Murray
Posted: Sat Jan 10, 2004 9:41 pm Post subject: Stanley Meyer Theories and Circuits

---

Hi everyone !

Love how the forum is set up, much easier to keep track and record information, very happy to be a part of it.

Firstly I would like to introduce myself, my name is Murray . I live in a small country town in Australia. I am a Automotive Machinist and am currently working with Automation industry installing and assembling the electronics for Telemetry (Remote control) irrigation.

I have had more than a interest in hydrogen on demand systems for 10 years but have only seriously researched and experimented for 4 years. I have studied in depth the three I find to be most creditable Stanley Meyer, Daniel Dingle. and xogen, but have also studied most of the others.

At present I am constructing a new cell that will be simple in its design and easy to record all necessary parameters that may lead to showing these good results, it also has the ability to adjust the cell plate spacing by an actuator as a added voltage protection for myself. I will notify the group when I have completed construction.

The Basic Understanding of Stanley Meyers Technology

There are 2 main points to realize with Stanley Meyers Discovery

1.Voltage Fields

2.Restricting Electron Flow (Current)

Basically raising the electrostatic field (voltage field) to a heightened level attenuating to place spacing and having a resistive element or a inductor tuned to high impedance to matched to the frequency input will choke off electron flow and strip the already distorted electrons and recombine them as certain intervals to release gas now on demand.

well that my therory after reading all the patents, but I am very open to others opinion and value any comment on the patent and theories you may have.

Here are some previous posts of mine

The information below is contained in previous links I have
supplied, but I thought I would post it again seeing I feel it has
great importance.(hard to find info)

Voltage Dissociation of The Water Molecule (by Stanley A. Meyer)

Placement of a pulse-voltage potential across the Excitor-Array (ER)

while inhibiting or preventing electron flow from within the Voltage Intensifier Circuit (AA) causes the water molecule to separate into its component parts by, momentarily, pulling away orbital electrons from the water

molecule, as illustrated in Figure (1-9).

The stationary "positive" electrical voltage-field (El) not only attracts the negative charged oxygen atom but also pulls away negative charged electrons from the water molecule. At the same time , the stationary "negative" electrical voltage field (E2) attracts the positive charged hydrogen atoms. Once the negative electrically charged electrons are dislodged from the water molecule, covalent bonding (sharing electrons) ceases to exist, switching-off or disrupting the electrical attraction force (qq') between the water molecule atoms.

The liberated and moving atoms (having missing electrons) regain or capture the free floating electrons once applied voltage is switched-off during pulsing operations. The liberated and electrically stabilized atom having a net electrical charge of "zero" exit the water bath for hydrogen gas utilization.

Dissociation of the water molecule by way of voltage stimulation is herein called "'The Electrical Polarization Process".

,Subjecting or exposing the water molecule to even higher voltage levels causes the liberated atoms to go into a "state" of gas ionization. Each liberated atom taking-on its own "net" electrical charge. The ionized atoms along with free floating negative charged electrons are, now, deflected (pulsing electrical voltage fields of opposite polarity) through the Electrical Polarization Process ...imparting or superimposing a second physical-force (particle-impact) unto the electrically charged water bath. Oscillation (back and forth movement) of electrically charged particles by way of voltage deflection is hereinafter called "Resonant Action", as illustrated in Figure (1-10).

Attenuating and adjusting the "pulse-voltage-amplitude" with respect to the "pulse voltage frequency", now, produces hydrogen gas on demand while restricting amp flow.

Stanley A. Meyer

cheers

Murray Willis

Some basics behind separating the water molecule with High voltage, minimal current and high gas yield

Stanley Meyer and Possibly Daniel Dingle

Contents

I will try to give two links. The first will be from a source other than from Stans work the second from Stan.

I found it was in my best interest to study the basics first so I could understand the principle behind this effect.

The water molecule

The main two things to realise about the water molecule is it is dipolar meaning it has a positive a negative side and the hydrogen atoms are held to the oxygen atom by a electrostatic force

don't worry I will explain electrostatic later on and if anyone wants to know more about the structure of the water molecule I can explain further.

link 1 http://www.aquadyntech.com/watermolecule.html

Stan Meyer (wfcy2k - yahoo group)

link 2 http://f6.grp.yahoofs.com/v1/ALDiPxTMAM7aE-5In_WLO2IcM_LVOUflk8CkzFrhyXD6gO7n71l5f8_HqTykkxqwaiGFTKPGTHZUVBsp-YFhy99qbysqo3qN_hi3/Stan%20Meyer/water%20molecule%20and%20high%20voltage%20field.gif

Normal electrolysis

Link 3
http://www.nmsea.org/Curriculum/7_12/electrolysis/electrolysis.htm

The main thing to realise here is that this process involves the exchange of electrons with ions and protons (I wont go into the specifics it's all there)

Electrolysis creates a circuit were ELECTRONS FLOW

another thing to realise is the direction of flow for electrons is from Negative to Positive, conventional current flow tell us differently.

Why should we use high voltage?

Remember I said the water molecule is held by a electrostatic attraction

definition of a electrostatic (voltage field!!)

Link 4 http://amasci.com/miscon/voltage.html

"voltage is basically two points with more electrons than the other. The greater the difference in the number of electrons the higher the voltage"

and if we increase voltage we increase the voltage field. quote from link above "What are the three kinds of invisible field? Gravity, magnetism.....and voltage!

If the water molecule is subject to a pulsating high voltage field (electrostatic field) at the correct frequency, plate spacing, and restriction of electron flow. This hopefully will develop efficiencies above normal electrolysis.

anyone who has used high voltage will say, as soon as I raise the voltage level between my 2 plates it just arcs across

the first thing to understand is why it does

1. Remembering voltage is just a amount of electron difference between two points and when it has exceeded a threshold point a direct short will occur in the form of a arc. this creates a direct pathway for current to flow. once this happens your voltage drops and you have lost your all important VOLTAGE FIELD.

2. "WE CAN STOP THIS FROM HAPPENING" remember a voltage is a potential difference (more electrons on one side than the other)

remembering the current flows from negative to positive

So what if we had no electrons on the negative plate?

Answer- electron flow has now been eliminated so voltage can now raise to a extremely high, without the possibility of it arcing because there are no ELECTRONS TO LEAK and now we have a very large voltage field without the possibility of a voltage drop(an arc)

Also a important thing to note is like charges will repel and unlike will attract.

that is what is happening to our negatively charged electrons orbiting our oxygen and hydrogen atoms, they are being attracted to the positive voltage potential and are taken momentarily and during a off period of the pulsing operation they are allowed to partially recombine releasing gas now "WITHOUT ELECTRON FLOW" THROUGH A CIRCUIT AS YOU WOULD SEE WITH NORMAL ELECTROLYSIS. WE ARE ONLY USING THE VOLTAGE POTENTIAL..... THE VOLTAGE FIELD TO PULL APART THE WATER MOLECULE.

So to put it more simply, if you were a positive voltage field (lack of electrons) and you needed some electrons and you could not get them from the negative(earth) because they were being blocked by a resistor, where is the only place to get some?

Answer - from the" WATER MOLECULE" (breaking the electrostatic bond)

Stan Meyer

link 5
http://f3.grp.yahoofs.com/v1/EL7iPz1V6HF1Fnzba5CJtuWRwZZ3EIqNqcRGYF4Ck clFJhmvY0zbmzGHbssm_IFkojQJ5QzTbprRCOOUiEdP6PRxJ9eoBcCHpBD5/Stan%20Meyer/high%20voltage.gif

link 6 http://f4.grp.yahoofs.com/v1/EL7iP1wHhs91Fnzbd6n-QsgFRZ1sRrjY6W-7WUlzPgICQzG_57mHDTxSTr_uFEUvXNBvwbgxEGZiepzEBafm6Kz1pGtzi39-MUST/Stan%20Meyer/high%20voltage%202.gif

link 7
http://f5.grp.yahoofs.com/v1/EL7iP2tjkap1Fnzbo1Pou74eBNblWVw9p7ipcFuRS kXumjPVu8DA_NvRDtOtvcz8gQLUjKDNEQZ0__MksJVQXzw4yi45bETRZpCF/Stan%20Meyer/high%20voltage%203.gif

link 8
http://f5.grp.yahoofs.com/v1/EL7iPxy4KF11Fnzbkg5OAu0QMzsp8eQr2shz8Fs55 3OmYS--N1oIbkSMMhIZm5w03zwZoP9y9SnlrtZ59GDHGlW8TeKFO39F_Xe4/Stan%20Meyer/step%20charging.gif

I am going to have a part 2 to this post here I will try to cover

universal time constant curve and how it relates to the step

charging!!!!

and capacitence of a given cell (capacitor)

If you are after more information relating to what I have written about above I suggest you read Stanley Meyer's patent 4,798,661

http://www.fortunecity.com/greenfield/bp/16/stanleymeyer.htm

http://www.rexresearch.com/meyerhy/meyerhy.htm#4798661

You will probably come across the Voltage intensifier Circuit Patent 4,936,961

The VIC circuit is very similar but it uses a variable inductor as a resonant charging choke. The variable inductor is tuned so that it will develop a LARGE MAGNETIC FIELD TO CHOKE OF ELECTRON FLOW instead of using a resistor.

The diode and the other inductor act as a voltage and frequency multiplier. the VIC circuit is the best for doing the job, but patent 4,798,661 is the easiest to duplicate though - in my opinion.

I have bought a pulse generator from cl systems and it works great I have been running my tests through my electrolyser but with no exciting results. I can not see how the water molecule is going to be separated above normal limits of electrolysis I am temporally abandoning frank Roberts system until I am able to understand the principle. so I know what to do. Basically all the effects I am seeing are dielectric breakdown and bubbles not sticking to the plates. but I know there must be something in it, as Xogen did claim to run a small engine from a similar system. The pulse generator will still be suitable I hope for high voltage but with adequate protection (free wheeling diode) and a gating system (I will get into that later on)

High voltage makes sense from the reasons I have stated above and I can now finally see where the efficiencies come from.

I hope some people will follow me in this endeavour to replicate Stans patent.

remember the patents usually put it in it's simplest form, as Stans says he used the KISS method keep it simple stupid to protect his patents. Also his voltage levels he uses was probably to only show operabillity for the invention. Higher voltages are probably going to have to be used for the water car project.

What I have written above is subject to

change because it is only my understanding at present.

cheers

Murray Willis

other info

Ps

If anyone is interested in working with me on my prototype that I am building I would be happy to have you aboard.

It is going to be pretty much the same as fig 1 of patent 4,798,661

power source will be a variac transformer / bridge rectified with all the circuit component of fig 1 that will enable matching the variables to restrict current and let voltage do its job.

(I will not be using Chin langs pulse generator as I will have to independently adjust time high and time low periods)

and a necessity for people pursuing Stanley Meyers technology is to get this material it has been invaluable for me.

http://www.nutech2000.com/category7_1.htm

What I have written above is subject to
change because it is only my understanding at present.

Murray Willis 

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

---

johnh

Posted: Sun Jan 11, 2004 7:33 am Post subject:

> **murray wrote:**
>
> so it is obvious to see now, that if the water molecule is subject to a pulsating high voltage field (electrostatic field) it will separate because it will be greater than the electrostatic bond between the atoms!!!!!!!!!!!!

I wish that was obvious to my water!!!!!
In my cells pulsating high voltage field makes no more diffence than a static low voltage field. Im sorry but this just aint so obvious. I have a hard time picturing an electrostatic bond and a covalent bond as the same thing.

JohnH

Murray

Posted: Sun Jan 11, 2004 10:11 pm Post subject:

Hi John

Fair enough, ha ha I didn't mean it to be a arrogant statement , can you explain what exactly you have performed with high voltage e.g., plate spacing, voltage level, cell and circuit construction maybe I can throw some more ideas around for ya.

Just want to help

I also changed the statment as I can see were you are coming from, thanks.

Refer Below

If the water molecule is subject to a pulsating high voltage field (electrostatic field) at the correct frequency, plate spacing, and restriction of electron flow. This hopefully will develop efficiencies above normal electrolysis.

here is a link that describes electrical attraction and electrostaic attraction of the water molecule.

http://www.aquadyntech.com/watermolecule.html

Murray Willis

Ps if you can see anything else in the post that is confusing or misleading please tell me. I am very open minded.

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

LaserLine

Posted: Mon Jan 12, 2004 1:46 am Post subject:

Murry fist off welcome to the forums. I'm really happy to see join. I'd love to help with you with your project and stuff, but it looks like I'm going to have to do a lot of reading. Great stuff though. Thanks for the post and don't hesitate to email or private msg me (using the forums at the top). I'll hosts videos, image, etc on our server, so if you need space just let me know. Now for some reading.

johnh

Posted: Mon Jan 12, 2004 2:20 am Post subject:

> **Murray wrote:**
> Hi John
>
> Fair enough, ha ha I didn't mean it to be a arrogant statement , can you explain what exactly you have performed with high voltage e.g., plate spacing, voltage level, cell and circuit construction maybe I can throw some more ideas around for ya.
>
> Just want to help
>
> .....SNIP
> .

Have msde s few cells in the past and have a squarewave generator 1 HZ to 2MegHz that i drive with a 555 timer circuit if I want duty cycle control then put the output to whatever I feel like driving . at the moment it is hooked up to another 555circuit configered as a coildriver that is putting about 2kV from a single auto coil across a 1 mm gap between two 25mm* 100 mm ss plates. I haven't kept any real test results because I am not interested in anything below a 10 time response above electrolysis and this will be reasonably easy to spot.

I am not after any theories as to what may happen or what may work. show me some results AND THEN work out a theory WHY it worked.

(edit) sorry that sounded a bit rough. I didn't mean it to sound rude but I get a bit peeved with people like Battousai1/John thinking the theory is rock solid and it only needs a bit of work on the technology to put it to work when in reality we still have nothing JH

Actually at present these cells will be neglected as I am building a Plasma electrolysis / pyrolysis cell that I hope to post some photos of in a week or two.

JohnH

Murray

Posted: Mon Jan 12, 2004 5:25 am Post subject:

Hi JohnH

Forgive me if I have came across proclaiming to know everything, I am just mostly using some quotes and trying to explain parts of Stan Meyers technology and am actually looking for different opinions from people like your self to help me expand my knowledge.

When I first started working with hydrogen, it was 90% experimenting and 10% research. It was not the best approach for me as it left me very discouraged.

Now its 10% experimenting 90% research but now I feel I have a greater chance to push through the trial and error process of experimenting to get to the ultimate goal because I feel I am close to understanding the forces at work.

I suppose everyone is different.

good luck with your future experiments.

cheers

Sincerely Murray Willis

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

---

johnh
Posted: Mon Jan 12, 2004 5:30 am Post subject:

[quote = "Murray"]

So what if we had no electrons on the negative plate?

Answer- electron flow has now been eliminated so voltage can now
raise to a extremely high, without the possibility of it arcing
because there are no ELECTRONS TO LEAK and now we have a very large voltage field without the possibility of a voltage drop(an arc)
[/quote]

AND

> **Quote:**

> "voltage is basically two points with more electrons than the other. The greater the difference in the number of electrons the higher the voltage"
>
> and if we increase voltage we increase the voltage field. quote from link above "What are the three kinds of invisible field? Gravity, magnetism.....and voltage!

Can somebody try to explain this to me please

JohnH

Murray
Posted: Tue Jan 13, 2004 1:49 am Post subject:

John

I have a drawing in my files sections at

http://groups.yahoo.com/group/wfcy2k/

it is in my file

Stan Meyer
Theories and Circuits

Titled

Stanley Meyers Water Fuel Cell Explanation

The high voltage circuit can be replaced with alternative equipment.

For the best explanation to answer you question may come from the source of where I acquired it

Stan Meyer Patent 4,798,661

http://www.fortunecity.com/greenfield/bp/16/stanleymeyer.htm

http://www.rexresearch.com/meyerhy/meyerhy.htm#4798661

I would also love to here opinions on patent 4,798,661.

Murray Willis

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

Simon
Posted: Tue Jan 13, 2004 11:58 am Post subject:

Hi Murray

Thats some really interesting stuff there! I've been caught up in the whole resonance idea ie the chin generator and havent given Stanley Meyer much of a look. Its a bit over my head at the moment and i will be continuing with the chin generator and my electrolyser like Frank Roberts, but maybe one day i'll give Stan's way a go to...

---

johnh
Posted: Tue Jan 13, 2004 6:24 pm Post subject:

> **Murray wrote:**
> John
> SNIP
>
> I would also love to here opinions on patent 4,798,661.
>
> Murray Willis

So this is actually a low voltage generator max volts of 8 if I read the patent correctly

I don't really understand the electronics -
I don't know if the SCR will actually work as drawn - unless there are smoothing capacitors across the bridge wont the SRC keep switching off? and if you put capacitors there the pulse wave form is lost.

Can't understand his assertion that the resistor 60 is connected from ground to ground unless his cells are somehow grounded that he is not showing.

> **Quote:**

> As known in electrical art the resistor will provide a complete block to electron leakage--current flow. However, since the resistor 60 is connected from ground-to-ground there is no real affect on the voltage; and since there is no connection with the positive side there is no voltage drop.

This is typical Stan talk how the devil can a resistor provide a complete block to current flow.

All in all once again I'll say leave the theory alone just give me something that works to copy

Regards

John

---

johnh

Posted: Wed Jan 14, 2004 1:59 am Post subject:

But I'm still chewing on it Murray

have you tried doing the Maths on this statement to work out a frequency for your Chin Machine

> **Quote:**
>
> **Page 1 #60 Background and Cross references**
> wherein the principle of physics that physical motion of an element between spatially positioned structures will resonate if the distance between the structures, in wavelengths, is matched to the frequency of the force causing the physical motion, is utilized in a practical and useful embodiment.

Have never thought of that as being a principle - would have thought it also depended on the elasticity of the substance and its mass but maybe he's right - for someone with the right knowledge it should be a piece of cake to work out - the measurements would have to be very accurate of course. When trying to picture this i can see it work with a tennis ball for example between two walls but would it work the same with a brick?

JohnH

Gary

Posted: Wed Jan 14, 2004 6:42 am Post subject:

Hi John, you're not alone in trying to decipher the working electronics of these schematics. I feel that something must have been lost in translation somewhere as it simply does not always make sense.

There seems to be many inconsistencies in the text too!

Murray has provided more info on the SM wfc than I have seen before, so I've been going thru it bit by bit, noting my points of confusion - and there are alot!

I do think that the schematics and pulse depictions must be oversimplified - it simply isn't that easy. The text also talks about the parallel resonant cct, and later about the series resonant cct. It's not a parallel cct that is depicted in the schematics, but it is a series LC cct with effectively the internal resistance of the electrolyte in parallel to the capacitor (capacitance of the wfc).

Much confusion arises from the fact that a resonant cct is usually referred to in conjunction with an AC signal. Furthermore a series resonant LC cct provides low impedance at the frequency of resonance, where we would surely require a high impedance in order to maintain a high voltage. But then, perhaps resonance in terms of the wfc is not talking about the cct resonating as such.

I've been trying to figure out what is happening (or supposed to happen) by determining what exactly the electronics are doing in relation to what the text describes - but it just gets more confusing!

The cct is basically that of a Low Pass filter, with the dielectric resistance of the electrolyte/water as the load. And as a low pass filter, the resistive element of the electrolyte/water would provide high resistance to high frequencies, while the capacitive element of the wfc would provide low impedance to high frequencies.

But what I am struggling with is the fact that the text would suggest two things are been done, that don't really work together.

Firstly, it is stated that the voltage pulses are step charging the wfc (capacitor) to a point where the dielectric breakdown voltage of the water is achieved and so momentarily maximum current will flow. Pulse frequencies would certainly not be that critical for simply step charging.

And secondly, the dc voltage pulses and duty cycle (which??) are at a frequency at which the distance between the plate electrodes exactly matches the wavelength of the pulse frequency to achieve what is termed as "resonance". However, at the suggested 1.5 mm plate spacing this would require a frequency of 200GHz!! And any mention of frequencies tends to be around the 41KHz-45KHz range! So what's that all about??

What have these two concepts got to do with each other here? Surely we can only do one or the other... can't we??

Its all very confusing, and surely simply step charging the wfc can have no bearing on "resonance" whatsoever, as this simply builds an ever increasing voltage potential across the electrodes.

The diode in the cct simply acts to stop the wfc discharging thru the inductors and hence current flowing backwards and so reversing the electrode polarities.

But I'm struggling with the inductors. In an AC cct they would work. But as they depend on the current flowing back and forth to operate as a choke (resisting current flow) or as a tuning component. I fail to see what they are achieving here.

One passage from the text says, quote:

"The primary coil of the torroidal is subject to a 50% duty cycle pulse. Blah, blah, blah... As the stepped-up pulse enters the first inductor (formed from 100 turns of 24 guage wire 1 inch in diameter), an electromagnetic field is formed around the inductor, voltage is switched off when the pulse ends, and the field collapses and produces another pulse of the same polarity, ie., another pulse is formed where the 50% duty cycle was

terminated. Thus a double pulse frequency is produced."

I know for a fact that when the electromagnetic field of an inductor collapses, a current is induced in reverse of one that created the field in the first place, and hence the seconadary voltage is also reversed.

A lot of misleading ideas, not only poorly worded and confusing, but I believe scientifically flawed throughout. What it basically comes down to is a complete mish-mash of theories!

But don't let me put anyone off... I'm still having a crack at it. I will be doing my own tests though to determine the myths and magic from the reality!

_____
regards, Gary.

Gary
Posted: Wed Jan 14, 2004 11:45 am Post subject:

---

deleted duplicate post

_____
regards, Gary.

Gary
Posted: Wed Jan 14, 2004 11:47 am Post subject:

Just been playing around with some capacitance formulae, and from my calculations, given the dielectric constant of water to be 20, with 0.06 sq.m of electrode plate surface area (equivalent to 20cm x 30cm), spaced at 1mm apart would give a capacitance of approximately 9nF.

Now, to achieve resonance in an LC (inductor/capacitor) series cct as depicted, the reactance of the inductor must match that of the capacitor. Further LC calcultions gave me an inductance value of 1.52mH in series with our 9nF capacitor to give a resonant frequency of 43KHz!

However, you can forget about the spacing between the plates matching the resonant frequency wavelength as the wavelength at this frequency is nearly a kilometer!!

Furthermore, the calculations above are based on an AC signal, I still do not see how a LC cct can actually resonate with dc pulses, as the whole idea of resonance relies on the alternating cycle of continual charging and discharging of the capacitor thru the coil, along with the continual building and colapse of the electromagnetic field generated around the inductor. And don't forget that in an LC series cct, impedance is at minimum during resonance, ie., allowing maximum current flow, minimum voltage.

However, the figures above (forgeting the plate spacing = wavelength nonsense) would suggest that the wfc figures are closely based on series LC formulae - however wrongly applied they may be.

Seems to me the harder you look into this stuff the more flaws become apparent.

You appear to know your stuff, John. What do you think?

_____
regards, Gary.

---

johnh
Posted: Wed Jan 14, 2004 3:06 pm Post subject:

Hi Gary

Thanks for the explanations

I only know enough electronics to get myself into trouble but yes from a standard electronics theory point of yiew it is very confusing - and seeing it does not appear to work put together as drawn and described from a non-standard view it is flawed also.

One thing is very clear and that is there is a lot of differences between this patent 4 798 661 and all the others - here we have none of the coils or inductors. it just appears to be pulsed low voltage to the cell - but the explanation is still wacky. Anyway Im going to have a go at putting it together with one variable distance plate cell as depicted

regards

JohnH

Murray
Posted: Thu Jan 15, 2004 1:27 am Post subject:

Hi Gary and everyone

thanks for your comments

Gary wrote

Furthermore, the calculations above are based on an AC signal, I still do not see how a LC cct can actually resonate with dc pulses, as the whole idea of resonance relies on the alternating cycle of continual charging and discharging of the capacitor thru the coil, along with the continual building and colapse of the electromagnetic field generated around the inductor. And don't forget that in an LC series cct, impedance is at minimum during resonance, ie., allowing maximum current flow, minimum voltage.

I am not working on Voltage intensifier Circuit Patent
4,936,961 but this link may help understand dc resonant charging

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

It may only be helpful in raising the voltage level

here is a extract from my original post

Voltage intensifier Circuit Patent
4,936,961

The VIC circuit is very similar but it uses a variable inductor as a
resonant charging choke. The variable inductor is tuned so that it
will develop a LARGE MAGNETIC FIELD TO CHOKE OF ELECTRON FLOW instead of using a resistor.

The diode and the other inductor act as a voltage and frequency
multiplier. the VIC circuit is the best for doing the job, but patent
4,798,661 is the easiest to duplicate though - in my opinion.

what I have written there is based on the video tapes I have bought (in house meeting in New Zealand, that Stan attended, were he was asked many questions concerning this circuit).

I agree with you Gary resonance is confusing because I also can't see anything resonating. But Stan has left a good clue I believe with the resonate cavity interfacing as you will find referece in many patents and this usually happens once a certain voltage level is achieved as you will see in fig 8 of 4798661 voltage level 13.I have not had a great deal of time to look into it but it has alot to do with particle impact at a certain voltage level as I have read and heard Stan talk about during the resonant action
.

I will give a in depth post into this when I get time I am Studying at the moment for work.

I will try to explain again in slightly different way how the covalent bond of the water molecule is separated efficently without or with little electron/current flow

1 A capacitor is a well known for electrostatics in its ability to hold charge

2 At the Atomic level the electrons in a substances will become distorted during this electrostatic effect on the capacitor.

link http://www.tpub.com/neets/book2/3.htm

3 At a high voltage level electrons may be stripped thus disrupting/weakening the bond between a polar molecule. the two unlike atoms will disassociate and go towards there attractive sides(opposite) depending on the positive or negative state.

4 free floating electrons may help to produce gas beyond normal limits

5 this may be all very dependent on frequency and pulse off periods but higher voltage and restriction of current by means of a resistor or inductor is critical to raise voltage across the plates to a level that may not be normally possible because of the voltage drop due to an arc. as I have previously written about in my original post.

here's some good info on electrostatics that I am currently reading

http://www.techlib.com/science/electrostatics.html

I don't see this as being a simple task to reproduce but I live in hope. That with persistence and hard work, good well planed and recorded experiments I will one day achieve some results.

I realize that this technology will be lost if we don't share it, so people please don't fall into greed and share it openly. As I owe what I have learnt from others at many forums and I feel I have a responsibility to share it.

cheers Murray

What I have written above is subject to
change because it is only my understanding at present.

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

Gary
Posted: Thu Jan 15, 2004 5:30 am Post subject:

Hi Murray, every little bit helps, and parts of the puzzle keep falling into place.

Would recommend everyone take a look at Murrays richieburnet link in his post above.

Some good stuff there Murray. The resonant charging circuit is interesting, and I can see exactly how this works. Explanations and diagrams make this very easy to follow and easy to understand.

However, (and, I know... here we go again) this cct applies to a Tesla coil, where the primary winding of the Tesla coil is a major component in creating a resonant cct with the tank capacitor. Yes, here they do have a resonant cct, and resonance is achieved every time the spark conducts current across the rotary gap, but SM's wfc has not got this coil in parallel to the wfc (capacitor) or a firing gap!

As far as I can see SM's original cct (fig.1, page 4) is only a voltage doubling and charging cct. The charge across the wfc can only ever be twice that of the supply voltage, and can't keep stepping up indefinitely. Furthermore, once the capacitor has charged to twice the voltage, that's it! Nothing more can happen, no pulsing voltages, no resonance... nothing! In this cct it doesn't matter what the input voltage frequency is as there is

simply no resonant cct here!

In Figure 1 on page 31, however, SM has completely done away with the inductors altogether and instead uses a thyristor and variable resistor in series with the wfc? I see know way to achieve any kind of resonance without an inductor in the cct!!

I would also conclude that the pulse waveforms depicted are misleading as the cct quite clearly shows a simple full wave bridge rectifier which will give the parabolic shape of a standard half sinosoidal waveform! Again, look at the richieburnet stuff to see exactly what I mean.

I would say that the whole principle of the two ccts mentioned here are completely different, and the long-winded description of the working of the non-inductor cct reads to me as gobledygook at present. Though I am still trying to pry out any important hidden little gems of treasure from within the continuously conflicting information.

One thing I believe though: If it was just a simple matter of increasing the voltage to a very high potential and relying simply on the electrostatic field to pull apart the molecules of water, then industry might just have cottoned on to this by now and be doing this instead of piping through hundreds of amps of current!

Anyway, keep at it, we have to take the good with the bad. One day someone may just fluke it by experimenting.

_____
regards, Gary.

---

johnh
Posted: Thu Jan 15, 2004 6:08 am Post subject:

Hi Gary

I know its been said before but what if the resonance that is being described is in the water molecule - not in the circuit.

Take the classic resonance of the child on the swing,or a clock pendulum - the cycle can quite easily be started and driven with a DC pulse It just needs a little kick at the same time in the same direction and the momentum keeps going. and of course if the kick is greater than the energy lost in friction etc the amplitude will become greater and greater. Take a look at Teslas resonance experiments when he nearly flattened a whole suburb. maybe the same thing can happen here..... drive the molecule back and forth between the attracting and repulsing plates at increasing amplitude until the bond lets go then the pause in duty cycle comes along to let things relax then the cycle starts again.
(I will have to find the references but I think there are instances of mechanical cleavage of a covalent bond being less energy intensive than electrical separation - I think this may be in the theory of vortex and cavitation water heaters)

EDIT SEE
http://guns.connect.fi/innoplaza/energy/story/Kanarev/generator/index.html first 3 paragraphs of introduction

Anyway I said I wasn't going to form any theories until I had some results  so I'd better crawl back to my workshop and stop the windage.

regards

John

Gary

Posted: Thu Jan 15, 2004 8:23 am Post subject:

Not intending to be so negative, John, just trying to open peoples eyes as to some of the flaws as I perceive them.

I know there are people such as yourself and Murray that are applying a lot of effort into this. I just wouldn't want good people to waste too much time going down the wrong track due to a lack of understanding of the more obvious processes.

Of course there will always be the totally uneducated that continue in blind ignorance of the science involved. But I'm not knocking them either, as it might just be that their lack of scientific knowledge provides them with a completely clean slate and no preconceived ideas to hinder the imagination. It might just be that one of these people come at the problem from an altogether different angle and get results!

Sometimes it is easier to see what isn't or can't be happening, rather than what is or maybe happening.

To date the Kanarev link looks to me to be the most promising, but the plasma stuff looks interesting too! Throw in the Tesla Coil and a VandeGraaf generator and theres some pretty exciting stuff to be experimenting with!

PS. I understand the idea behind the pendulum, but to make it work you need to have a pendulum in the first place!

_____

regards, Gary.

---

johnh

Posted: Thu Jan 15, 2004 8:45 am Post subject:

> **Gary wrote:**
>
> PS. I understand the idea behind the pendulum, but to make it work you need to have a pendulum in the first place!

Don't you think that something bouncing between two plates could act the same?

like the old bat games on a computer

John

Gary

Posted: Thu Jan 15, 2004 3:16 pm Post subject:

I certainly do John, but I can't see that anything is bouncing! A bounce would imply an object moving oneway and then coming back. Nothing here comes back!

Provide a +ve voltage pulse and you get the kick, a static field builds on the plates and the water molecule aligns +ve/-ve, ok, fair enough. The pulse stops and the action is temporarily halted until the next +ve dc pulse once again aligns the H2O. But on no occasion would there appear to be any bounce as such from this scenario as the dc pulse never goes -ve.

What will be happening, assuming that the wfc is NOT acting as a capacitor and holding a charge, is that the ac fullwave rectified dc pulse will rise from 0V at the beginning of its pulse phase, to a maximum voltage (the peak supply voltage) and back again down to 0V before the next pulse starts. So we don't get a +ve/-ve pulse, rather a +ve/0V pulse.

This pulsing action may well have some bearing on the dissassociation of the water molecule, but this is where the mystery lies.

One thing for sure tho', if the wfc is acting as a capacitor as is stated on numerous occasions, then this will mean it will hold its charge. In which case the voltage pulsing effect simply keeps the capacitor fully charged and hence pulse frequency becomes largely irrelevant! Also bear in mind that the resonant charging ccts only purpose is to double the voltage and keep the capacitor fully charged!!

This is where much of the info comes into conflict with itself:

Is SM's wfc design a capacitor or is it a so-called resonant cavity? It doesn't seem to be able to make it's mind up!

If its the latter, it would not require a resonant charging cct at all - just provide whatever voltage you need at the correct dc pulse frequency!

If its the former then you just have a fully charged, capacitor with nowhere to discharge.

Loving the challenge tho' and can't wait to getting building again in my workshed when the weather gets a little warmer.

Sometimes I find I need to take a break with all this stuff and give my brain a time to clear, before I disappear up my own arsehole.

Pays to stand back from time to time and ask yourself what's wrong with this picture?

We'll get there. Regards Gary

_____
regards, Gary.

Murray
Posted: Fri Jan 16, 2004 12:10 am Post subject:

Gary

Thanks for your reply, I agree and came to the same conclusion a while ago about the dc resonate circuit.

I don't know if you have done this experiment but it's cool and is a great visual effect of electrostatics on water

I am getting stronger effects from using a Styrofoam cup and rubbing it against glass.

from link

http://www.sciencemadesimple.com/static.html

Bending waterWhat you need:
a hard rubber or plastic comb, or a balloon
a sink and water faucet.
What to do:
Turn on the faucet so that the water runs out in a small, steady stream, about 1/8 inch thick.
Charge the comb by running it through long, dry hair several times or rub it vigorously on a sweater.
Slowly bring the comb near the water and watch the water "bend."
This project can also be done with a balloon.
What happened: The neutral water was attracted to the charged comb, and moved towards it.

A interesting thing though is the water molecule is a dipole (positive and negative side) so exposing as Stanley Meyer has to opposite attraction field makes sense because voltage does not have to be consumed, it is just potential energy.

you might also find figure 9 of patent USP # 4,826,581 ~ Controlled Process for the Production of Thermal Energy from Gases Interesting

http://www.rexresearch.com/meyerhy/meyerhy.htm#4826581

Do you see what I see the "variable inductor", replacing the resistive element.(tuned to choke of electron flow)

and also the primariy and secondary are joined to earth on the step up transformer similar to a ignition coil for obvious reasons.

just a thought

The dc resonant charging choke is probably wound to match 60hz input freq to cause the dc resonate charging effect (I am not saying it's resonating anything within the water molecule)

I have not really given much thought.(get back to that later on)

have you got any of this information

http://www.nutech2000.com/category7_1.htm

I would like to send you a copy of the hours worth of video footage I have on Stan meyer once I get it on to VCD but the hydrogen fracturing process book would use a Forrest worth of trees to photocopy it, so you might have to buy it, If you want it. (alot more info than the patents).

I have promised other I would do the same for them, don't worry everyone.

I am going to really have to stop posting for a while as I have too knuckle down and concentrate on studding for work (radio software communication stuff, its a headache)

bye for a while 

Ps Thats enough theory time for me. time to experiment and get some tests done.

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

Gary
Posted: Fri Jan 16, 2004 2:36 am Post subject:

Like I said Murray sometimes you have to give your brain a rest from this stuff anyway.

Just realised why the 77 pages I printed from the rexresearch is so often confusing. It seems that much of the info are reports and articles produced from old SM demonstrations, so not all of the info is "straight from the horses mouth", so as to speak.

This might be why there seems to be so many conflicting statements. Much then may be down to misinterpretation or lack of understanding of actual demonstrations. We might also be witnessing the Chinese Whisper effect too!

Don't work too hard Murray, all the best. Gary

John,

you might be right about the mechanical destruction of the water molecules. I think that old Stans adustable excitor plates might just be a vice, and he's simply squashing those little blighters!

_____
regards, Gary.

---

johnh
Posted: Fri Jan 16, 2004 9:14 am Post subject:

> **Gary wrote:**
>
> you might be right about the mechanical destruction of the water molecules. I think that old Stans adustable excitor plates might just be a vice, and he's simply squashing those little blighters!

That sounds emminently reasonable

This is a reply I wrote earlier but my connection dropped out

> **Gary wrote:**
> I certainly do John, but I can't see that anything is bouncing! A bounce would imply an object moving oneway and then coming back. Nothing here comes back!
>
> Provide a +ve voltage pulse and you get the kick, a static field builds on the plates and the water molecule aligns +ve/-ve, ok, fair enough. The pulse stops and the action is temporarily halted until the next +ve dc pulse once again aligns the H2O. But on no occasion would there appear to be any bounce as such from this scenario as the dc pulse never goes -ve.

I understand what you are saying Gary but that is like saying that if I hit a tennis ball against a brick wall it wont come back because there is no racquet to hit it.
What I am saying is that**IF** there is an acceleration of the water molecule from the DC pulse with an elastic distortion then it meets a solid object (a steel molecule in the opposite polarity plate) Then maybe seeing as the accelerating force is now switched off the molecule will be "bounced" back with no pulse to drive it.

Just had another thought - the hydrogen atom of course is able to enter into the steel matrix because of its small size but the oxygen is unable to. So can the oxygen get bounced back and the hydrogen get trapped in the steel for an instant like in metal hydride storage. Sort of like a molecular sieve.
John

Battousai1
Posted: Fri Jan 16, 2004 9:35 am Post subject:

Hi Murray! This is the first time I read this thread and thanks to this thread of yours I gain a "renewed insights" in the watercar project..

I would like to ask how does a Stun Gun work and how does it produces so much voltage? like around 500,000+Volts?

sorry for the qestion though, its because after reading the "high voltage requirement" I just remembered the "stun gun thing" even if it has nothing to do with electrolysis... but can you use its high voltage yield in the electolysis process?

I will still re-read 3 times the infos you posted and the links also inorder for me to grasp the true nature of the "real world" and not just making theories based on my simple understanding of electrolysis. Im starting to realize that Im already learning new things here.. and hoping that someday I will be able to understand things beyond plain and simple electronics.

Dave

Posted: Fri Jan 16, 2004 10:08 am Post subject:

> **johnh wrote:**
>
> > **Gary wrote:**
> >
> > you might be right about the mechanical destruction of the water molecules. I think that old Stans adustable excitor plates might just be a vice, and he's simply squashing those little blighters!
>
> That sounds emminently reasonable
>
> This is a reply I wrote earlier but my connection dropped out
>
> > **Gary wrote:**
> > I certainly do John, but I can't see that anything is bouncing! A bounce would imply an object moving oneway and then coming back. Nothing here comes back!
> >
> > Provide a +ve voltage pulse and you get the kick, a static field builds on the plates and the water molecule aligns +ve/-ve, ok, fair enough. The pulse stops and the action is temporarily halted until the next +ve dc pulse once again aligns the H2O. But on no occasion would there appear to be any bounce as such from this scenario as the dc pulse never goes -ve.

I understand what you are saying Gary but that is like saying that if I hit a tennis ball against a brick wall it wont come back because there is no racquet to hit it.
What I am saying is that**IF** there is an acceleration of the water molecule from the DC pulse with an elastic distortion then it meets a solid object (a steel molecule in the opposite polarity plate) Then maybe seeing as the accelerating force is now switched off the molecule will be "bounced" back with no pulse to drive it.

> **Quote:**
>
> Just had another thought - the hydrogen atom of course is able to enter into the steel matrix because of its small size but the oxygen is unable to. So can the oxygen get bounced back and the hydrogen get trapped in the steel for an instant like in metal hydride storage. Sort of like a molecular sieve.
> John

Hi John I think you have hit on it,have had the same feeling over
months of testing the electroded have to be conditioned.

Dave

Gary

Posted: Fri Jan 16, 2004 11:50 am Post subject:

Now that's what I call thinking outside of the BOX!

Problem is, this would imply that whole molecules of water accelerate to an electrode, (which one?) but as a balanced molecule it is neither +ve or -ve, but neutral overall. This isn't like murrays comb by the tap water where the comb only exhibits a -ve charge. We also have the +ve electrode neutralising the effect of the -ve.

Or are you thinking that only the molecules near the -ve electrode close enough to have the hydrogen atom inserted into the steel will see this happen?

Bit like someone being blown in the wind and getting their head stuck between two railings!

Only thought here is that the s steel is used specifically because of its inertness in the electrolyte/water environment and so you would not really expect this to happen or else this would also surely be evident during normal high voltage electrolysis.

Always pays to do some lateral thinking. Interesting idea John and worth further consideration me thinks!

_____
regards, Gary.

Murray
Posted: Fri Jan 16, 2004 3:22 pm Post subject:

G'day Battousai1

There is definitely alot of info to try and make sense of with Stan Meyer. I hope some of my info helps and is accurate to some degree.

Definitely read the links and the info I have provided and closely look at the circuits and decide which you would prefer to build at present I will be concentrating on fig 1 of patent 4, 798,661.

Different subject - Was Stanley Meyers brother a General in the USA army. I think I saw him on the news tonight visiting John Howard about the Star wars defense program.

Bye for a while.

Murray

Ps.....without the Internet for resource and reference material I don't know were I would be, probably board shitless!!. I believe it's all out there we just got to know where to look and which path to take with this technology. But I feel electrostatics play a major role

Just my opinion

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

Murray
Posted: Fri Jan 16, 2004 3:47 pm Post subject:

I just thought I would post this

Another Free Energy Researcher Dies
From: "Terry J. Blanton" <commengr@bellsouth.net>
Date: Sun, 29 Mar 1998 14:35:23 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 29 Mar 1998 18:16:31 -0500
Subject: Another Free Energy Researcher Dies

Posts regarding the death of Stanley Meyer:

(from Vortex-L listerserver)

<><><><><><><><><><><>

Vortexians:

I just called the funeral home listed in the announcement of Meyer's death. I used directory information to get the number. The gentleman there at Evans Funeral Home confirms that Meyer had indeed died and that there was a service there. I hope this ends speculation about the reality of Meyer's death.

Gene Mallove

Dr. Eugene F. Mallove, Editor-in-Chief Infinite Energy Magazine Cold Fusion Technology, Inc. PO Box 2816 Concord, NH 03302

Phone: 603-228-4516
Fax: 603-224-5975
editor@infinite-energy.com

http://www.infinite-energy.com

<><><><><><><><><><><><><><>

And from Rich Murray <rmforall@earthlink.net>

SERVICE HELD FOR GROVE CITY INVENTOR

March 27, 1998

A memorial service was held last night for a Grove City inventor who was dead on arrival at Mount Carmel Medical Center after he became ill last Friday night at a Grove City restaurant.

Stanley A. Meyer, 57, suffered a ruptured brain aneurysm, said Dr. William Adrion, Franklin County coroner. However, Adrion will wait for results of a toxicology examination before ruling on the cause of death, said Capt. Dennis Deskins of the Grove City police department.

For at least the past 20 years, Meyer has been working on a water fuel cell, a process that he claimed could cheaply remove massive amounts of hydrogen from water and create fuel for everything from automobile engines to power plants and spaceships.

Meyer's wife, Marilyn, other relatives and his attorney refused to comment. The memorial service was held at Evans Funeral Home, 4171 E. Livingston Ave. ++++++++++++++++++++++++++

Received by H2OPWRD@aol.com Friday 3/27/98 9:30PM

Hello,

I've noticed your posts in sci.energy.hydrogen concerning Stan Meyer's water fuel cell technology. Thought you might be interested that he passed away last Friday.

He was eating dinner at a Grove City, OH restaurant, when he jumped up from the table, yelled that he'd been poisoned, and rushed out into the parking lot, where he collapsed and died.

He had just secured funding for a $50 million research center near Grove City, and there was a police cordon set up around the land where the center was to be built and around his home.

Eyewitnesses reported a number of local police and "men talking to their sleeves" at the house. His widow, family, and lawyer had no comment for the local press.

Murray

ps he could have died from normal causes but you can't help being suspicious

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

Murray
Posted: Fri Jan 16, 2004 4:11 pm Post subject:

G'day all

electrstatics 

worth a read

http://community-2.webtv.net/RICHARDPORTER2/FREEENERGY/

ALSO

http://community-2.webtv.net/RICHARDPORTER/MADWEBTVSCIENTIST/

extract.....

The surprisingly simple "hydrogen fuel reactor" system on this engine allowed it to run on a mixture of 95% water and 5% gasoline. The above picture was taken from a camcorder video taped presentation that I

participated in on 10/10/02.

bye for now

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

---

johnh
Posted: Sat Jan 17, 2004 1:18 am Post subject:

Cell construction

Does Stanley say anywhere what the cell should be made from?
what I mean is the actual container

I can find no reference to anything yet.

Thanks
John

Gary
Posted: Sun Jan 18, 2004 6:19 am Post subject:

Hi John, if you go to:

http://www.rexresearch.com/meyerhy/meyerhy.htm

I printed off all 77 A4 pages of SM stuff here, and on my page 6/77 it says the preffered construction material for the capacitor plates is ss T-304.

I actually spent all of Saturday going over this stuff, particularly SM's 4936961 patent (my pages 3/11 of 77) and have concluded now, that most of the critical data has been left out with various interpretations of what exactly is happening varying widely and so just adding to the confusion. But, I beleive I may possibly have figured out exactly what is supposed to be happening and why!

Firstly though, as a matter of inconsistency within the texts. My page 2/77, states that current levels would appear to be of no greater than one tenth of an amp (100mA), with the voltage pulsed at 10's of thousands of volts. But even at this current and for example 20KV, this would create 2000W of dissipated power within the water which would be like switching on a kettle. However, my page 9/77 indicates that the voltage reaches around only 1000V!

I think that the idea is to (theoretically anyway) totally restrict the flow of current, and stop any kind of normal

electrolysis occuring, hence the resistor on the cathode shown in some ccts. And, the higher the voltage the better, as long as we can virtually eliminate this current flow. The purer the water the less impurities to carry this unwanted current and the higher the voltage achievable before dielectric breakdown occurs.

The voltage is stepped up by a supply transformer to lets say, for example, 500 volts. The ac element (if using an ac power source) is then reomoved by the fullwave bridge rectifier, 4 diode set up, giving dc voltage pulses. The voltage pulse first develops across the series charging inductor but reduces as current flows to charge up the capacitor (wfc plates). The capacitor charges up to 500V (the supply voltage), but as it is does so, the magnetic field around the series charging inductor colapses and induces a further 500v further charging the capacitor to 1000v (twice the supply voltage).

So we have 1000v of potential across the capacitor plates, and quite a good electrostatic field. This electrostatic field can be increased by moving the plates (electrodes, excitors) closer together as SM does, until the point comes whereby the dielectric breakdown voltage of the water is reached and the water shorts out. However, we don't want this to happen as this is effectively normal high current (high power) electrolysis - hence the resistor in series with the cathode to hinder current flow and prevent runaway current flow should the potential be over-reached and dielectric breakdown occurs.

What we actually want is to achieve the voltage just before the dielectric breakdown occurs in order that we have maximum potential to pull apart the oxygen, hydrogen bonds O:H:H (not H:OH as in normal electrolysis).

What would theoretically happen then is that the hydrogen ions, now each short of and electron and so +ve charged, (this is assuming that the oxygen has pinched both the H electrons and is itself 2-vely charged) would migrate to the cathode and the oxygen to the anode to get electrically neutralised by the charges on the plates. This would also then, reduce the charges on the plates, and so too the electrostatic field intensity, which would then require topping up by another voltage pulse.

Hence in this scenario the capacitor continually discharges, not by current flow, but by the charges being taken away from the charged plates by the O and H atoms that have themselves been prised apart by the electrostatic field intensity. The H & O atoms once neutralised rise to the surface and leave the liquid as gases!

This seems to make some sense to me given the circuitry SM has given us to work with, but there are still a couple of grey areas.

Firstly, what is the voltage required to create enough potential to pull apart the water molecule and at what plate distance is this electrostatic field strong enough to do this? And, secondly where or how does pulse frequency come into play other than keeping the capacitor topped up to Vmax?

Stan's adjustable excitor plates make use of the fact that the electrostatic field strength is directly in proportion to the plate spacing. The closer the distance, the greater the electrostatic field intensity for any given voltage. The higher the voltage the more play you will get in the adjustment, so the easier to tune correctly!

Is any of this making sense to anyone?

My big problem, as always, is the frequency of the voltage pulses, the so-called resonance frequency. My theory here is that as the electrostatic charges are taken from the plates by the disassociated H:H & O atoms, there is an optimum frequency at which the charge to the capacitor plates can be replaced. This would cause a pulsing electrostaic field as the charges are taken and then quickly replaced. However, as the capacitor is never fully discharged this electrostatic field would perhaps only be resonating from say (and I'm only guessing here), 900v to 1000v, so effectively there would be a 900v constant potential accross the capacitor, continually aligning the dipole water molecule and pulling at its bonds, pulsed with a 100v top up charge!

OK, guys, that's it. That is how I believe old Stan's device is supposed to work.

One further point that I am now dismissing altogether - or at least until I've had chance to build the above device and test it - is the distance between the plates having anything to do with the pulse frequency wavelength. Quite simply, none of the figures add up, especially given the following relationships between electromagnetic radiation frequency to wavelength:

10KHz = 30Km
50KHz = 6Km
100KHz = 3Km
1MHz = 300m
10MHz = 30m
100MHz = 3m
1GHz = 30cm
10GHz = 3cm
100GHz = 3mm !!!

All the best, Gary

_____
regards, Gary.

---

johnh
Posted: Sun Jan 18, 2004 3:52 pm Post subject:

> **Gary wrote:**
> Hi John, if you go to:
>
> http://www.rexresearch.com/meyerhy/meyerhy.htm
>
> I printed off all 77 A4 pages of SM stuff here, and on my page 6/77 it says the preffered construction material for the capacitor plates is ss T-304.

But is the actual container a conductor or a di-electric.

> **Quote:**
>
> So we have 1000v of potential across the capacitor plates, and quite a good electrostatic field. This electrostatic field can be increased by moving the plates (electrodes, excitors) closer together as SM does, until the point comes whereby the dielectric breakdown voltage of the water is reached and the water shorts out. However, we don't want this to happen as this is effectively normal high current (high power) electrolysis - hence the resistor in series with the cathode to hinder current flow and prevent runaway current flow should the potential be over-reached and dielectric breakdown occurs.
>
> Gary

I don't think this is correct Gary
in normal electrolysis the di-electric has not broken down. in fact because of the electrolyte it never existed if we ran this sort of voltage in an electrolyte we would just get resistive heating.
What we have here is an ionization path forming and then an arc striking creating a plasma ball along the arc path. The ionization event may be exactly what we want and there may be a better way to achieve the switching point at breakdown with better electronic design.
What I am saying is this may be what occurs EVERY CYCLE and SM found one way to achieve it. It may not be the best way.
Regards
John

Gary
Posted: Sun Jan 18, 2004 4:33 pm Post subject:

Hi john, don't think that the container is that important, as long as its not a conductor - or unless you intend to incorporate it into the design as an electrode like the Carl Cella stuff.

Some kind of strong plastic like a battery casing or large glass vase or jar will work fine. SM's depicted cell just has a window in it which enables him to fire a laser thru, apparently to aid gas production.

Yes, you are right about that ionization not being the same as normal electrolysis, I was just saying that as arcing occurs, high current flows in the way that it does in normal electrolysis. Hadn't paid much heed to that paragraph as that part was not foremost in my thoughts or indeed critical in personal analysis of SM's wfc.

Do you agree or disagree with the other points?

I think if it is the ionization point we were looking for, then the cct to control this would be far more complicated than anything I have ever seen of Stans. Not only this, even pulsed this would mean incredibly large current surges, certainly not the milliamps he refers to.

I might very well be wrong, but I just can't see the charging components or the excitor plates lasting very long with constant high current arcing! And that cathode resistor would get bloody hot very quickly!

regards, Gary

_____
regards, Gary.

---

johnh
Posted: Mon Jan 19, 2004 12:17 am Post subject:

> **Gary wrote:**

> Hi john, don't think that the container is that important, as long as its not a conductor - or unless you intend to incorporate it into the design as an electrode like the Carl Cella stuff.
>
> Some kind of strong plastic like a battery casing or large glass vase or jar will work fine.

I thought the problem was that we cant get anything to work fine!

> **Quote:**
>
> Do you agree or disagree with the other points?

I cant agree with the scenario but have no better idea of what is happening

What is your rational for supposing that the hydrogen becomes a positive ion ?

why would the hydrogen and oxygen ions migrate apart when they are highly attractive?

If the hydrogen became negative - picked up an extra electron it then becomes repulsive to the oxygen

Sorry lots of questions and no help - think I'll go back to the workshop!

regards

John

Gary

Posted: Mon Jan 19, 2004 3:27 am Post subject:

Hi John, my rationalisation coming up!

"Why would the hydrogen and oxygen ions migrate apart when they are highly attractive?" Because we have pulled them apart with an electrostatic field intensity which is greater than their bond field strength!

Unlike normal electrolysis, where one Hydrogen H atom is split from the hydroxide OH molecule, losing its electron so becoming a +ve H ion (the OH now being -ve), Stan's depictions show both Hydrogen atoms being prised from the Oxygen atom.

Now, assuming that the Oxygen atom retains both of the Hydrogens electrons (because they are in a higher energy level orbit of the oxygen), then we have a 2-ve oxygen ion and two x 1+ve hydrogen ions, which after being pulled apart from the water molecule by the intense electrostatic field then quickly migrate to the charged plates which provide a greater -ve attraction than the molecular bonds did.

This might also explain the production of monatomic hydrogen as referred to in some articles, because as +ve ions, the hydrogen would not bond together immediately to form H2 (they couldn't as neither has any electrons to share at present, and are in any case both +ve, so repellent toward each other).

Some of these hydrogen ions might rise to the surface and escape the liquid confines during migration. Some

hydrogen ions may also, on reaching the massively negatively charged cathode pick up two electrons from the abundance of electrons on the plate, rather just one each and sharing, and thus leave the liquid as monatomic hydrogen 1-ve ions.

I admit that this theory could be wrong, but it works for me (at present anyway) as being the most logical way of explaining what is or maybe occuring in Stan's wfc.

Not trying to convince anyone I'm 100% right here, just throwing in my theory for you guys to take apart!

regards, Gary.

_____
regards, Gary.

Murray
Posted: Mon Jan 19, 2004 4:31 am Post subject:

Gary

extract (you wrote)

I believe I may possibly have figured out exactly what is supposed to be happening and why!

I think that the idea is to (theoretically anyway) totally restrict the flow of current, and stop any kind of normal electrolysis occurring, hence the resistor on the cathode shown in some ccts. And, the higher the voltage the better, as long as we can virtually eliminate this current flow. The purer the water the less impurities to carry this unwanted current and the higher the voltage achievable before dielectric breakdown occurs.

The rest of the post is pretty much what I have been trying to point out all along.

Have a look at all my posts

You figured it out did you

I don't really care, you can take the credit, but I joined the forum to work as a team.

oh well I hope everone sees what Gary and I are pointing out because it is excitting suff

Murray Willis

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

Gary
Posted: Mon Jan 19, 2004 8:56 am Post subject:

Whoa! Calm down Murray, I'm not trying to take credit for anything here - I really couldn't care less.

The invention if it works is already there in black and white, its just deciphering its bloody operation in practice that is the problem

It's only my interpretation of things as I now understand it after I spent all saturday trying to analyse the function of the cct and match it to confusing text gobbledegook. Simply my explanation of the theory of SM's capacitance cell and cct as depicted. Most of the info I waded thru came by via your links anyway.

I really didn't realise that it so closely followed your view of it. In fact I seem to remember us disagreeing on quite a few points in the past. John doesn't seem to agree, anyway!

Quite frankly, I'd be amazed if we suddenly see eye to eye on all aspects of this!?

I certainly don't recall anyone talking about a partially charged capacitor being topped up by a dc voltage pulse as the H:H & O ions take charges away from the electrodes! Or the resulting top up pulse voltage being only the difference between the supply voltage and the charge still held by the capacitor. And, I have no free floating electrons or electrons being stripped from their orbits around atoms!

Furthermore, this explanation only accounts for the adjustable plate electrode wfc. The resonant cavity concentric tube wfc is altogether another beast, and I'm still struggling with that due to the high frequencies necessary to create a reasonably short wavelength.

I'm all for putting our heads together, especially when we find some common ground as we seem to have done here. If we're in agreement on most points now, then all well and good - but it doesn't mean that it will work!

Anyway, as I said, I only thought that this was perhaps the idea behind the intended operation of this particular SM wfc. A lot still seems to depend on whether or not a pulsing voltage will have the required effect and of course at what frequency.

Just all theory to me at present until I can get out to my workshed and do some practical.

Still friends??

All the best.

Gary

_____
regards, Gary.

Murray
Posted: Tue Jan 20, 2004 12:58 am Post subject:

Hi Gary

Sorry mate, bad day at work, no excuse though.

please don't let this brief indiscretion between us effect anything. Feel free to state any differences of opinion in any of my theories.

I value your knowledge and I hope we can set a example to others, as forums can get ugly, look what happen to oupower and bob boyce.

Gary, I am excited that we share similar opinions and want to encourage different views.

I wont to contribute were I can to helping you if you need any further resource material if need be.

Its getting exciting!!

cheers

Murray Willis

Ps - your theory concerning ions is interesting. I must give it some further thought.

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

---

johnh
Posted: Tue Jan 20, 2004 3:27 am Post subject:

> **Murray wrote:**

Hi Gary

Sorry mate, bad day at work, no excuse though.

please don't let this brief indiscretion between us effect anything. Feel free to state any differences of opinion in any of my theories.

SNIP
Murray Willis

Ps - your theory concerning ions is interesting. I must give it some further thought.

Great show both of you
don't take this the wrong way I really am saying congratulations.
I thought another group was about to go belly up and instead I see a maturity and common sense that is refreshing

so once again take a bow and work togethre to crack this nut.

Regards and thanks

JohnH

Gary
Posted: Sat Feb 07, 2004 5:13 am Post subject:

Saw a tv programme the other night on Alexander Graham Bell (inventor of the telephone).

The interesting thing was that (apart from the fact that he stole a patent from someone else), his (and the other persons) ideas were patented before they actually had a device up and working.

The diagram for the first telephone basically showed a head listening into a box that was part immersed in water, with a wire to another box - that was it! Nothing technical, and that with a brief description of what he "wanted" to happen was his patent. No demonstration or anything was asked for or indeed necessary. A patent for an unseen, unknown, unexplained device was granted, based simply on an idea accompanied by a small sketchy diagram.

I think that this is what old Stan did, and why it is so difficult to reproduce his device. I think that Stan simply patented the idea - he might never have actually had a device working properly!

One thing for sure, patents don't need to include any great detail.

_____
regards, Gary.

Gary
Posted: Wed Mar 10, 2004 3:05 am Post subject:

Murray recently forwarded me some detailed Stan Meyer info that has shed a little more light on his wfc, and certainly answered a few of my questions.

OK, firstly, Stans wfc WAS designed to be a capacitor with the water or electrolyte as the dielectric.

High voltage is used, the idea being to use the voltage potential to pull apart the H2O molecule by breaking the O-H covalent bonding. As only a small leakage current is to be expected, the voltage potential can do a lot of work effectively at very low power (IxV=W)

Resonance in this case refers simply to the resonant frequency of the L - C (inductor - water fuel cell capacitor) circuit. Not to ultrasonic cavitation, water molecule spin cycle, or vibration or oscillation of any kind!

You will note from the SM diagram (I assume you're all familiar with it) that he has two inductors (one either side of the water capacitor, one is simply used for fine tuning) in series with the water capacitor. Effectively just a capacitor and inductor in series. An LC series cct.

In an LC series resonant cct, the inductive reactance Xl (ac resistance) and the capacitive reactance Xc are equal but in opposite phases, so cancel each other out Xc - Xl = 0.

In his info Stan states that at resonance, when the inductive reactance Xl cancels out the capacitive reactance Xc, then the voltage potential is in theory infinite, which would be good as no current would flow and we could pull water apart very effectively... however, this is wrong!

What Stan has stated is true for a PARALLEL LC cct, NOT a SERIES LC cct. In fact the exact opposite is true for a series LC cct - no resistance, theoretical infinite current and 0 voltage! (note that in reality, the resistance of the wire itself comes into play and prevents infinite current)

I don't know how he has got this so wrong, or whether its bearing has any relevance to the working of his wfc at this point. I say this, because Stan clearly indicates the use of resistive wire for all inductors and indeed even the secondary coil of his voltage step-up transformer.

What I do know is that at resonance, when Xl cancels Xc, the only thing restricting the flow of current is the resistance of the resistive wire! And, that as the water capacitor is at resonance with the inductive elements of the coil, it will offer no resistance to current flow and so effectively have no voltage drop across it.

All this is very puzzling, as I can't see how no one has ever picked up on this blatant flaw in the electronic theory. It would be so simple to put the inductors in parallel with the water capacitor to correct this bit of theory, yet I have never seen it done. I've never heard any discussion about this on any forum either... Why?

So although I am telling myself the electronics here are all wrong, I'm also asking myself; has Stan simply wrongly applied electronic theories and the water capacitor works in this LC series configuration irrespective of his misinterpretaion... but for reasons other than stated?

I can't help feeling that the resistive wire might play a big part, because if it was a parallel LC cct at resonance then with a theorectically infinite resistance, across which sat a theoretically infinite voltage, then only the

smallest of leakage current would occur and resistive wire would surely be unnecessary.

Anyway, experimenting will answer the above. At least I know what he was trying to achieve now - thanks to Murray!

To move on, while I'm on a roll. Resonant frequencies: there is no set resonant frequency as this all depends on the inductance of the coils, the capacitance of the water capacitor (which itself is dependent upon the dielectric constant of the water or electrolyte, plate area and plate distance).

However, once again, now I know exactly what I am trying to achieve, it will be quite easy to work out some calculations to get me at least in the "ball park" and allow some fine tuning to get it spot on! I'll be doing some figures on this soon as I can.

Estimating the cell capacitance will be the first mission - or rather designing a cell with an appropriate capacitance to give a suitable resonant frequency. The inductance of the coil needed can then be worked out from the capacitive reactance at resonance and a suitable coil made up. Should be a piece of cake!!

Incidentally, an alernating voltage is needed for any LC circuits to work, but as we want to keep the pulling effect on the H2O molecules constant, dc pulses are required. This still works as, even though the voltage never goes -ve with respect to ov, it is still varying between 0v and the 2 x supply voltage.

Stans only reason for pulsing the dc pulses, ie, the duty cycles was to control the rate of H2/O2 production - nothing more complicated than that.

OK folks, still some confusion over the LC series cct bit, but answered many other questions. Once again, thanks to Murray.

Will keep you all posted on any further observations.

_____
regards, Gary.

Murray
Posted: Wed Mar 10, 2004 3:59 am Post subject:

Gary

well explained !

please have a look at section 3 - hydrogen gas management system

figure 3-23 this shows the prefered configuration of the VIC circuit and do you see the pulse pick up coil?

What action would the pulse pick up coil perform exactly I am confused? Does it relay the correct frequency to the primary input?

and also on the opposite page the preferred construction of the resonant cavity fig 3-25 and also read bottom

paragraph of page 3-16 and the top paragraph of page 3-17, describing the resonant cavity.

Stan conveniently forgot to describe that in his patent about the improvment of insulating the exterior and the structure of design.

excellent stuff

Murray

Dave

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

Hi Gary

> **Quote:**
>
> across it. What I do know is that at resonance, when Xl cancels Xc, the only thing restricting the flow of current is the resistance of the resistive wire! And, that as the water capacitor is at resonance with the inductive elements of the coil, it will offer no resistance to current flow and so effectively have no voltage drop

This is for a AC tuned circuit ,but there is resistance in the inductance. The current being V/I and then there is the reactance
Xl and Xc if that is a few thousand ohms it is quite a high potential
across both of them. I x Xl at resonance the same for Xc.
And does not apply to SM WFC.

As far as I know Stan Meyer used a DC resonant charging circuit
which is is a bit different from AC resonance. the VIC will not deliver
a large amount of current without collapsing due to its high impedance.

Best Regards Dave 

Gary

Posted: Wed Mar 10, 2004 11:45 am Post subject:

Dave, I agree the dc pulsing complicates matters in terms of applying Xc & Xl theory to the cct and will not provide the same results as proper ac.

I'm not sure that I understand then how - or why - Stan predicts that Xl-Xc (or viceversa) = 0 ohms! But it is clear in his texts that he is using ac LC equations to provide the figures!

As I see it, the capacitor will charge up on the dc pulses, but not be discharged as it would on the -ve cycle of ac. Any discharging would just be through losses due to leakage across the water and resistance of wiring, and not be a full discharge in the time between pulses. The next pulse would then top up the charge. I am assuming that we will therefore generally see a dc voltage across the components. If this is the case, Xc would be massive and Xl just equal to its wire resistance.

Still a little puzzling eh!

_____
regards, Gary.

Dave

Posted: Wed Mar 10, 2004 3:26 pm Post subject:

Hi Gary
Do you have Stan`s info about the LC circuit or where I can
find were he describes how he arrives at Lx-Cx =0 I would be most interested because I can`t get my head around that also.
Tommorow I will do some tests with a choke, my test cell is about
.03mf gassing .

Will let you know the results and will post waveforms if they show step charging.

Best Regards Dave

Murray

Posted: Wed Mar 10, 2004 11:00 pm Post subject:

Hi Dave

I don't know if you have seen this link but it is the best I can find on describing the dc resonant charging circuit. I think I may have already posted it.

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

Murray

Gary
Posted: Thu Mar 11, 2004 2:36 am Post subject:

Hi Dave, the info is in hard copy format so you'll just have to take my word for it. I know it just does not make sense, that's why I'm too finding this most puzzling - especially now as Murray provided me with this info that appears to be straight from the man himself!

Ok, I think we both agree that when applied to ac theory, the LC series cct does what we expect it to do, as posted earlier, but Stan is insisting that all the ac theory equations also apply to his dc pulsing - which we know is wrong.

That's a good link that Murray provided above regarding dc resonant charging - I think its the same circuit they use to create arcs from a tesla coil. That's exactly what Stans cct is achieving, but without discharging the capacitor!

Can we agree on what is actually happening in the dc pulsed LC cct?

We know that dc pulsing will charge the capacitor. On the rising of the pulse, the capacitor will charge to the dc supply voltage as current flows through the inductor. Then, as the voltage pulse begins to drop and hence the magnetic field surrounding the inductor begins to collapse it induces further current to flow into the capacitor to a point to which the capacitor is now charged to twice the supply voltage.

At this point then, the capacitor has a greater potential than the supply voltage so would start to discharge through the inductors in the opposite direction, however, the blocking diode prevents this happening.

So what have we got? As I see it, Xc and Xl no longer play much of a part now because we no longer have a series cct that can be tuned as such. All they will determine now is the time in which it takes to fully charge the capacitor.

All we seem to have is a capacitor storing a constant dc charge at a voltage twice that of the supply voltage. Any pulsing effect will be the minute amount (ripple) required to top up the capacitor due to leakage - do you agree??

All this now begs the question: what does Stan hope to achieve from his resistive wire? If, as he suggests all the inductors are composed of this resistive wire, the time to charge the capacitor will increase by quite a lot. This would create a much longer step charging process and wasted power in terms of heat, but what else does this achieve?? My brains tripping out here!

Incidentally, all Stan's depictions show a full wave rectified dc pulse with no smoothing.

I've got some other stuff from Murray that I've not had chance to examine fully yet - perhaps that'll shed some more light on things!

Dave, haven't you got your wfc set up with a similar LC circuit? And doesn't certain frequencies produce more gas than others for you? If so this would imply that there is an optimum frequency of pulses that maintain the full charge on the capacitor - wouldn't it? Frequencies below this optimum might not keep the capacitor fully charged, but frequencies above it should.

***
Murray, not sure what the pulse coil pick-up is supposed to do on fig 3.23, will investigate. The rest of the cct is the same just on a core, which if metal or ferrite will no doubt increase the value of the inductors.

_____
regards, Gary.

Murray
Posted: Thu Mar 11, 2004 3:44 am Post subject:

Gary

You will notice in the video footage that I sent you where he is giving a demonstration to the newzealanders (in house meeting). He was confronted on the resistive wire issue and he said it was only there to cover him if someone decided to try and take out a patent using a resistive wire circuit. But I also feel it has greater significance to restricting electron flow in some manner. defiantly worth further investigation.

Also wouldn't the Voltage through the charging inductor still oscillate? even though the diode is there, because it would still charge the capacitor up to twice the supply voltage and then still travel back to the other side of the inductor and oscillate freely until additional pulses excite the oscillation?

and the Cathode inductor (bottom inductor of the VIC circuit) is only there to choke of electron flow that's why it is adjustable. it is using the magnetic field created to block off electron flow to help conserve power ratther than a resistive element.

Murray

Ps the in house meeting - chalk board demonstration is very informative Stan talks alot about the VIC

excitting stuff

Gary
Posted: Thu Mar 11, 2004 6:34 am Post subject:

Just watched the SM videos Murray, and some things concern me.

The in house lecture was most interesting as at times Stan had questions thrown at him that it seemed he could not answer and indeed did not answer to any satisfaction - certainly not mine.

Firstly, as you said, when questioned about the resistive wire inductors, he claimed that he filed his patents with such variations in order to prevent people claiming there own patent by making such slight adjustments to his. Basically covering all the bases - fair enough. Though how you could patent a well documented simple resonant

LC series charging cct is beyond me!

More interesting was his failure to even give a "ball park" frequency of resonance figure. He claimed that depending on the water and its contaminants that resonance could be anything from 1 - 10KHz (I'm not sure if he mean't 1Hz - 10KHz or 1KHz - 10KHz, suspect the later). However, the dielectric constants of tap water are around 78 - 80 and seawater I think is about 81, so there's not much in it. Stan also at some point gives the dielectric constant units of ohms - again wrong. The dielectric constant is not a measure of resistance, but a constant and as such is just a figure without units.

He also made what I thought was a major blunder in the house meeting, when he stated that the charging choke also doubles the frequency!!

Also the VIC diagram on his blackboard showed a square wave input at 50% duty cycle, not the ac rectified signal shown elsewhere. Which got me thinking, how would a half wave rectified signal effect the cct operation?

He then went on further to say that the voltage pulses could be upped even higher with more coils on the charging choke! This surely should have been the secondary of the main transformer coil.

There is some interesting stuff, but I can't help feeling that he has a better understanding of the sales pitch, than the physics. I also found the bible reference a bit tacky, feeling that "doing the Lords work" is just another sales pitch aimed at God fearing Christians!

Each of his lectures is pretty well the same, word for word, he obviously has a well practiced set piece.

He has various stages in the full wfc technology, of which the breaking of the covalent bonds in the water capacitor is just the first. Of interest was the electron extraction stage whereby he further subjects the gas released from the water capacitor to high voltage pulses within a gas resonant chamber.

The idea here is to extract the electons from the Hydrogen to prevent them reforming with the oxygen into water after combustion. The result is a gas that can not naturally restabilise into water upon combustion. This apparently creates an very high energy state that is self propogating until the atoms finally combine with another element or pull electrons from a -vely charged source in order to stabilise.

All very interesting, but to my mind until we have sorted out this VIC the rest is irrelevant.

This was all very big news in USA years ago, I wonder what the true and full story behind all of this is and why it seems to have come to nothing? Not just a fashion fad, this could have changed the world we live in - perhaps that is what the problem was!

They appear to have had a car running on Hydrogen, which again made big news in the USA. If this was a hoax - and I'm not suggesting it was - it was far more elaborate than crop circles!

One of the news clips states that Stan is relatively uneducated, in that he has no qualifications and never even graduated from high school. Perhaps this goes a long way to explaining his apparent lack of full understanding of some of the physics and electronic principles involved.

Incidentally 20Kv is the commonly quoted voltage achieved by the VIC.

I think that at very close spacing of electrodes, and at these potentials he does get current flow. However, the inductors naturally resist this (see below), so once the current starts to flow to any great degree the voltage increases across the inductors and drops across the capacitor. The inductor reactance stops the current running away and the reduction in voltage across the capacitor naturally reduces the current flow. In effect it may be self

stabilising.

However, as the inductors don't put up much resistance to low frequencies or dc, I have to assume that high current flow is initiated in high frequency pulses that tie in with the dc pulse frequency. The higher the frequency the greater the inductor reactance, the less current flow.

Murray, that blocking diode prevents current travelling in the opposite direction, which it wants to when the capacitor is charged to greater than the supply voltage.

Only the current flows, and voltage only appears across a resistive (or reactive) component when current flows through that component. So the inductor will oscillate with the dc pulses up until a time at which the capacitor is fully charged.

When fully charged, voltage across it is maximum (because capacitors block dc and show very high reactance to low frequencies) and no current will flow anywhere else in the cct because that blocking diode prevents the capacitor discharging.

_____
regards, Gary.

Dave
Posted: Thu Mar 11, 2004 2:26 pm Post subject:

Hi Gary
I find a lot of the Stanley Meyer stuf very murky, its like
that game hot and cold you think you have found a clue but its not
true.Looking at some of the patents he cites is interesting ,it seems to me he cobbled together his patent from others. Thats ok but he is not very clear ,but they are as it should be.

Did you ever see his no frills patent on the Canadian site that is worth looking at it seems pretty straight forward. If you haven`t
seen it here it is.
http://patents1.ic.gc.ca/details?patent_number=1234774&language=EN

Best Regards Dave

Gary
Posted: Fri Mar 12, 2004 3:02 am Post subject:

Agree Dave. I've now seen a couple of hours of video footage of Stan doing his lectures and have a copy of his Water fuel cell technical brief "Hydrogen Fracturing Process" which is over 1/2 inch thick double sided A4! And, still I am confused and uncertain on many points.

I think the whole thing is Murky because of Stan's lack of any real scientific background. Watching the videos, I can't help feeling that hes just relaying info hes aquired by browsing through science books picking out the bits that he feels might serve his purpose. Though the technical brief is more coherent than anything else I've read, but it is still lacking in depth and flawed. This becomes even more apparent when he tries to go that scientific step too far and things start to not add up!

Its like he's explaining what he thinks should be happening - or what he would like to be happening if the real science did not get in the way. But, ask him a technical question and he really has no plausible answer, so blags it.

On one of the videos, someone asked him "What happens to the heavy water content of the water in the wfc during the fracturing process?". This appeared to have knocked him off guard, and for a moment he started talking about iron and metals in the water. I really got the impression that he thought of heavy water was water physically heavier because of metal contaminants.

Isotopes were not mentioned until that person rephrased their initial question, and used the word isotopes. Then Stan was clearly out of his depth and blagged it for a sentence or two until he swiftly moved back on to his set piece.

To my mind he provided no satisfactory answers to anyones questions. The man was clearly no scientist.

Just quickly on the resonance issue. Stan at some point clearly mentions resonance in terms of the water resonating. From all my researching now, I think that he has simply improvised with the word "resonance" itself (it sounds good) as if in self-explaination of something he does not at all understand. Not once was resonance explained other than by water resonating.

The word was already there for him to use and reapply where he wanted to. The "DC LC resonant charging cct", where resonance refers to the natural frequency at which the capacitor and inductor charge and discharge - nothing at all to do with water resonating.

I now have just one main question: Can a high voltage potential in the region of 20Kv pull apart the water molecule, pulsed or otherwise? Or is it still bursts of current flow that is doing the real work?

Hope to find out soon!

_____
regards, Gary.

Dave
Posted: Sat Mar 13, 2004 7:25 am Post subject:

Hi Gary
The only record I have of High voltage decomposition
of water is in a book by" Fred Guthrie 1875".You must have gathered by now I like collecing old books.

The method is to use well- boiled slightly acidified water and a high voltage machine connected across two point electrodes.He says
the hydrogen produced is about three times instead of twice.He attributes it to formation of ozone or peroxide of

hydrogen.

To change the subject I have done some further tests just using straight bridge rectified rippled dc .

The results are as follows:

Gas measured with a graduated babies feeding bottle over the tubes of my test cell.

6 min produced 62.5cc gas.
Current consumed 0.3 amp
Current measured by voltage drop across 0.8 ohm Res:
was 0.240 volts.Using True Rms voltmetet,and double checked with a 547 Tek scope.
This is the best result I have had so far.

By Faraday calc: 0.3amp shold produce 19 cc Gas.

I am now going to look into gating the dc ripple to see if there is a relaxation time maybe these results can be improved.

Best Regards Dave

Gary
Posted: Sat Mar 13, 2004 12:34 pm Post subject:

Hi Dave, I've just got hold of one of those electronic cct design programs. I'm going to try to reproduce Stans resonant charging cct and see what I get from the software scope & dmm. This software will hopefully allow me to experiment and modify component properties at will.

With reference to above post, does your power consumption take into account the voltage and current phase variations that apply to LC ccts?

Dave I'll try to borrow another VCR in the next few days or so, and make you a copy of the SM video that Murray sent me... from Aussie land! Well worth watching if only to know that you are getting the info first hand from the man himself. It also gives you a feel for the way he thinks.

Further thoughts: Bearing in mind that 240v supply will allow more than enough current flow through normal tap water to kill you (the hair dryer in the bath tub scenario), then 20Kv across two closely spaced electrodes is going to provide one hell of a belt of current.

I don't think there is any way Stan could provide that kind of voltage across his electrodes in order to use the voltage potential to pull apart the water molecule and at the same time prevent massive current flow between those electrodes. I really have my doubts about the electrostatic potential doing the work here.

I think we must be dealing with pulsed current surges limited by the inductor reactance, with that current limitation dependent on the inductor value and the frequency of the pulsed dc.

_____
regards, Gary.

Dave
Posted: Sun Mar 14, 2004 6:33 am Post subject:

Hi Gary

> **Quote:**
>
> With reference to above post, does your power consumption take into account the voltage and current phase variations that apply to LC ccts?

No inductance, I went back to basics, and just used transformer and a bridge rectifier.
After replicating Stan Meyers circuits giving it the benifit of the doubt and trying not to deviate even if it was against my better judgement.His circuit design is a bit of a dogs dinner.
I am now going to redesign from the ground up.

Thanks for the offer of the tape will look forward to it.

Best regards Dave 

Gary
Posted: Sun Mar 14, 2004 5:23 pm Post subject:

Hi Dave, I've been playing around with that electronic software all day - when I should have been doing other things - and not really achieving much either.

All very stressful. Sure, I can change around the components, and alter the values at will, getting various pulse waveforms. However, I soon realised the real problem is I don't really know what I'm trying to produce from the cct. Do I want a high voltage with a pulse that only oscillates between the high end of the 20kv, or do I want the pulses to zero out every time.

All my experimenting today was done with a sinewave input - I could not get the square wave to work at all, perhaps because the rise and fall time are almost non-existent so no magnetic field is produced across the inductor.

I had a capacitor as the wfc with different levels of leakage current to imitate the current flow between

electrodes. I gave the capacitor a nominal 50nF, and played about with the inductor value and frequency of pulses. One thing I do know is that with a 20Kv potential, you have to get some resistance/reactance into the cct or you get hell of a lot of current flow - my electronic dmm was reading 600 amps at one point - a tad to high me thinks!

How can you stop current flowing across plates that are 1mm apart with a voltage of 20Kv across them, when the standoff voltage of PURE water is only I believe 80v per mm??

Its given me a bloody headache, going to give it a rest for a couple of days, give my mind time to clear - I've got dc pulse waveforms coming out my ears!

Think your right. Start from scratch and work forward by experimenting one step at a time.

_____
regards, Gary.

Murray
Posted: Sun Mar 14, 2004 11:47 pm Post subject:

G'day Gary

link

http://www.rexresearch.com/meyerhy/meyerhy.htm#4936961

Referring to patent 4798661 Stan uses resistive elements to stop electron flow.

Referring to patent 4826581 fig 9 the resistive element has now been substituted by a inductor. (similar circuit configuration to some circuits in patent 4798661)

Referring to the VIC circuit of patent 4936961 has a variable inductor going to electrode B (cathode)

The inductor has substituted the resistive element as a more suitable option to restricting current as it uses the magnetic field to restrict amps.

Refer to the in house meeting video (New Zealand) what I sent you.

Where Stan is describing the VIC circuit and says "note we are using a magnetic field to restrict amps not a resistive element" (cathode inductor)

also read pg 18 of patent 4798661 explains it well.

Important quote "There can be no electron leakage from the negative potential plate if there are no electrons to leak."

hope this helps

I will send Dave a copy of the book if you have not already.

drop us a e-mail Dave and I will send it to you, appreciate your valuable input.

I am currently finishing of my cell and high voltage hope to have it done soon but taking my time as dealing with high voltage scares me so I am making sure I have alot of safety precautions and proper diode protection for my circuit.

My circuit is similar to fig 6 of patent 4798661

good luck to all

Murray

Gary

Posted: Mon Mar 15, 2004 3:16 am Post subject:

Hi Murray, I think we may have had this conversation before. I read thru most of the stuff time and again, and when Stan states, quote: "In achieving resonance in any cct, as the pulse frequency is adjusted, the flow af amps is minimiized and the voltage is maximised to a peak."

Wrong! Only in a parallel resonant LC cct! Stan states quite clearly that he knows this is a SERIES resonant charging cct!

When he's making such blatant and simple errors it doesn't give you much faith in his theories, calculations or indeed his explanations for the wfc workings.

Somewhere it is also quoted: "The practical demonstration of the Meyer Cell is substantially more convincing than the parascientific jargon used to explain it."

Which implies to me that if the cell does work, Stan doesn't really know why, or have the scientific knowledge to explain what exactly is happening. Sums it up for me! Just because Stan says it does this, doesn't mean it will do it! Stans explanations are simply not explanations in a true sense. He skims the surface assuming that that's all the explanation needed - its not good enough!

Its like saying "a car works because its got an engine in it!" Oh, that's ok then, that it fully explains it!!?

Also mentioned in that article is the fact that the voltage rises until the dielectric breaks down and momentary high current flows. However, when this happens a current sensing cct removes the pulse drive from the cct allowing the water to recover! What or where is this current sensing cct depicted or described?

Or is this where he is relying on the inductors to provide high resistance to current flow.

Murray at resonance in a series resonant cct, the inductor reactance and the capacitor reactance are in opposite phases and actually cancel each other out, providing "zero" resistance to current flow, not maximum resistance. You get minimum voltage, maximum current - another one for the Stan Meyer puzzle book!

_____

regards, Gary.

Murray

Posted: Mon Mar 15, 2004 4:00 am Post subject:

G'day Gary

I realize

you wrote

"Murray at resonance in a series resonant cct, the inductor reactance and the capacitor reactance are in opposite phases and actually cancel each other out, providing "zero" resistance to current flow, not maximum resistance. You get minimum voltage"

I am not saying the **cathode inductor** is at resonance with the capacitor in the VIC

I assuming that at high frequency this causes the cathode inductor of the VIC to restrict current. (as the magnetic field increases)

correct me if I am wrong but inductors will develop a large magnetic field and resist high frequencies thus causing the blockage of electron flow to the cathode of the VIC?

just trying to stop those nasty electrons flowing into our cell so we can **increase our voltage.**

Murray

cheers mate

Dave

Posted: Mon Mar 15, 2004 11:29 am Post subject:

Hi Gary & Murray
With regards to high voltage across the cell
Stan Meyer only shows charging waveforms Fig 8 "Applied voltage
potentials" as they go through different stages up to about 12 volts.
for max gas generated,as you say Gary it would arc across.
With the VIC it charges it up but the potential would not be say 20Kv across a leaky cap.
I still believe the cell has to be formed and it takes time ,a bit like a when a lead acid battery is being charged hydrogen is only released
when it is fully charged.
For what its worth.

Another thing I have noticed with my small scale test cell using tap-water is that the efficiency drops off only after a few runs due to the water becoming contaminated.

Thanks for your offer Murray I will send you a email.

Best regards Dave

Gary
Posted: Tue Mar 16, 2004 5:49 am Post subject:

Hi Murray, that variable inductor (the one I think you are calling the cathode inductor) only serves to allow overall inductance of the cct to be adjusted. The fact that it is shown the other side of the capacitor is irrelevant. In a series cct it can be put anywhere, and simply adds to the inductance of the cct.

The problem is that if the inductor was to provide a very high reactance to stop the flow of electrons, then all the high voltage would be across it, and not the capacitor, where we want it. Trust me, its just not as straight forward as "good old Stan" makes it out to be!

I was really beginning to think that it is all about very high current pulses. Because at LC series resonance the only resistance is that of the water between the plates (capacitor leakage) and the resistance of the wire of the inductor, maximum current will flow.

This of course is so irrespective of what voltage we are applying, but the higher the voltage the greater the current surge. But surely Faraday's laws would still apply here, so whats the point?

I wonder if we've been thinking too deep about this, as well as being led astray by Stan's very dodgy theories.

Now I'm thinking along the lines that if you send half wave rectified ac or dc squarewave pulses into a series LC resonant cct, the inductor now will not double the dc supply voltage, but provide a pulse in the gap between pulses. Remember that an inductor without resistance is in theory lossless, so this comsumes no power in providing the extra dc pulse. (edited by Gary: actually got this bit wrong - half asleep - half wave rectified thru the inductor will not fill the gap between pulses, it will double the pulse just as in full wave rectification, so still leaving a gap between individual pulses)

(got the sq. wave signal working - I was so tired I'd forgotten to take the bridge rectifier out of the cct for sq. wave input!)

Whether full wave, half wave rectified or square wave, this voltage doubling should so produce twice the gas at the cost of no extra power! Considering a full wave rectified signal, the inductor doubles the voltage of every pulse - doubling the voltage across the capacitors resistance, will double the current flow, effectively doubling the gas produced at no extra cost of input power!

The inductor effectively does a lot of work, but doesn't charge us for it!!

Does that make any sense to you Dave?

With reference to Stans info, somewhere he states that in the contents of his patents he leaves out vital info to

stop them being copied, which makes no real sense, as someone could produce his patents filling in the bits he left out and file it as their own! I think this is more bullshit!

More likely he was relying on someone to incorporate the missing bits and then say that was how he'd developed it already - sneaky. I don't trust the man at all!

_____
regards, Gary.

MattB
Posted: Fri Jul 16, 2004 8:39 am Post subject: Some spanners in the works.

Hello fellow participants!

I hope that everyone is progressing with their respective projects. Although I am relatively new to the SM-WFC I feel that I have collected a huge amount of information over the past twelve months and wish to share what I have gathered.

I am going to post a reply to multiple posts on this thread without the quotes where possible so I can keep the size to a minimum. I am attempting to cover from 1st to last post in this thread so if I lose anyone I am sorry.

Firstly, I feel the simpleist construction for the reactor cell is that which Stan gives us in the video "It runs on water". There are two versions of this video, one put out by equinox in England and ran on discovery channel and the other version released on Stans "Water Fuel Cell video". There are some differences between the two (which I will elaborate on later) but both have the section where he shows both the 9 concentric ring array and the other where the variable spacing two plate unit is shown. I know that they are brief but I have the reconstructed drawings which are from his original application serial no. 06/302,807 which ended up being the 4936961 patent, which over time clearly changed from the original application.

Murray,

I wanted to follow all the links you put in your original posting but the links are somewhat scrambled. Could you post them again in a better format. I want to read as much as possibe and understand all you have stated.

I find it interesting that you feel the 4798661 patent is easier.

I refer to the video "It Runs on Water" - When Stan turns on the generator he has what looks like an alternator sitting on the bench. Or is it? In '661, figure 5 shows the primary winding to be a rotating armature. It may be that this 'rotating armature' is in fact the rotating electrical pulse generator of patent no. 4613779. I am assuming that Stan is using either an alternator or his epg as he is trying to put the cell into his buggy and this was the obvious place to start as he needed a power supply. I tend to think that this is the case as Stans first patents in Canada refer to him using non-filtered rippled dc and the alternator would have provided this type of signal.

I have seen some posts where Stans principles are bought into question and am now wondering if he simply used the amount of current produced by the alternator/epg to use electrolysis like in the Carl Cella generator. Does anyone have any ideas on this? Don't get me wrong, I just want to explore all avenues. I still have great faith that he could do exactly what he says - and that one day we will all know how to replicate it!

Water is bipolar, meaning two opposite electrical ends although the hydrogen is embedded so deeply as to make the molecule almost spherical. Dipole is more than 2. Just some obvious useless info.

Off to a start on the info but it is bedtime. I will post more tomorrow.

Matt

MattB
Posted: Fri Jul 16, 2004 8:59 pm Post subject:

Part 2

Ahhhh - nothing like a little sleep to clear the head.

In my previous post (late last night) I made a mistake when I quoted the number for the electrical pulse generator. I corrected this this morning.

I wish to reference the article from electronics world and wireless world Jan 1991 by Frank Ogden.

"The real differences occur in the power supply to the cell. Meyer uses an external inductance which appears to resonate with the capacitance of the cell - pure water apparently possesses a dielectric constant of about 5 - to produce a parrallel resonant circuit. This is excited by a high power pulse generator which, together with the cell capacitance and a rectifier diode, forms a charge pump circuit. High frequency pulses build a rising staircase dc potential across the electrodes of the cell until a point is reached where the water breaks down and a momentary high current flows. A current meaasuring circuit in the supply detects this breakdown and removes the pulse drive for a few cycles allowing the water to "recover" (if that is what it does)."

Firstly, is this what you guys were talking about i.e. the parallel as opposed to the series circuit?

Secondly, I saw mention in earlier posts that you were wondering what the extra pickup coil would do. I think that the pickup is connected to detect resonance in the circuit and is actually the phase lock loop referenced in later patents. If so, this circuit detects current flow and stops the pulses so that current doesn't continue to arc across the plates. Stan talks about manually tuning this in. Clearly if the charging isn't interrupted the process is merely electrolysis and couldn't be achieved using pure water.

Enough for now - Pt 3 soon.

H2opowered
Posted: Thu Jul 22, 2004 3:58 pm Post subject:

I was told by Stan that the bench device is a single phase AC motor powering an alternator which then runs into

the power supply (pulsing circuit, step-up transformer etc) and into the cell.

The reason this was set up this way was to duplicate exactly what would take place in a normal vehicle installation.

Tad

H2opowered

Posted: Thu Jul 22, 2004 4:01 pm Post subject:

P.S. Murray's theories are right about the Meyer process. Stan told me that the problem I was having with leakage in the cell was due to lack of resistance in the circuit which leads to the cell leaking during the off-time. You must keep the cell at maximum voltage in order to break molecules via this process. No current, all potential.

Resonance is the key, yes, but the cell must not leak power to such a degree that you lose your voltage level.

Tad

Freedomfuel

Posted: Wed Jul 28, 2004 10:36 am Post subject: Stanley Meyers Theories

---

What Meyer Thought he was doing, what he was actually doing and what he said he was doing could be three different things. One thing is for sure. He was not splitting water to use hydrogen and Oxygen as fuel. In my opinion, if you read beyond all the suedo scientific bullshit he wrote then it appears that what went into his engine was mainly water, but not ordinary water. It was energised water containing an electric charge. In fact his system depended on electrical phenomenon entirely and combustion was not involved at all. This I believe is true also of the so called Joe cell cars in Australia and Dingel's car, except a small amount of gasoline is burnt or maybe atomized at the same time. Considering that Dingel could get a fuel consumption of something like 350 mpg it might as well be considered as free energy, because the potential energy of that amount of fuel if completely burnt and turned into kinetic energy could not take you that distance. In one of my posts in my 'Dingels Magic car' topic I go into some detail on some research by George Wiseman of Eagle research into a peculiar anomaly associated with the hydrolysis of water in which a 'third gas' which is positively charged water vapour is formed in certain circumstances. The details of the experiment are here:

http://www.eagle-research.com/browngas/whatisbg/watergas.html

I think that Murrays post does point in this direction but there is a lot of non scientific muddle in some of the quotes which is going to confuse people. Still it is all very interesting. I hope that Murrays post will direct people away from the absurd idea that water can be a source of energy apart from solar energy contained in it. (lets not talk about cold fusion). Since the source of the energy to make this charged water vapour comes from the battery it is hard to understand how the battery could supply enough power to drive a car even for a short

duration. I have examined the idea that an endothermic process is involved in which ambient heat is converted to usefull energy and I am going to introduce some more esoteric ideas of how energy could be derived from the environment.

Freedomfuel

Posted: Wed Jul 28, 2004 11:19 am Post subject: Stanley Meyer's Theories

---

I think that it is unwise to give your real name in a forum like this. Remember we are talking about a technolgy that could make the 10 trillion dollar investment in oil worthless. Just remember what happened to stanley Meyer and be careful especially if you want to market conversion kits.

Here is an excellent site dedicated to water science

http://www.martin.chaplin.btinternet.co.uk/index.html

Can someone give some insight into how water droplets can gain an electric charge in a thunder cloud for instance.

Simon

Posted: Sun Aug 15, 2004 10:37 pm Post subject: Re: Stanley Meyers Theories

---

> **Freedomfuel wrote:**
>
> I hope that Murrays post will direct people away from the absurd idea that water can be a source of energy apart from solar energy contained in it.

what are you the fun police or something? do you work for the government or and oil company?

Simon

Posted: Sun Aug 15, 2004 10:41 pm Post subject:

Anyway Stanley Meyers idea's have really gotten me interested! I think its great how he seems to have overcome all the problems with normal electrolysis like heat and the high amp requirement to provide enough gas to run a car. I've been reading a lot of stuff about his work to try and understand it a bit more... a lot of it is over my head at the moment but im getting there. If someone could explain it in simple terms that would be great... from what i understand its a low amp high voltage cell with chokes to stop arcing happening under the

water and ensureing a huge amount of volts travel through the cell? is that right?

---

johnh

Posted: Mon Aug 16, 2004 5:29 am Post subject:

> **Simon wrote:**
>
> Anyway Stanley Meyers idea's have really gotten me interested! SNIP
> If someone could explain it in simple terms that would be great... from what i understand its a low amp high voltage cell with chokes to stop arcing happening under the water and ensureing a huge amount of volts travel through the cell? is that right?

One could have hoped that Stanley would have explained it in simple terms !!!

I don't think you are right though Simon.
The Idea seems to be to get a huge potential built up on the cell (using the cell as a capacitor) but don't let any current flow through the cell at all
This is why he is using distilled water and no electrolyte.
It is something like the electromagnetic or electrostatic forces that disassociate the water and needs no electrons from the current supplied to the cell in the reaction so therefore it uses no power.
The biggest problem is that no-one else has made a cell that even halfway works.
I have just got a hard copy of a heap of Stans Data from Murray But will take me a while to wade through it. in his later work he does not seem to be talking about making hydrogen with the cell rather the water dissociates and rejoins releasing energy on the way, or thats the way I read it.
Unfortunately Stan tried to explain everthing in his Psuedo science way instead of just giving ways and results. so we are left with a mishmash of halfcooked theories and no way to get the results.

Regards

John

Simon

Posted: Mon Aug 16, 2004 12:58 pm Post subject:

Thanks john that has cleared up a few things... maybe murray could explain it better! I know Tad has made some good headway with Stan's idea's.

Murray
Posted: Tue Aug 17, 2004 2:37 am Post subject:

Simon

A great diagram for explaining this process is Figure 8 of patent 4,798,661. This compares Applied voltage potential and amp leakage.

refer to text within the patent for explaining different positions indicated from within the diagram that escalates until hydrogen gas is generated.

note..... figure 1, 5, and 6 were the resistance is between earths and the resonant cavities.

note..... in figure 6 there is a 60hz input frequency and the resonant cavity is adjustable!!!
This means that the distance can be matched to the frequency maybe alot easier that the other way round at present.

note..... a resonant cavity may be a necessity (tubular electrodes) this causes a effect similar to a neon tube were ions and electrons are colliding and effecting the atomic charges.

This patent best explains the process and forces at work. I know it is hard to understand, I just kept reading it over and over again, deciphering it bit by bit until it made sense.

unfortunately current will be consumed Stan has said the VIC circuit may use around 4 amps at times but the gas production is astronomical compared to electrolysis.

This is definitely I believe the best patent to understand the forces at work. and gives alot of clues for experimenting.

at the moment I do not have the skills to wind the necessary inductors for the VIC circuit. One day I will but can't afford a inductance meter and all the other bits at the moment and have not got the time. so I am concentrating on patent 4,798,661 I have ordered most of the parts to replicate fig 1.
Tad seems to have the skills to get that on track and he is doing a great job with the new web site.

feel free to ask some questions from the text of patent 4,798,661 of any other of stans patents and I will try my best to answer it.

Murray

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

Murray
Posted: Wed Aug 18, 2004 12:35 am Post subject:

Simon

Also note that on the graph of figure 8 of patent 47986621 "the positive and negative potential brackets" and how they define certain areas. The negative potential bracket indicates that the voltage can be raised across the water capacitor cell by adding the resistive elements between the cathode and earth, heightening the electrostatic forces between the two plates and puts more stress on the water molecule by using the dipole nature of the water molecule

polarizing at first, then pulling apart the hydrogen atoms towards the negative potential and oxygen atoms towards the positive potential and then using resonant action to compound this effect without alot of amp consumption

The above is the important basis of the discovery Stan made

read

section 1 page 7 of the technical brief refer below
"voltage dissociation of the water molecule"
and all the diagrams within section 1

also

Resonant cavity design is a major contributor to performance of the system section 3 page 39 figure 3-25 "resonant cavity" this is the preferred design I think but I am trying plan ss tubes first

for a more in depth description

There is information in the technical brief that is being uploaded in PDF.

here are some links but I think there needs to be more uploaded.

http://members.cox.net/h2opowered/preface.pdf

http://members.cox.net/h2opowered/section1.pdf

http://members.cox.net/h2opowered/section2.pdf

http://members.cox.net/h2opowered/section3.pdf

http://members.cox.net/h2opowered/section4.pdf

http://members.cox.net/h2opowered/section5.pdf

http://members.cox.net/h2opowered/section6.pdf

Murray

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

Murray

Posted: Fri Aug 20, 2004 1:39 am Post subject:

Freedomfuel

> **Quote:**
>
> What Meyer Thought he was doing, what he was actually doing and what he said he was doing could be three different things. One thing is for sure. He was not splitting water to use hydrogen and Oxygen as fuel. In my opinion, if you read beyond all the suedo scientific bullshit he wrote then it appears that what went into his engine was mainly water, but not ordinary water. It was energised water containing an electric charge. In fact his system depended on electrical phenomenon entirely and combustion was not involved at all

good point

I think I am correct in writing this summary from the technical brief and video footage.

Stan kept the water molecule in a sub critical state in the water fuel injector system. When the water molecule had less than 6 electrons missing from the oxygen atom, it was unstable and could be thermally ignited. This actually made the atomic components decay and produce pure thermal energy and produced more energy than the combustion of hydrogen and oxygen that recombines to form water vapour.

referenced from

section 3 page 23 - Hydrogen Fracturing Process

and the in house meeting in Newzealand (video)

cheers

Murray

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

Freedomfuel

Posted: Sat Aug 21, 2004 11:39 am Post subject:

We must remember that Stanley Meyer did not have access to a laboratory with analytical equipement so much of what he said about his system was just geusswork. I wonder what we would find if we actually analysed the mixed gases from his electrolysis cell? We assume that he was producing hydrogen and oxygen because the mixture went pop when ignited but in my opinion an electric discharge under water is more likely to make

steam. For water to be vapourised at normal atmospheric pressure and at room temperature the water droplets might need to have an electric charge which repels other droplets and keeps them in vapour state. This would be the energised water that George Wiseman of Eagle Research is talking about. Exactly how water takes on a charge in these circumstances is uncertain. Murray suggests that the Oxygen molecule loses it's outer electrons but I have never heard of a strong electric field being able to do this even when pulsed, but I am not a chemist. He also writes about this ionized water vapour being 'thermaly ignited'. It is true that a flame will induce implosion but what about heat alone? Here is an interesting experiment for someone to do. Actually there is no ignition because George Wiseman has established that implosion will occur without the presence of Oxygen so it could be possible that it is ionization of the air around the flame which triggers implosion. Other factors may also trigger implosion such as a pulsed magnetic field or the presence of a negatively charged object. It is interesting to note that according to Joe's experiments the same volume of energised water ('the third gas') would make a more powerful implosion than the explosion of a Hydrogen and Oxygen mixture. My hypothesis is that positive Hydrogen ions combine with water to produce H(H20)+. In support of this is the claim by certain anonymous authors of water car plans that their engine's exhaust Oxygen, Nitrogen and water. It could be that the Hydrogen Ions are being intercepted before they can reach the positive electrode (or is it negative, I always get mixed up).

According to Martin Chaplin's excellent water science site

http://www.martin.chaplin.btinternet.co.uk/index.html

it is true that a strong electric field will weaken the Hydrogen bond but this the bond between water molecules that joins them as clusters or chains. It will not separate Hydrogen from Oxygen.

In my opinion the polarization of water molecules in a pulsed electric field is essential for the operation of the water car not only to break Hydrogen bonds but also in order to bring about 'dielectric absorbtion' in order to trigger an electron cascade in the air surrounding the cell. I believe that it is this phenomenon that holds the key to understanding how the water car can take energy out of the environment to achieve a co-effiency of performance greater than unity. I realise that I am out on limb with these ideas especially insofar as I hypothesize that water can exhibit dielectric absorbtion. I have heard of various solids and oil exhibiting this property but what about water? Very pure water is used commercially as a dielctric so it is not beyond the bounds of possibility.

If you really want to get deep into the physics of zero point energy try reading Ken shoulders and Steve Shoulders on the subject of 'Charge Clusters In Action'.

http://www.svn.net/krscfs/Charge%20Clusters%20In20%action.pdf
http://www.amasci.com/weird/evexp.html

Try doing a Google search for charge clusters and see what you can uncover.

Here are some notes on dielectric absorbtion:
http://www.audience-av.com/on_capacitor_dielectric_material.htm

Charge clusters are highly organized, micron-sized clusters of electrons which are typically encountered during an electric spark. They seem to exhibit anomolous excess energy effects which may have been exploited for some time in certain over unity devices, and more recently in cold fusion. For instance Edwin Gray powered electric motors through high voltage electric sparks applied once every revolution and he received persecution by the government for his efforts. It could be that electrons striking the outer positive case of Joe Cells are in the form of charge clusters or else a silent electric discharge under water is also producing them.

Check out www.powerlabs.org/waterarc.htm for underwater arcs and so called water atomization.

Freedomfuel
Posted: Fri Aug 27, 2004 7:37 am Post subject:

> **johnh wrote:**
>
> I don't think you are right though Simon.
> The Idea seems to be to get a huge potential built up on the cell (using the cell as a capacitor) but don't let any current flow through the cell at all
> This is why he is using distilled water and no electrolyte.
> It is something like the electromagnetic or electrostatic forces that disassociate the water and needs no electrons from the current supplied to the cell in the reaction so therefore it uses no power.
> The biggest problem is that no-one else has made a cell that even halfway works.
> I have just got a hard copy of a heap of Stans Data from Murray But will take me a while to wade through it. in his later work he does not seem to be talking about making hydrogen with the cell rather the water dissociates and rejoins releasing energy on the way, or thats the way I read it.
> Unfortunately Stan tried to explain everthing in his Psuedo science way instead of just giving ways and results. so we are left with a mishmash of halfcooked theories and no way to get the results.
>
> Regards
>
> John

I have re-read Martin Chaplin's water science site at

http://www.martin.chaplin.btinternet.co.uk/index

and I have clarified some of the ideas prompted by this post from Johnh. According to Martin Hydrogen bonds are weakened and broken by a strong electric field but these are not the covalent bonds that make up the water molecule. Instead we are talking about intermolcular bonds that occur in liquid water whereby Hydrogen atoms can be attached to Oxygen in neighbouring molecules. This kind of intermolecular Hydrogen bonding creates clusters and chains of water molecules. When these bonds are broken by a strong electric field water can pass from a liquid to a vapour state without heating. This is stated explicitley in Sam Barros' water atomization by under-water arcing site:

http://www.powerlabs.org/waterarc.htm

Thus in this case breaking of Hydrogen bonds does not separate Hydrogen from Oxygen.

According to Martin this kind of Hydrogen bonding is electrostatic rather than covalent, as it would be in the water molecule, and it requires 23 kJ / mol rather than 392 kJ / mol. This would explain why Stan required so much less current to produce the same volume of gas compared to regular electrolyis.

There are several experiments one could do to explore this further. If the central electrode is made a smaller diameter the electric field strength would be increased near to this electrode due to the converging field lines.

Also is a pulsed electric field realy necessary? It would be interesting to try using a direct current and raising it by degrees to 40,000 volts and see what happens. I am not convinced by the idea that this is necessary to ramp up the charge on the plates. I supose that what Stan was thinking of was that in the period when the electric field was zero and the force on the O-H dipole is relaxed the spacing between the atoms would not revert to it's normal distance so that it would gradually be stretched with each pulse. Is there any experimental confirmation for this? I wonder at what voltage does this breaking of the Hydrogen bond occur? Judging by the George Wiseman's experiments it ocurs at low voltages:

http://www.eagle-research.com/browngas/whatisbg/watergas.html

The crucial thing is the strength of the electric field rather than the voltage used. A cell with a central electrode made of a wire may have sufficient field strength near this electrode to produce copious bubbles at low voltage.

Freedomfuel

Posted: Fri Aug 27, 2004 7:41 am Post subject: Re: Stanley Meyers Theories

---

> **Simon wrote:**
>
> what are you the fun police or something? do you work for the government or and oil company? 

Now think about it logicaly. If I was working for the government or an oil company I would hardly be advising forum members to remain anonymouse. On the contrary I would be encouraging free energy researchers to give out their names and adresses on the internet so that the men in black can come round and sort them out.

Freedomfuel

Posted: Fri Aug 27, 2004 8:39 am Post subject:

Here is a resume of a speech made by Stan at the SEER'94 event. I did not make a note of the link where I found it so I am giving the whole text:

This is a typical Meyer text which appears to mean something to the scientifically naive but which does not bear close examination. What on earth does 'atomic energy balance of water' mean for heaven's sake! The essence of this piece is that the system used in the dune buggy does not depend on the separation of Hydrogen and Oxygen but instead uses energised water fed to the engine and ignited in the normal way using a spark. This is highly significant because legions of water splitters have believed that the Meyer dune buggy was proof of concept for the pulsed DC methode.

This piece also expresses Meyer's opinion that water has intrinsic energy and that it has become energised by the absorption of photons by sea water. Needless to say Martin Chaplin's water science site does not support this

idea or mention it at all.

http://www.martin.chaplin.btinternet.co.uk/index.html

In my opinion water is just the ashes of Hydrogen and it's internal energy of 1.88 kJ / mol confirms that it is not a source of energy. I believe that water cars take their energy out of the environment in the same way as many other free energy devices. Take a look at the Searl Effect Generator for instance. This fantastic device utilizes a strong pulsed electric field across a dielectric (nylon in this case) which stimulates an electron cascade in the surrounding air. This is not to be confused with a corona discharge which causes electrons to move out from the device rather than be drawn towards it. A naive interpretation of what is happening would be that it is drawing electricity out of the air but there is rather more to it than that. It also experiences cooling to such an extent that it super-conducts at full speed. It has been observed that some sucessful water cars also run cool to such an extent that their radiaters ice up.

One thing that remains to be established is how exactly was the water vapour in Stan's buggy energised and why does it implode with such force. I am working on the hypothesis that high density charge clusters are present in the energised water vapour produced in most water cars. How this phenomenon causes implosion and cooling is a mystery to me so much more research will need to be done.

Editor Note: This excerpt was published in the SEER'94 Event Program where Stan Meyers was to be a guest speaker.

New Energy

Stanley Meyer
Atomic Energy Balance Of Water. Using Water As Fuel. The Atomic Energy Balance of Water is activated and performed in a sequence of events in an instant of time. The Hydrogen Fracturing Process simply triggers and releases atomic energy from natural water by retarding and slowing down the reformation of the water molecule being subject to sub-critical state during thermal gas ignition. The Voltage Intensifier Circuit brings on the Electrical polarization Process that switches off the covalent bond of the water molecule without amp influxing. Energy Pumping Action undergoing "Resonant propagation" of opposite electrical stress oscillates the "Energy Aperture" of the combustible gas atoms to increase the atomic energy level of the combustible gas atoms prior to gas ignition. The Electron Extraction Process ionizes the highly energized combustible gases to decrease atomic mass while applied Voltage PulseFrequency of opposite electrical polarity initiates the triggering process once maximum voltage deflection is achieved ... releasing Thermal Explosive Energy (gtnt) beyond normal gas burning levels. The energy contained in a gallon water exceeds 2.5 million barrels of oil when equated in terms of atomic energy. Water, of course, is free, abundant, energy recyclable.In the Water Fuel Cell, the 40,000 volts of opposite electrical attraction force at around one milliampere is all that is required to convert water to explosive thermal energy on demand. This energy is increased through the "voltage tickling of state" space (particle oscillation as an energy generator). It is spark-ignited by the applied pulse-voltage of opposite electrical voltage polarity, and the energy is released safely. There are four basic processes that occur: 1) electrical polarization process stage; 2) universal energy priming stage; 3) gas ionization stage; and 4) thermal gas triggering stage. These processes occur in a sequence of events in an instant of time.

Eighteen microliters of a water droplet per injection cycle is all that is required to run the experimental dune buggy at 65 m.p.h. down the road. To run a truck, for example, it would take only 148 microliters of a water droplet to equal the on-road performance of the dune buggy, Meyer said.

Normally, gasoline has .5 pounds of hydrogen in it; whereas water has 1.7 pounds of hydrogen-or 2.5 times that of gasoline. Running a car under the Water Fuel Cell method, you would go 2.5 times farther than on gasoline.

The Water Fuel injectors (see photo on page eleven) that replace the conventional spark plugs in an internal combustion engine form the resonant cavity which allows water to be converted to thermal explosive energy. This technology allows the car to run both safely and under control.

Controlling the release of thermal energy in this way has solved some of the problems in the past of using hydrogen as a fuel source:

-Because the water is converted inside the piston, it is a fail-safe system that solves the problem of gasoline explosions.

-It is a 2:1 ratio-two hydrogen atoms to one oxygen atom. The ratio is maintained when converting the water to explosive gases. This eliminates the hydrogen enrichment problem. The ratio is maintained regardless of the speed of the engine.

-Nitrous oxide formation is held to a minimum.

"When you ignite gases from water, the by-product is a de-energized water mist which goes out the exhaust," Meyer explained. "It's an open energy system. The water mist is then re-energized by absorbing photon energy from the sun and then returning to the earth's water supply in the form of rain for energy re-use. We can also use a dosed, transparent recycling system to keep the vapors from going out into the atmosphere, yet still allow the photon energy absorption process to take place. This is now being looked at for possible future use.,,

Water Fuel Cell technology is specifically designed to be in compliance with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) non-polluting criteria, as well as highway safety standards in order to make the Water Fuel Cell injection system ecologically acceptable.

"The Water Fuel Cell only uses natural energy present in our environment," said Meyer. "It doesn't add to or subtract from universal energy that is already present in the combustible gas atoms of water. All we have done is tap into this universal energy safely.

"Meyer said the U.S. National Security Energy Act of 1992 said that alternative fuel sources must be oxygenated, and the Water Fuel Cell technology complies.

Freedomfuel

Posted: Fri Sep 03, 2004 11:00 am Post subject:

I have been reading some of the previous posts and there seems to be a lot of confusion over the circuitry in Meyer's patent. The series inductance and capacitance that he specified cannot possibly function as a resonant circuit because the diode prevents any reversal of the current. It has been suggested by one forum participant, perhaps based on a statement by Meyer himself, that the circuit functions as a ramp generator. That is the voltage is raised step by step to a maximum when conduction occurs and drops to zero. This would work if the water capacitor had a higher value and time constant but it is the picofarad range. Therefore, the frequency of the DC pulses would need to be in the megahertz range. In my opinion the inductors serve no useful purpose and can be dispensed with. There is a ramping up of the charge on the plates but this could be due to the pulsed DC contributing to a phenomenon called 'dielectric absorbtion'. You may have noticed that when a capacitor is discharged you can still measure a low voltage across it afterwards. This is due to an accumulation of surface charge on the interface of the dielectric and the plates. Here is a difficult to understand account of dielectric

absorbtion:

http://www.audience-av.com/on_capacitor_dielectric_material.htm

Here is an easier to understand account of dielectric absorbtion:

http://website.lineone.net/~aarekhu/freenotes.htm

Here you can see an experiment that shows dielectric absorbtion being induced in various materials using a high voltage pulsed DC:

http://homepage.ntlworld.com/ufophysics/efg.htm

If I am right about this it would allow a greater electric field strength across the plates than would be possible with the applied voltage in the hundreds of volts that Meyer used. You must remember that the dielectric constant of water would reduce the electric field by 1/80 requireing a higher charge to be applied to the plates.

It is an established fact that a high voltage pulsed DC facilitates the production of the energised water vapour with an electric charge that Meyer really used in his buggy. This energised water vapour is also Known as 'Browns Gas' and is always produced in this way by Brown, Knudtson and Wiseman for instance. It is also the main energising gas in all the water cars that I have studied.

More about 'charge clusters'.
Meyer had no idea where the energy came from to power his buggy. There has been considerable research, much of it covert, into the properties of this so called 'Browns Gas'. There has been one observation concerning Browns Gas that has led me to surmise that high density charge clusters are the real source of energy in this energised water vapour. It has been reported that when this vapour is 'burnt' it can neutralise the radioactivity of certain isotopes. It has also been established that charge clusters are emitted from the cathode in ordinary low voltage electrolysis. Here is a quote from Ken Shoulders:

'In the electrolytic case, the reaction is attributed to charge clusters generated from mechanical energy first stored and then suddenly released from a brittle metal lattice through the mechanism of fracto-emission'

It seems to me that all these water crackers trying to make fuel from water have really been generating charge clusters suspended in water vapour and coming up with a more potent source of energy than Hydrogen and Oxygen combined. It is also FREE ENERGY! I am beginning to think that the discovery of charge clusters and their role in Browns Gas may prove to be the most important scientific discovery of the 20th century and it may one day become a source of energy that could replace nuclear energy and fossil fuels.

If I am correct about this then our objective should be to design cells that deliberately generate charge clusters. Meyer appears to have done this but we can go further. We should consider using underwater arcing to enhance charge cluster generation. Meyer did utilize underwater arcing to generate his 'fuel gas' in one of his patents. We could learn something from the cold fusion guys about cell construction that utilizes underwater arcing. One of these links suggests a way of using anodised aluminium electrodes in calcium carbonate to produce the sparking that we require.

http://blake.montclair.edu/~kowalskil/cf/48clusters.html
http://padrak.com/ine/FB97_1.html
http://www.amasci.com/weird/evexp.html

Murray
Posted: Fri Sep 03, 2004 3:42 pm Post subject:

Freedomfuel

> **Quote:**
> Meyer did utilize underwater arcing to generate his 'fuel gas' in one of his patents

I thought I had read all the patents, which are you referring to?

The only patent I have read that has any reference to arcing is 4,798,661, but that it is always made clear that this needs to be avoided. To raise both the positive and negative voltage zones for this resonant/electrostatic action to occur. That is far different to the electrolysis process.

refer below

"As the electron leakage enhances, the flow of the electrons to the positive plate exciter gradually increases as they enter the attractive field of the positive plate. Upon attaining a heavy flow of electrons reaching the positive plate attractive area, arcing will occur. An electrical arc is formed between the two plate exciters. When this occurs a direct short conductive flow of current will flow across the plates."

"The electrical arc between the pair of plate exciters will form a direct line of conductivity; current will flow unrestricted. Upon the electron leakage attaining a direct short, the current is at a maximum. The voltage being subjected to the current takeover decreases gradually upon initial electron leakage and thereafter drops as the flow of electrons increases. When the electron leakage arcs over to the positive potential plate exciter, the voltage will drop to zero."

"The circuitry and expedients to inhibit the electron leakage at all levels of the magnitude of the voltage applied to the plate exciters is a sequence of steps and functions operable from predetermined circuit components"

"In the basic process of water separation as herein utilized, the hydrogen and oxygen gasses are separated by the application of a voltage to the plate exciters with the attendant current as close to zero as possible"

Murray

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

Murray
Posted: Fri Sep 03, 2004 3:50 pm Post subject:

Some very very very important Info for the people replicating the VIC Circuit of Stan Meyer

refer below

> **Quote:**
> WFC VOLTAGE INTENSIFIER CIRCUIT
>
> The WFC Voltage Intensifier Circuit (VIC) was especially developed to restrict amp flow while allowing voltage potential of opposite polarity to perform the work of separating the bipolar electrically charged water molecule by way of opposite Electrical Attraction Force known as "Electrical Stress". The distributed selfinductance of each coil inherently prevents amp influxing (retards current flow) across the water gap; while, simultaneously, the distributed capacitance of each coil causes an increase of applied voltage potential of opposite polarity of equal intensity to be placed on opposite sides of the water molecule... performing the Electrical Polarization Process @. Each coil further functions as resonant charging choke coils to tune-in to the dielectric properties of water, when the applied pulse
>
> frequency is adjusted to incur minimum amp flow, while voltage potential attempts to surge toward infinity if the electronic circuit would allow this to occur. Increasing the number of turns of each coil in direct relationship to increasing applied pulse voltage amplitude increases the electrical stress across the water gap.

Murray

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

Gary
Posted: Wed Sep 08, 2004 4:35 am Post subject:

Hi guys, this current restriction business spoke about above does not make any sense and I think you really need to get your head around some basic electronics here or else you could waste a lot of your time and effort.

Firstly, the idea of a water capacitor sounds great, but unfortunately water is a conductor which make for a very poor dielectric, unless you can obtain pure water - which you won't be able to because as soon as its exposed to the air other gases like oxygen dissolve in it and contaminate it.

Anyway the idea is to be able to use free or cheap available water - there is not much point in making a wfc that works only with purified water that costs more than petrol!

So, you can't charge the wfc plates up with a massive electrostatic charge like a capacitor with water in between - it simply conducts.

Furthermore, as I see it any kind of current restrictor will cause the voltage to drop across the restriction - not the plates where you want it. I think I've said all this before, there are simply certain laws of physics and

electronics that must be observed.

If you intend to try to pull the water molecule apart by massive electrostatic forces then the eletrodes don't even need to be in contact with the water as no current needs to flow - in fact you really need to insulate the electrodes in something like glass! But SM, to the best of my knowledge, has never done anything like this.

The other thing to remember is that ohms law is not strictly a law. In fact ohms law R = V/I is simply a useful relationship that applies to most metals. Semiconductors and electrolytes do not follow the rules of ohms law. The resistance of an electrolyte is not constant, but changes with applied voltage which makes cell design using V = I x R very difficult. Consider that there is a threshold voltage of around 1.6 volt required to get the electrolyte to conduct at all!

Furthermore, with an electrolyte increasing the voltage does not proportionally increase the current. The relationship between curent, voltage and resistance in an electrolyte (unlike in a metal) is non linear - you get more current for your voltage at the low end of the scale, which is another reason why NORMAL low voltage electrolysis is more efficient than NORMAL high voltage electrolysis.

Anyway, its good to be back!

_____
regards, Gary.

Murray

Posted: Wed Sep 08, 2004 10:11 pm Post subject:

Hi Gary

> **Quote:**
>
> If you intend to try to pull the water molecule apart by massive electrostatic forces then the eletrodes don't even need to be in contact with the water as no current needs to flow - in fact you really need to insulate the electrodes in something like glass! But SM, to the best of my knowledge, has never done anything like this.

I agree massive electrostatic forces wont do the job that is why Stan makes reference to in the video footage I sent you that the VIC will use current but the energy yields from the gases evolved from the unit will be far greater than the input power.

and also in the note quote below (current as close to zero as possible)

"In the basic process of water separation as herein utilized, the hydrogen and oxygen gasses are separated by the application of a voltage to the plate exciters with the attendant current as close to zero as possible"

Tad seems to agree with me about the current limiting and he claims to had successful results replicating the

VIC and he also heard that restriction plays a very important role from a close friend who was close to Stan Meyer.

but that's cool we can agree to disagree

Hey I could be wrong

I think it's deffinetly time to pull my finger out and do some experimenting.

I have been side tracked again (nothing new) and looking at this magnet motor

http://www.perendev-power.com/mm_howitworks.htm

> **Quote:**
>
> Furthermore, with an electrolyte increasing the voltage does not proportionally increase the current. The relationship between curent, voltage and resistance in an electrolyte (unlike in a metal) is non linear - you get more current for your voltage at the low end of the scale, which is another reason why NORMAL low voltage electrolysis is more efficient than NORMAL high voltage electrolysis.

Thank you for explaining the above I will keep that in mind if I decide to follow that path

good luck with the Land Rover

Murray

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

Freedomfuel

Posted: Fri Oct 01, 2004 12:08 pm Post subject:

> **Murray wrote:**
>
> Freedomfuel
>
> > **Quote:**
> >
> > Meyer did utilize underwater arcing to generate his 'fuel gas' in one of his patents

> I thought I had read all the patents, which are you referring to?
>
> The only patent I have read that has any reference to arcing is 4,798,661, but that it is always made clear that this needs to be avoided.
>
> Murray

Here is where I thought I saw the list of Meyer patents that included one that utilyzed underwater arcing to make his water fuel. Since then I have gone back to the site and have been unable to find it:

http://www.fortunecity.com/greenfield/bp/16/stanleymeyer.htm

I don't think you can quote Stanley as an authority on underwater arcing because the subject is still incompletely understood today.

The idea about restricting current is interesting because it appears to support the approach being used by a Russian scientist. Here is the URL for his low current electrolysis page:

http://guns.connect.fi/innoplaza/energy/story/Kanarev/electrolysis/

I still think that the idea that you can pop apart the covalent OH bond with a strong electric field and little or no current flow is highly dubious. In order to obey the conservation of energy principle energy would have to supplied from the environment, but neither Stanley or anyone else has suggested how this could happen. Zero point energy anyone? If you read Martin Chaplin's online Bible on water science, the section on electric and magnetic effects on water makes no reference to the covalent OH bond being stretched within electric fields. What does happen is that the weak electrostatic bonds between water molecules are weakened and broken and if the field is strong enough the bonds parallel to the field are strengthened while those in other directions are weakened. Even if it was possible to break the covalent OH bond with an electric field it would be so strong that it would cause arcing. Here is the URL of the page referred to:

http://www.martin.chaplin.btinternet.co.uk/magnetic.html

There also seems to be confusion about the meaning of the term 'Hydrogen bond'. According to Martin:

'Hydrogen Bonding occurs when an atom of Hydrogen is attracted by rather strong forces to two atoms instead of only one, so that it is considered to be acting as a bond between them.'

http://www.martin.chaplin.btinternet.co.uk/hbond.html

This Hydrogen bond contributes to water maintaining a liquid state by forming water molecules into chains and clusters, and although I believe the Meyer buggy and other water cars supply their engine mainly with water vapour merely breaking all the Hydrogen bonds would not be enough to vapourise water. That is why I believe that our water cells are related to cold fusion cells and are not really performing electrolysis.

Another idea that needs to be challanged is Meyer derived theory that since elctrostatic forces are breaking the covalent OH bond then no curent flows and no power is taken from the battery. As I remember Meyer's theory he maintained that the charge and hence the voltage across the water capacitor was raised in steps with each voltage pulse which stresses the water molecule to the point where it pops apart. I have not read as much Meyer

theory as Murray because I think that it is rubbish but I believe that he thought that simple harmonic motion was stretching the covalent OH bond apart. Assuming that such a thing is possible, which it probably is not, this would not be free energy as some people seem to believe. I may be wrong about this but increasing the average displacement of the Hydrogen atom would also increase the dielectric constant of the water dielectric, requiring a compensating increase of charge on the plates to maintain the same electric field strength. This is undergraduate level stuff so I am a bit out of my depth here and will have to some more research to confirm this. See my latest post about 'Resonating Water Molecules'

My hypothesis is that something completely different was going on in Stanley's cell from what he thought was happening. I believe that it could be related to cold fusion even though nuclear reactions are not involved. No-one was provoked into responding to my suggestions about high density charge clusters which is a disappointment. This is cutting edge stuff and a lot more relavent than Stanley's silly theories.

Freedomfuel

Posted: Fri Oct 01, 2004 12:28 pm Post subject:

> **Gary wrote:**

> Hi guys, this current restriction business spoke about above does not make any sense and I think you really need to get your head around some basic electronics here or else you could waste a lot of your time and effort.
>
> Firstly, the idea of a water capacitor sounds great, but unfortunately water is a conductor which make for a very poor dielectric, unless you can obtain pure water - which you won't be able to because as soon as its exposed to the air other gases like oxygen dissolve in it and contaminate it.
>
> Anyway the idea is to be able to use free or cheap available water - there is not much point in making a wfc that works only with purified water that costs more than petrol!
>
> So, you can't charge the wfc plates up with a massive electrostatic charge like a capacitor with water in between - it simply conducts.
>
> Furthermore, as I see it any kind of current restrictor will cause the voltage to drop across the restriction - not the plates where you want it. I think I've said all this before, there are simply certain laws of physics and electronics that must be observed.
>
> If you intend to try to pull the water molecule apart by massive electrostatic forces then the eletrodes don't even need to be in contact with the water as no current needs to flow - in fact you really need to insulate the electrodes in something like glass! But SM, to the best of my knowledge, has never done anything like this.
>
> The other thing to remember is that ohms law is not strictly a law. In fact ohms law R = V/I is simply a useful relationship that applies to most metals. Semiconductors and electrolytes do not follow the rules of ohms law. The resistance of an electrolyte is not constant, but changes with applied voltage which makes cell design using V = I x R very difficult. Consider that there is a threshold voltage of around 1.6 volt required to get the electrolyte to conduct at all!
>
> Furthermore, with an electrolyte increasing the voltage does not proportionally increase the current. The relationship between curent, voltage and resistance in an electrolyte (unlike in a metal) is non linear - you get more current for your voltage at the low end of the scale, which is another reason why NORMAL low voltage electrolysis is more efficient than NORMAL high voltage electrolysis.
>
> Anyway, its good to be back!

Nearly all the points Gary has made are irrelevant.

First just what is the relative dielectric constant of distilled water and tapwater? Less than the figure of 80 for true pure water but by how much?

Gary maintains that having a lower dielectric constant means that impure water will conduct at alower electric field strength compared to pure water. By conduct I asssume he means dielectric breakdown leading to arcing. Does the dielectric breakdown voltage really depend on the value of the dielectric constant. Some basic physics research is required here.

The curent restriction provided by the coils would cause a neglegible voltage drop if the DC impedance of the coils is small enough. Does any one know what this DC resisitance is?

I have already dealt with the idea that pulling apart water molecules with strong electric fields causes no current flow.

It may be true that electrolytes have a non - linear V=IR relationship but surely Stanley was not using an electrolyte in his cell. Pure water remember.

I have hypothesised above that the ramping up of the charge on the plates is not due to Stanley's cunningly designed circuit but is a result of a phenomenon called 'dielectric absorbtion'. This is an accumulation of surface charge on the interface between the dielectric and the plates when the capacitor is alternatively charged and discharged. The glow discharge observed by Alex Schiffer surrounding some Joe Cells is to my mind a good indication of dielectric absorption although not many physisists would agree. Remember Stanley was not the only one to be using high voltage pulsed DC.

---

andrewg85
Posted: Mon Nov 29, 2004 12:41 am Post subject:

Hey guys, this idea may be totally ridiculous, but it might be of interest relating to the Meyer patent, and it might even work. If you know how a flourescent light starts up, you should get the idea of what I'm going on about.

A quick rundown on how they work:
The starter across the light is a short circuit, allowing for the ballast to charge up.
The light itself however is an open circuit when there isn't enough voltage. The ballast then releases a high voltage into the light when the starter open circuits from the bimetal strip to strike an arc in the light to start it off. The ballast then limits current once light is running.

My idea:
The water capacitor with plain tap water would act as a short circuit to a high frequency pulsing DC, along with the impurities. The power would build up in the resonant charging chokes. The pulses in the circuit will switch off causing the emf built up in the coils to discharge into the water capacitor. The diode blocks the voltage going back into the main circuit.

The end result? High voltage and high current spikes for very short periods of time in the wave to place severe stress on the water. This may also where he is getting the 40Kv from, and not the step up transformer, as the patents describe that as a 1:3 step up voltage ratio.

Xogen, places a coil at the bottom of the cell. This may put a magnetic field in the water, and then discharge up into the main capacitor cell. It might just be an improvement to Meyer's idea.

I will try this out myself using the test rig I have here at home.

Any thoughts anyone?

Dave

Posted: Mon Nov 29, 2004 1:11 pm Post subject: Meyer

> **Quote:**
>
> The end result? High voltage and high current spikes for very short periods of time in the wave to place severe stress on the water. This may also where he is getting the 40Kv from, and not the step up transformer, as the patents describe that as a 1:3 step up voltage ratio.

Hi andrew
Yes there will be spikes across the cell ,Meyer describes
it as frequency doubling ,but is not true in the way he describes
in his patents.Also the step charging waveforms he shows is in
reality the LC time constant,I will take a pic of my waveforms
and put it on the forum.I t looks just like Meyer`s step charging.
Never the less you should be able to obtain three times more gas
out than normal . COP 3
A straight switching circuit is best to drive the cell .

Best Regards Dave
than

---

andrewg85

Posted: Mon Nov 29, 2004 11:00 pm Post subject:

Hey Dave
The frequency doubling or some sort of multiplexing must come from the extra resonant charging choke, from the current lead / lags. Meyer does seem to leave parts of the patent out. If 3x overunity in his device is all he's getting, he may be using a combination of overunity devices to power the car? eg. permanent magnet motor to generate the electricity.

The LC time constant? You mean as in how long it takes to charge either the inductor or capacitor to a % of full charge?
I have a straight switching circuit with plain pulsing DC 20Hz to roughly 45Khz. It has fine tuning control. No PWM. I have lately been using the computer to see the frequency on the screen. I have off that 10 x IRF540 mosfets to switch up to 330Amps continuous, 1100Amps intermittent.

Dave
Posted: Tue Nov 30, 2004 1:27 pm Post subject: Meyer

> **Quote:**
>
> The LC time constant? You mean as in how long it takes to charge either the inductor or capacitor to a % of full charge?

Hi Andrew
Yes is the answer to your question. As to the 3x output
In the Meyers Technical Brief ,Appendix A Re:Table of Tabulations
He gives the Power consumed ,I back worked it and it came to
Cop 3,also on a video of the water fuel cell it stated 3 times more
gas than normal,so I assumed that was his results which tie in with
my measurments that I have done.
Have you measured gas output yet?

Best Regards Dave

---

andrewg85
Posted: Tue Nov 30, 2004 2:16 pm Post subject:

Hey Dave
It's just a theory I thought of charging a coil and discharging the back emf into the cell. I will build one, give it a try, and come back with the results.
Andrew

Freedomfuel
Posted: Sun Jan 23, 2005 12:33 pm Post subject:

In my opinion the schematic in the Meyer must have a deliberate mistake included to foil would be imitators. However, you could be on the right track with the idea that the back emf of the coil is discharged into the cell. This idea has been used in William Alek's overunity battery charger which you can view here:

Motionless Shock Battery Charger
http://www.nuenergy.org/pdf/charger.pdf

In his design the coil is in parallel with the battery being charged and it is connected with a ferrite magnet. The diode is included to block the forward emf which would be travelling in the opposite direction of the back emf. In my opinion what is happening here is that longitudinal/scalar electric waves are being generated from charge

clusters inside the magnet and it is these that are charging the battery. Measurements with conventional instruments would not indicate significant overunity because they cannot detect these longitudinal waves.

Qiman is in agreement with me on this exept that, according to him, the background radiation being converted into electric energy is zero point radiation rather than boring old thermal energy as I believe.

All you have to do is reproduce the the William Alek circuit with the battery to be charged with the electrolysis cell. If ambient heat is being converted into electrical energy I cannot see how it could be sufficient to power even a small vehicle like the Meyer Buggy. I suspect that there was a source of fuel somewhere in the vehicle.

Freedomfuel

Posted: Sun Jan 30, 2005 1:21 pm Post subject:

In theory it is possible to run a vehicle using energy taken from the environment using solar cells or one of those weird magnetic devies that qiman favours, but it is almost imposible in practice.

For instance two Russian scientists successfuly replicated the Searl Effect Generator which produced 6 kW output using 110 kg of neodymian magnets.

Roschin and Godin. Experimental Research of the Magnetic-Gravity Effects
http://www.rialian.com/rnboyd/godin-roschin.htm

Obviously it would be impossible for Stanley to secrete something like this in his dune buggy. When he was sued by his investors an engineer appointed by the court declared that the buggy used nothing more than simple electrolysis.

The only conclusion I can draw from this is that he must have mixed fuel with the water in his electrolysis cell. I also suspect that Dingel has also mixed fuel with the water in his electrolysis cell. I say this because two newspaper articles stated that he uses a small amount of fuel yet everyone who has examined the Dingel car cannot see how fuel could be introduced into the engine.

Some people may think that this is fraud but if it proves that it is possible to vapourise the fuel in the electrolysis cell it may be the holy grail of extreme mileage. As the Eagle Research books make clear it is almost impossible to vapourise modern gasoline satisfactoraly and it is this rather than oil company suppression that prevents vapour carburettors from being adopted. The possibility of combined fuel-water vapourisation in the electrolysis cell is confirmed by the fact that the Eagle research Hy2CO 2A fuel vapourisation system uses bubbling of air through the fuel rather than heat.

Murray

Posted: Fri Feb 11, 2005 3:42 am Post subject:

Hi all

Got some theories rolling around in my head just thought I would download.

Ok, as most people are aware I think Stan Meyer and Xogen are the only creditable sources.

I have made it a goal for myself to try to understand the forces at work at a molecular level as well as the relationship with electrical stress when applied to the water molecule.

Stan Meyer has been the only person who has attempted to describe this event, when hydrogen and oxygen is released on demand with minimal power consumption. He has many diagrams that describe the process.

I believe voltage Is the key, voltage is electrostatic force a potential force that indeed effects the water molecule or any other atomic particle present in a insulting material.

In resources other than Stan Meyer I have studied, show that electrons do get distorted. They get pulled away from there atomic nucleus when subjected to voltage(electrostatic force) thus weakening the bonding force of the atomic particle.

This proves that Voltage does indeed perform work.

I'm not saying that Voltage alone will do the job. It is a case of using a combination of voltage and restricted amp(electron) flow frequency and duty cycle pulses.

I always thought that we were looking for a point when this magical resonance would occur sought off like a point when we hit this massive jump in gas production at a certain frequency, but now I am not so sure.

Resonance I feel has been misinterpreted, I don't believe at this point that it is anything to do with a molecular resonance more of a collision of particles at a high voltage level when using the resonate cavity.This is when the positive ions and negative ions react similar to a neon tube and hydrogen and oxygen are created .

look at figure 8 patent 4798661 gas generator voltage control circuit of Stanley A Meyer

it says it all, your raising voltage but always adjusting frequency dutycyce or negative potential (resistance) to raise voltage to the next level.

raising voltage higher and higher gives you the advantage pulling away electrons and weakening the bonding force of the two atomic structures H2 and O from the water molecule.

It differs from electrolysis because of the restricted amp flow means there is more stress (distortion) of the molecule and a different process of gas generation applies.

Of course your thinking, If Stan Meyer used for e.g. 200 volts and .5 of a amp he is still using as much power as a person using 12 volts and 8.3 amps because they both equal 100 watts of power, and they both would produce similar gas levels.

but his way meant that you could use the potential energy (voltage) stress the hell out of the water elongate it's atomic structure pull away orbiting electron and not follow the same procedure of electrolysis

basically he could keep a constant cyndrical gap between his electrodes and increase voltage without arcing, but only if he used tools such as restricting current, frequency and duty cycle pulses to restrict electron leakage and

reduce power to produce more gas than the expected power input.

we might have to have cells as he did in parallel to produce enough gas to serve a purpose but who cares!

So what I'm doing is building a cell having a transparent tubular enclosure. This will contain only one stainless steel tube assembly inside having a gap of .0625 as Stan Meyer used. I will use precise measuring equipment - electrical and gas flow measurements.

it' s the only way to make progress otherwise your chasing your tail

I will upload a electrical diagram as soon as I catch up on a few things

I apologize to everyone about my experimenting progress I am always juggling this project in amongst other life commitments.

For those out there who endeavor to patent this technology and profit from it. I think morally you are doing the world a injustice there have been wars fought over oil, people have died and the environment is suffering it is bigger than you and your greed.

and by the way be quick, because I will work it out it is just a matter of time and when I do everyone will know with just a click of a button. I will upload it free, no doubt about it!

That will be enough satisfaction for me. I'm not rich by any means, I live week to week and live in a respectable old house, I could do with the cash but I know this discovery is like the holy grail and there are people out there, who will stop you from profiting from it one way or another.

anyway that's enough downloading

cheers

Murray

_____
Imagination is more important than the knowledge.
The knowledge is limited and the imagination is not. (Albert Einstein)

---

hydrocurious
Posted: Fri Feb 11, 2005 5:45 am Post subject:

---

hello all,

been lurking for awhile gathering info and ready to start experimenting and possible implementation of h2 into an ICE.

Group question... i think you are right about the Myers concept of high voltages and low amperages.. but from the hardware aspect, is it better to use tubular electrodes vs. plates when trying to replicate Myers gas production?

My first attempt at gas production will be using aluminum plates and a small 12v battery. Bear in mind this is the beginning, just to see what i get. I know that there will be refining, testing and so on..the alumimum plates are a freebie, so out of pure curiousity gonna see what happens before investing in stainless steel electrodes.

---

johnh

Posted: Sat Feb 12, 2005 7:06 am Post subject:

> **hydrocurious wrote:**
> hello all,
>
> My first attempt at gas production will be using aluminum plates and a small 12v battery. Bear in mind this is the beginning, just to see what i get. I know that there will be refining, testing and so on..the alumimum plates are a freebie, so out of pure curiousity gonna see what happens before investing in stainless steel electrodes.

Just bear in mind that Aluminium will react with most electrolytes and liberate hydrogen without electricity.
The Aluminium usually being changed to aluminium oxide.
This can give quite different production to electrolysis and the gas will likely be quite a little higher in hydrogen content.
Nothing wrong with this approach but be aware before making claims of greater efficiency.(the energy content of the aluminium consumed needs to be taken into account.)

see the article entitled The super battery called Aluminum on this page
http://www.hydrogenappliances.com/Hydrogendata.html

Regards
JohnH

Freedomfuel

Posted: Sun Feb 13, 2005 12:44 pm Post subject:

How do we really know that stanley Meyer really did what he claimed to have done? Where is the experimental data and where is the independant assesment of his technology? The whole thing is beginning to look fishy to me. Ask yourself this: how comes everyone who has tried pulsed electrolysis has not achieved anything like the same results? Are we really to believe that Stanley had stumbled on some incredible secret that would change the world? When no-one can reproduce the results claimed for some incredible energy technology there are only two conclusions you can make. Either they witheld some crucial detail of the device or else it is a hoax. The fact that Stanley's theories are not based on established scientific theories makes me believe that his 'water-powered' buggy was a hoax. This is not to say that what he was doing was without value. He may have deliberately misrepresented the technology in the buggy to lure investors or confuse would be imitators. Let us suppose that

somehow he had introduced some fuel into his engine without anyone noticing. If that means that he was running the vehicle with 3/4 water and 1/4 fuel that would be a major achievement in itself. This is doable because JL Naudin has demonstrated such a water/fuel mixture being used with the GEET fuel processor. If all internal combustion engines could use such a lean mixture we could run the world's auto fleet on bio-fuels like methanol and use petroleum just for making chemicals and plastics. I cannot emphasize what a revolutionary change this would be in the way we use energy and it's profound implications for the environment. So instead of chasing after the impossible dream of a fueless car I suggest we look at ways to use the leanest fuel mixtures possible using electrolysis, fuel vapourization and whatever else we can find.

Here is the main authority on water science on the internet that we can use to verify some of Stanley's ideas:

Martin Chaplin's Water Site
http://www.martin.chaplin.btinternet.co.uk/index.html

Water Ionisation
http://www.martin.chaplin.btinternet.co.uk/ionis.html

Hydrogen Bonding In Water
http://www.martin.chaplin.btinternet.co.uk/hbond.html

Molecular Vibration and Absorbtion In Water
http://www.martin.chaplin.btinternet.co.uk/vibrat.html

The Structure Of the Water Molecule
http://www.martin.chaplin.btinternet.co.uk/molecule.html

Water Activity
http://www.martin.chaplin.btinternet.co.uk/activity.html

Water Dielectric and Microwave Radiation
http://www.martin.chaplin.btinternet.co.uk/microwave.html

Magnetic and Electric Effects On Water
http://www.martin.chaplin.btinternet.co.uk/magnetic.html

There is no support for the idea that a strong electric or magnetic field can break the covalent bond in water according to Martin Chaplin. It could however, weaken this bond as Murray suggests but I am not sure that this means that work has been done without current. Initially raising the potential of the plates does require work to be done. Actually pulling the covalent OH bond apart, if that were possible, would also require a current because seperating charges means a force has to be directed against the potential gradient and work is done and energy is taken from the battery.

According to Dave 'resonance' really means somthing different from what Stanley used the term to mean. His idea is that resonance occurs when the water dipole is twists back and forth in a time varing electric field. This could have the effect of breaking the weak electrostaic bonds between water molecules enabling the water to vapourise without heat. As most of what is produced in these cells is Browns Gas this is the most plausible explanation of what is happening.

I wish Murray success in his endevours, but I think that he is chasing after moonbeams.

Dave
Posted: Sun Feb 13, 2005 1:15 pm Post subject:

Hi Freedomfuel

> **Quote:**
>
> Where is the experimental data and where is the independant assesment of his

All I know is this: In the Equinox film show by ch4 UK "It runs on Water" It was stated that gas output was = to 300%.
In Stan Meyers Technical Brief Appendix A. RE:Table of Tabulations
and you back calculate from the Data it comes out to 300%

My own gas measurments also comfirm this to be true.

It is also true that his written technical description is not conventional.

Nor was Oliver Heaviside who showed that energy of electric current did not travel down wires but in the space between.
And a lot of people today still believe that the energy of the current still travels down the wires.

Best Regards Dave 

Freedomfuel
Posted: Mon Feb 14, 2005 12:42 pm Post subject:

What you wrote about Olver Heaviside is interesting. Where can I read more about it?

What I find hard to accept is the idea that the power input into Meyer's cell could be so small compared to the power output of the buggy's engine. 150 watt in for 12 kW out seems highly improbable to me. I accept the possibility of overunity in principle but this is ridiculous.

Also it difficult to calculate the potential energy of the gas being produced because it was probably Browns Gas which is supposed to not exist so you will not see any figures for it's enthalpy in textbooks. George Wiseman is not much help here either.

By to 300% do you mean that the volume of gas produced was 3 times what Faraday's law indicates what it should be. I am not sure what Faradays law is. Could someone enlighten me?

Dave
Posted: Mon Feb 14, 2005 3:13 pm Post subject:

Hi Freedomfuel

Here is a bit about O.Heaviside http://www.neurodiversity.com/bio_heaviside.html

He Wrote three books on Electromagnetic Theory ,Ihave had a
read years ago. I can`t afford to buy them as they are as rare
as hens teeth, and the cost is about couple hundred pounds.

Yes 300% 3 times more gas than predicted by Faraday law.

If you look on the main page of this forum I put somthing up in
reply to Murry,its under Equations and Formules. About Faradys Law.

Best Regards Dave

---

chemelec
Posted: Tue Feb 15, 2005 8:32 am Post subject:

> **Quote:**
> Freedomfuel
>
> Posts: 91
> Joined: 11 Jun 2004
>
> Posted: Sun Feb 13, 2005 12:44 pm
>
> How do we really know that stanley Meyer really did what he claimed to have done? Where is the experimental data and where is the independant assesment of his technology?

That is Also MY Question.

Anyone can make Any kind of Claim:

If I were to Claim 1,000%, without any Independent assessment, It Doesn't mean Anything. Just Try to Prove me wrong, Especially Considering None of these people Ever gave the Appropriate Data to Duplicate there Apparatus!

Take care.....Gary

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

Dave
Posted: Tue Feb 15, 2005 2:36 pm Post subject:

Hi Gary

> **Quote:**
>
> Anyone can make Any kind of Claim:

Come on It should be kid`stuff for you to replicate,I` ve done it

all you need is a good scope,scales,a good true RMS meter and some passion.I have put enough info throughout this forum .
You just need to make the measurements and find the truth of the
matter yourself.

I do know about measurments I am also retired electronics engineer and
spent years working in High energy Particle Physics ."What do you
want a reference!

Best Regards Dave

Freedomfuel
Posted: Sun Feb 20, 2005 1:53 pm Post subject:

This result of 3 times the volume of gas as predicted by Faradays law does not explain how it is possible for Meyer to run his buggy with no fuel. In practice he would need to achieve a gas output of hundreds of times what Faradays law predicts for a certain current which seems impossible to me. Also I cannot understand how he could fit enough cells into his buggy to produce the volume of gas required. What we want to see is experimental data for this miraculous dune buggy.

hydrocurious
Posted: Mon Feb 21, 2005 6:05 am Post subject:

i've read all i can get my hands on regarding Meyer...any one know what in fact happened to the buggy after his death?

it's kinda like the story of Teslas electric car..i imagine them and other devices sitting in a warehouse somewhere only known to the evil oil companies. 

---

qiman13

Posted: Sat Mar 05, 2005 8:33 pm Post subject: stuff

Good to see you guys still active with the posts.

The heaviside component is the most important part of the energy in a circuit for energy purposes and yes it does surround the wires. Only 10 to the -13th of (1/11 trillionths) is diverged into the copper wire to induce the electrons to flow (if you're dealing with current) and that is measured as j-phi and is called the poynting flow. Poynting thougth all the rest was irrelevant since it wasn't being used. That is like scooping a cup of water from an infinite stream and saying that is all there is while discarding the entire river itself! That IS what is being taught.

Pulse the heaviside component unidirectionally, while keeping the circuit open (to prevent the possibility of electron flow) will result in the water taking up this heaviside component (without electrons), which is the radiant energy that the water absorbes to produce the overunity gas.

Regarding the amount of gas necessary over Faraday's law...well, the gas initially produced can continually be "potentialized" in a following chamber and a next one and a next one. Basically stripping away more and more electrons from the oxygen atoms making the gas very unstable and extremely powerful.

Freedomfuel, the gas produced does not have to stay at X power level...it can become more and more explosive. There are 3 known levels of the gas from Joe's cell and brown's gas. first level, 2nd level and a 3rd known as hypergas and I doubt that is the limit. Extrapolating this concept you can see that only a little of this gas is necessary to bring great power. I don't thing it should be assumed that all gas is going to pop the same. That should answer your question about how much volume of gas "should be necessary" to power the car.

Freedomfuel

Posted: Sun Mar 13, 2005 12:46 pm Post subject: Re: stuff

> **qiman13 wrote:**

> Freedomfuel, the gas produced does not have to stay at X power level...it can become more and more explosive. There are 3 known levels of the gas from Joe's cell and brown's gas. first level, 2nd level and a 3rd known as hypergas and I doubt that is the limit. Extrapolating this concept you can see that only a little of this gas is necessary to bring great power. I don't thing it should be assumed that all gas is going to pop the same. That should answer your question about how much volume of gas "should be necessary" to power the car.

Can you give us some instructions on how to control the potency of the Browns Gas produced. I know that the Joe Cell requires a specific proceedure to faciliate the production of the so called 'third gas' or Hypergas as it is usually called. Opinion on the Joe Cell seems to be divided beween those who swear by it and those who think that it is a hoax. One day I will order the book and video and start a new topic on the subject.

---

qiman13
Posted: Sun Mar 13, 2005 3:00 pm Post subject: gas production control

---

volume is by increasing the voltage to the cell.

controlling the potency of the gas?

I have absolutely no idea.

1. the "default" gas is easy
2. seems that the magnetic field concept to slow down the burn (increase octane??) of the gas is feasible.
3. hypergas? Even George Wiseman says he has made it but it happens spontaneously and isn't duplicatable since he doesn't know what makes it.

But Meyers info does show various chambers that the gas goes into and each one makes the gas stronger and stronger by stripping electrons from the oxygen making it more and more unstable and therefore more potential to release its energy.

That is the idea anyway.

Perhaps after the gas is produced, there is something to some open sesame frequency that magically turns the gas into some supergas. Would love to find out!

Dave
Posted: Wed Mar 23, 2005 9:20 am Post subject: Slots

On the video of Stan Mayer demonstrating his WFC, there are slots cut out of the tops of the outer tubes. Anyone got any idea`s why they are there?

Best Regards Dave

---

qiman13
Posted: Wed Mar 23, 2005 9:31 am Post subject: Re: Slots

I'm not sure exactly about the slots in the tops of the tubes.
Maybe related to the slots cut into the sides of the tubes as well?

Those are ports to pulse red LED light into.

> **Dave wrote:**
> On the video of Stan Mayer demonstrating his WFC, there are slots cut out of the tops of the outer tubes. Anyone got any idea`s why they are there?
>
> Best Regards Dave

---

urban_hahne
Posted: Thu Mar 24, 2005 5:53 pm Post subject: Stanley Meyer

Hi everybody. I am a new member of this group and I am an engineer who is living in Sweden. I am not so well educated writing English but if you read what I wrote several times I think you going to understand the most. I have read all the messages in this group since 2003. My intention is exactly as yours, namely to copy Stanley Meyers method to split water and give the knowledge to all people.
I have some thoughts about the molecular frequency of water and I have not seen someone explain the phenomenon. I have some feelings it could be of some importance, in fact could be the solution.
I think that the orbit of the electrons spinning around in the water-molecules is not exactly circular but slightly elliptic. If we should try to separate it from the molecule with a very small amount of power we should just give it a little push just when it is retreating from the molecule, continuing pushing the electron exactly in the same

place an amount of time the orbit going to be more and more elliptic and finally broke. This means it is very important to maintain the absolutely and exact frequency in the system if the over-unity-goal should be reached. I read somewhere that the frequency should be around 42, 8 kHz but not sure. The problem I think is to find the exactly correct frequency because one could not immediately record a change in the efficiency of the process when frequency is change because there is a need of time to change the orbit. Further is that the capacitance of the cell is changing with the temperature of the water and the capacitance or the inductance have to be adjusted for maintaining the resonance-frequency of the system.
Just tell me if I am far out in the wood.
Regards
Urban

Dave
Posted: Sun Mar 27, 2005 11:41 am Post subject:

Hi urban

> **Quote:**
>
> I read somewhere that the frequency should be around 42, 8 kHz but not sure.

I have never seen Stan Meyer quote 42,8 kHz , the frequency range
I have seen him mention is 1KHz and beyond 10 Khz it is going to
depend on the geometry of the electodes and the dilectric constant
of the water , with my reacter the output of my generator starts to drop of at about 13 KHz due to the impedence of the cell.

Best Regars Dave 

Dave
Posted: Sun Mar 27, 2005 11:47 am Post subject:

Hi Quiman13

[/quote]I'm not sure exactly about the slots in the tops of the tubes.
Maybe related to the slots cut into the sides of the tubes as well?

> **Quote:**

Have done some research . It seems that some organ builders cut slots at the top of there pipes for tuning.This is a guess I reckon that Stan Meyer cut the slots in his outer tubes to match the pitch to the inner ones as they would be at a higher pitch.

Best Regards Dave

---

urban_hahne
Posted: Sun Mar 27, 2005 4:48 pm Post subject:

Dave wrote:

Hi urban

> **Quote:**
>
> I read somewhere that the frequency should be around 42, 8 kHz but not sure.

I have never seen Stan Meyer quote 42,8 kHz , the frequency range I have seen him mention is 1KHz and beyond 10 Khz it is going to depend on the geometry of the electodes and the dilectric constant of the water , with my reacter the output of my generator starts to drop of at about 13 KHz due to the impedence of the cell.

Best Regars Dave

Hi Dave. Does your reactor have the same performance as Stanley Meyers reactor was claimed to have? If not, one have to try find the reason. Below you can read something about 42.8 and 43.43 kHz but the difference is probably depending on the temperature of the water. And yes of course the size of the electrodes, the space between them and the dielectric constant is the main thing who gives the capacitance of the cell. And the dielectric constant is allso changed when temperature is changed.

Best regards/Urban

I found this:

Keely and "Scientist X" (reported by Dan Davidson in his book "A breakthrough to New Free Energy Sources," 1977, ISBN 0-88247-469-3) and possibly Stan Meyer: water splits at the Keely frequency of 42.8 Khz, acoustic.

http://thetabase.net/twiki/bin/view/Main/AetherVortexSystem

and this:

(The link is gone but I have it in my computer)

Molecular Dissociation of Water:
A Project for the Experimenter
by Dan Danforth

In. the original setup that Stan Meyer showed us, he used 36 volts as the basic potential applied to the reaction chamber. He also commented that stainless steel (410 not 403) was the only metal that could be used as oxides formed with all others. His original chamber used 18 inch long by 0.375 inch diameter (o.d.) rod surrounded by 1 inch diameter (i.d.) 16 inch long pipe. The reason for the difference in length is for mechanical ease of construction. My prototype used 14 inch long rod and 12 inch long pipe of similar diameters as the drawing indicates.

Having a severe lack of parts diversity here in Sri-Lanka, I was only able to obtain a 24 volt. 8 amp transformer and built my circuitry around that. The final output is 20 volts with Ml reading 10 amps to the pulsing circuit which generates a symetricel squarewave (50% duty cycle) to the flyback inductor connected in series with the chamber as the schematic shows. The flyback high voltage spike is directed across the chamber via c* end d*. The use of a high voltage spike alone, without the current being delivered through the liquid, will not cause the disassociation to take place. This I verified using an ignition coil in place of the inductor and applied the secondary with halfwave rectification and blocking capacitor to prevent burn out to the chamber with no results. Apparently the current in the water aligns the molecules approprately to allow the high voltege spike to do its workr which in my opinion is the stimulation of molecular resonance. Once Stan's unit was made to begin breakdown (which takes 6 to 8 seconds) he was able to reduce both current and voltage to miniscule proportions. I attribute this to sympathetic oscillation of the aligned molecules, requiring very little in the way of additional excitation. A phenomena akin to Tesla's super resonance... resulting in Stan discovering that he only had to supply three pulses in ten to satisfy the requirement of the chamber. I have not yet had the opportunity to duplicate this portion of the experiment but, in time I vill.

Duplication of the device described in these pages, however, will produce the phenomena and hopefully launch other enterprising end inventive souls on to designing their own refined models. It would be nice to have feedback so that we can all collectively work to bring about the transition to non-pollution energy.

P.S.- Though electrical circuit is by no means optinised, but represents instead the result of parts availability here. Any good technician could improve on it quite readily.

There are two primary frequencies that produce the best results. They are: 14,372 Hz and 43,430 Hz. The former is about 50% more efficient, but it seems that just about any frequency between 9 KHz and 143,762 KHz works quite well. (1) This is because the nature of the wave form (a spike) is rich in harmonics and one of them is bound to be close to one of the two primary frequencies.

Use of permanent magnets may also increase efficiency. I'll give you the outcome of that attempt in my next letter along with the plans for what I hope to be a much improved version.

Dave
Posted: Sun Mar 27, 2005 5:12 pm Post subject:

Hi urban
Yes the reactor I have built produces the same amount of gas as Stan Meyers according to the information he gives in his
Technical Brief.
I go along with Harold Aspden`s Aether vortex spin theory and have
been in comunication with him for a number of years.Also I believe there is a nonlinear effect going. What Danforth say`s is true is that
you have to push gas through ,wind up the current and the back it off.
The reason is you creat a gas bubble dielectric whic will allow high voltage spikes,if you try to use high voltage pulses without having a gas film the the voltage will just collapse..

Best Regards Dave

Simon

Posted: Wed Mar 30, 2005 11:54 am Post subject:

> **Dave wrote:**
>
> Hi urban
> Yes the reactor I have built produces the same amount of gas as Stan Meyers according to the information he gives in his
> Technical Brief.
> I go along with Harold Aspden`s Aether vortex spin theory and have
> been in comunication with him for a number of years.Also I believe there is a nonlinear effect going. What Danforth say`s is true is that
> you have to push gas through ,wind up the current and the back it off.
> The reason is you creat a gas bubble dielectric whic will allow high voltage spikes,if you try to use high voltage pulses without having a gas film the the voltage will just collapse..
>
> Best Regards Dave

so dave are you able to run a motor from your gas output???

Dave

Posted: Wed Mar 30, 2005 3:23 pm Post subject:

Hi Simon

> **Quote:**
>
> so dave are you able to run a motor from your gas output???

Hope to soon ,Building new electronics to drive ithe reactor ,by that time the weather willl be a bit drier and warmer as spring has just arrived up here.

Best Regards Dave

Simon

Posted: Wed Mar 30, 2005 3:50 pm Post subject:

> **Dave wrote:**
>
> Hi Simon
>
> > **Quote:**
> >
> > so dave are you able to run a motor from your gas output???
>
> Hope to soon ,Building new electronics to drive ithe reactor ,by that time the weather willl be a bit drier and warmer as spring has just arrived up here.
>
> Best Regards Dave

awesome dave! make sure you post up pics!

Dave

Posted: Sat Apr 02, 2005 7:04 am Post subject:

This is worth a look.

http://www.alternate-energy.net/Electrolysis%20for%20Hydrogen%20Generation.pdf

Page 8 is interesting reading

Best Regards Dave

Mel67
Posted: Sat Apr 02, 2005 12:01 pm Post subject: O Snaps

> **Dave wrote:**
> This is worth a look.
>
> Best Regards Dave http://www.alternate-energy.net/Electrolysis%20for%20Hydrogen%20Generation.pdf

Dave, could you snapshot, your Oscope/Meter at several readings:

Pulsed DC- @ 1- 2 seconds from on, then in scientific increments?
Dave, what I'm basically looking for is "Oscope of Tap Water" vs Sulphur Dioxide anode Oscope readings in Air Force .pdf . Their square wave signal is kinda ragged.

Please?

_____
Jesus Christ Is Lord

Dave
Posted: Sun Apr 03, 2005 8:29 am Post subject:

Hi Mel

Sent you a pic by Email.

Best regards Dave

Mel67
Posted: Sun Apr 03, 2005 2:56 pm Post subject: O pic ty

> **Dave wrote:**

Hi Mel

Sent you a pic by Email.

Best regards Dave

Dave thanks for the Oscope pic. The off...ringing... seems less with TapWater vs Anodic Stimulants. (As per Air Force .pdf) Such as *Sulphur Dioxide*. And no mess. I suspect you saved me wasting my time, trying salt,battery acid, ect. Thanks, Dave!

_____
Jesus Christ Is Lord

Pete

Posted: Fri Apr 29, 2005 4:08 am Post subject: Meyer and Cornish

---

Has any one looked at the cornish hydrogen generator. I found web pages on it before I found stuff on Meyer. Cornish uses high voltage and aluminum wire. He seemed to be getting more hydrogen then you would get through electolysis and reacting water with aluminum. (.111 grams of hydrogen per gram of aluminum)

I have a great high voltage circuit for my cornish generator. So far no large amounts of hydrogen. I think I might switch over to experimenting with the WFC it seems to make more sense to generate hydrogen and oxygen insteaad of making aluminum oxide and hydrogen.

With the little I have spent on reviewing the wcf it seems like what they are trying to accomplish is keeping the highest voltage charge on the plates as possible with without arcing over. So they pule the votage to the plates to keep them (the capacitor) charged and ramp the voltage up to the point were it will pull the atoms of water apart. Am I on the right track?

Pete

Nav-Tesla

Posted: Fri Jun 03, 2005 3:09 am Post subject: What did Meyer do??????????

After years of pondering on the Stanley Meyer's WFC Technology,
ive started realizing that the process described by Meyer is certainly NOT ELECTROLYSIS the way we know it... as, when you observe in the Patents it talks of Explosive Thermal Energy obtained by some Intrinsic means of the H2O molecule itself and not by the dissociation of its constitutes and aslo Meyer again claims to retrofit the spark-plug area with what he terms as the 'Hydrogen Facturing device' wherein Water is injected and which results in the above stated Thermal explosive Energy to give the thrust in the IC engine.
Did Meyer really have something in Profound but tried to hide from the mainstream scientists.

can Water molecule be made(some ways!!!!!!!!) to harness the Quantum Vaccum Energy which Meyer then dumped it in the IC engine effectivily getting Thrust and Water Back in the process?????
I'm Working on these lines fror the last 10 12 years we are still in the dark age of knowing anything about the Geometry of Radiant Energy to effectivily harness it and putting it to Practical use.
Why for god sake any body not using the Bedini's device on a High-Power bases to demonstrate the capturing of Radiant Energy of the same proportional higher rate and thereby applying it to a practicle use????? I have plans to do this!!
Meyer took 20+ years to acheive what he claims he got!!!
Ive come up with (SINCE 1993) a Profound method in Actual Electrolysis but will not release details untill i have IP rights on it (PATENT) AND ALSO BECAUSE I HAVE CERTAIN MORE VENTURES RELATING TO OVERUNITY ISSUES TO TEST WITH IT.
I want to incorporate my device in conjunction with the Bedini's device and test for the Overunity perfection of my claim.
for some reason and my health not permiting me to work ive actually prolonged the results for some years now. But now ive made up my mind to give it a go.... as some body rightly said to me that perhaps i'm suffering from the 'Inventor's Diesese' (Murray!!!!ya!).

Best Regards,
Navneet.

[quote="Freedomfuel"]In my opinion the schematic in the Meyer must have a deliberate mistake included to foil would be imitators. However, you could be on the right track with the idea that the back emf of the coil is discharged into the cell. This idea has been used in William Alek's overunity battery charger which you can view here:

Motionless Shock Battery Charger
http://www.nuenergy.org/pdf/charger.pdf

In his design the coil is in parallel with the battery being charged and it is connected with a ferrite magnet. The diode is included to block the forward emf which would be travelling in the opposite direction of the back emf. In my opinion what is happening here is that longitudinal/scalar electric waves are being generated from charge clusters inside the magnet and it is these that are charging the battery. Measurements with conventional instruments would not indicate significant overunity because they cannot detect these longitudinal waves.

Qiman is in agreement with me on this exept that, according to him, the background radiation being converted into electric energy is zero point radiation rather than boring old thermal energy as I believe.

All you have to do is reproduce the the William Alek circuit with the battery to be charged with the electrolysis cell. If ambient heat is being converted into electrical energy I cannot see how it could be sufficient to power even a small vehicle like the Meyer Buggy. I suspect that there was a source of fuel somewhere in the vehicle.
[/quote]