 100% above conventional electrolysis, is impossible on the grounds that it would, again, violate the 1st law of thermodynamics:

It is important to recognise that *efficiency* is a measure of work done, whereas *effectiveness* is a measure of usefulness/benefit, elucidated further by the following example:

Example (iv): If the BBC used 4.16Amps, at 240Volts, to generate and radiate 1,000 watts of energy to broadcast 'Radio 4', it would represent 100% efficiency in the use of the power supplied measured against the power radiated. [Because the 1,000 watts of electricity supplied would be exactly balanced by the 1,000 watts radiated]. But if no-one is listening to Radio 4, then the transmission would be ineffective.

Moreover [importantly], it matters not whether 1 listener, or 60 million listeners, tune-in to Radio 4; the power of the BBC transmission remains unaffected. This is because the radiated electromagnetic radio signal has, what may be called, 'spare-capacity', i.e. Many more radio-receivers may 'tap-into' the radiated energy source (Radio 4) without affecting the efficiency of the BBC signal reaching listeners. But, if 60 million listeners tune-in, instead of just 1, the broadcast may be described as 60,000,000 times more effective.

In the same way, anti-gravity energy can be used to sever the bonds between hydrogen and oxygen much more effectively than *ripping them apart* using conventional electrolysis. Like all radiated electromagnetic energy [radio waves], antigravity waves, and antigravity energy, have 'spare capacity', enabling gains in effectiveness of 1,000,000 times, or more, when de-coupling hydrogen from oxygen. The effectiveness is not dependent on the supplied power.

Before we can appreciate how antigravity energy may be used to disassociate hydrogen from oxygen in water, we need to consider the way a single hydrogen atom bonds to another single hydrogen atom, to make a hydrogen molecule, and how that molecule bonds to an oxygen atom to make water:

A brief explanation of atomic bonding

The orthodox view assumes that atoms bond with neighbouring atoms to form compound molecules in one of three ways; Ionic bonding, Covalent bonding and Hydrogen bonding:

Ionic Bonding

In their natural state, the number of negative charges (electrons) in an atom is, generally, balanced by the number of positive charges (protons). But some atoms acquire an extra positive charge, or charges, and some atoms acquire an extra negative charge, or charges. These 'unbalanced atoms' are referred to as ions. An atom with more positive charges than negative charges is called a 'positive ion' and an atom with more negative charges than positive charges is called a 'negative ion'. When a positive ion is brought into close proximity with a negative ion the two attract each other and are drawn together because the charges are of a different polarity. The ionic charges cause the atoms to bond together permanently into a stable group of atoms known as a molecule.

Covalent bonding

Covalent bonding is defined as a 'chemical bond produced when two atoms share one or more pairs of electrons (usually each atom contributes at least one electron)'. It occurs when the weakly-bound electrons in the outer orbital sub-shells of atoms lasso a neighbouring atom to increase their own outer sub-shell electron count in an attempt to achieve structural stability.

But the orthodox definition is ambiguous and contradictory because although this sharing of electrons may happen, for example, in the bonding of electrons from the weak outer shells of say 'oxygen and carbon and oxygen', to form the compound-molecule of carbon dioxide (CO₂) it cannot work in the case of the hydrogen atom without stripping each individual hydrogen atom of its single individual electron, in which case it would cease to be a hydrogen atom. Because of this, an alternative School of thought has arisen suggesting that hydrogen must bond in a different [mysterious] way, referred to as 'hydrogen bonding'; but orthodox Science has thus far failed to provide an alternative explanation.

Hydrogen bonding is actually gravity-wave bonding:

Notwithstanding: As we have just seen, ionic bonding is known to be inter-dependent; a positive ion attracts a negative ion and a negative ion attracts a positive ion in equal measure. The same is known of covalent bonding; a valence electron from atom A lassoes its neighbour and a valence electron from its neighbour, atom B, lassoes atom A in equal measure. But with hydrogen bonding the bonding differs in that it is known to be uni-directional, one-way only; hydrogen bonds to the neighbouring atom, but the neighbouring atom does not bond to hydrogen.

This distinction is of great importance, because we know that hydrogen radiates helically polarized electromagnetic gravity waves that attract neighbouring atoms, but neighbouring atoms do not attract hydrogen, because hydrogen does not contain 'spiked-neutrons' (see [www.MauriceCotterell.com/How Gravity Works](http://www.MauriceCotterell.com/HowGravityWorks)). This means that 'hydrogen bonding' must, therefore, in fact, be 'gravity-wave bonding'.

Electrolysis of Water

Electrolysis—the passing of a *continuous* electrical current through a water-based electrolyte—can be used to break-down water into hydrogen gas and oxygen gas. Michael Faraday [c.1834] showed that when a *continuous* electrical current flows through water the hydrogen atoms and the oxygen atoms may be *ripped-apart*, to produce hydrogen gas and oxygen gas.

Faraday was unaware of the Atom, unaware that atoms radiate electromagnetic energy in the form of radio waves, unaware of alternating current [A.C.] and unaware of gravity waves. His method can thus be described as 'primitive', because it depends on the *ripping-apart* of hydrogen atoms from the oxygen atoms using primitive *continuous* [and inefficient] 'D.C. [steady-state] voltage'.

His method, determined entirely through experimentation, showed only that the production of hydrogen and oxygen varies with continuous D.C. voltage, up to 1.24v D.C., beyond which it varies only with continuous D.C. current [which could be varied by changing the concentration of the electrolyte (comprised of distilled water and sodium hydroxide, or distilled water and potassium hydroxide)]. He did no experiments using pulsed current, no experiments using alternating current, no experiments using radio frequency electromagnetic waves and no experiments with antigravity energy. It is difficult to see why critics of free-energy wish to live in the past, clinging to Faraday's electrolysis, when his work on D.C. systems was swept aside, in 1943, with the widespread adoption of Tesla's 'alternating current'[A.C.] which is far more versatile, efficient and effective.

The disadvantage of Faraday's conventional electrolysis, in regard to the production of hydrogen, is that the process consumes more conventional energy than the hydrogen it produces. It is far more efficient to break the gravity bonds that hold-together the hydrogen and oxygen in water.

A Modern-day alternative to continuous D.C. electrolysis

In 1986, U.S. Engineer Stanley Meyer showed that hydrogen disassociates from oxygen far more effectively using pulsed-D.C voltage to vary the current through distilled water [as against electrolyte] rather than Faraday's continuous D.C..

Placing tubular electrolysis plates in an electrolyte Meyer noted the following levels of hydrogen production. [These results have been confirmed by the Hydrogen Research Centre in Miami, USA.]:

1 electrode-pair [2 tubes] consumes	1 Amp	and produces 1 unit of gas
2 electrode pairs consume	1.5 Amps	and produces 2 units of gas
3 electrode pairs consume	2 Amps	and produces 3 units of gas
4 electrode pairs consume	2.1 Amps	and produces 4 units of gas
5 electrode pairs consume	2.2 Amps	and produces 5 units of gas
6 electrode pairs consume	2.21 Amps	and produces 6 units of gas

[source: *Practical guide to free energy Devices* by Patrick J. Kelly, www.free-energy-info.com/PJKbook.pdf]

Meyer had no idea why his pulsed current method worked. He could not explain why it should work and therefore could not obtain Patent protection for his 'Hydrogen Generator'. Notwithstanding; it is clear that his method is much more effective at disassociating hydrogen from oxygen in water. The results above also demonstrate that the pulsed-D.C. energy used has 'spare capacity' [as discussed earlier] that can be utilised by adding a greater number of electrodes, at no cost to consumption, which allows for greater efficiency. It is, here, suggested that the pulses of

current through the electrolyte generate electromagnetic wave harmonics that radiate through the water, neutralising hydrogen/gravity bonds.

Meyer, though, did not understand the mechanisms at play, and was unable to calculate the optimal frequency, or signature, of the gravity wave, nor the corresponding antigravity wave required to optimally disassociate the hydrogen from the oxygen.

Electrolysis using antigravity energy

Neither free-energy proponents or orthodox Science understand how gravity works. They do not understand that hydrogen is the prime-mover in the gravitational mechanism. They do not understand how much gravitational energy is used to maintain a gravity bond. They are unable to calculate how much energy it takes to maintain a gravity bond because hydrogen sucks-in heat energy and converts it into electromagnetic gravity waves that radiate continuously from the atom—it is a dynamic process that cannot be stopped and observed. Moreover, some energy is consumed in the bonding of a single hydrogen atom [H] to another single hydrogen atom [H] that together make-up the hydrogen molecule [H₂]. Some of the energy is consumed in the bonding of the hydrogen molecule with an oxygen atom [O]. Some of the energy radiates as gravitational waves that bombard other neighbouring atoms. Some of the energy is used by the hydrogen electron orbiting its proton, and some is used by the oxygen electrons that orbit their respective protons.

Antigravity energy neutralises, and hence *de-couples*, the gravity bonds that hold-together the 2 hydrogen atoms (with synchronized spin) inside 1 hydrogen molecule, and the gravity bonds that hold-together 1 hydrogen molecule to the oxygen atom.

1 single hydrogen atom contains 4 times the energy of 1 hydrogen molecule—which means that half of the energy consumed by each of the hydrogen atoms that make-up a molecule is lost in the communal bonding process, the difference being radiated from the atom as gravity waves.

When the hydrogen bond is broken, potential energy is thus released and downloaded [returned] to the individual hydrogen atoms. When anti-gravity energy is used to de-couple gravity bonds between hydrogen and oxygen atoms the energy is released in a controlled way [not in a massive explosion, like the atom bomb].

Gravity bonds between hydrogen and oxygen may thus be broken using antigravity energy [pulsed in trillionths of a second]—analogous to the pushing of a child's playground swing at just the right time (instead of holding-on to the swing and pushing it *continuously*)—consuming far less energy than Faraday's *continuous* current method, which uses trillions of times more energy to achieve the same result.

Hence, antigravity energy may be used to separate hydrogen from oxygen in water. The antigravity method is estimated to be 1,000,000 times more effective than orthodox continuous D.C. electrolysis, and hence much more efficient. [That is to say; the electrical energy used to produce 1 unit of hydrogen gas by *continuous* D.C. using 1 Amp of electricity may be produced using just 1 *micro*-Amp of antigravity energy].

Details on how to do this are set-down in two 'Confidential' Papers: *How to make Hydrogen using antigravity energy*, by Maurice Cotterell [2016], and *How to make Hydrogen using antigravity energy: Proto-type Development*, by Maurice Cotterell [2016].