Free Energy Summary (10.07.2018)

Thor Fabian Pettersen (2018)

Ca. 4300 words

+ rebuttal from Bob Cormack

Step 1:

Why is there existence rather than nonexistence?

In order to answer the mother of all questions, we will try to create nonexistence and apply it to the universe. Nonexistence shall be defined as the absence of everything. The universe has the certainty of position, or the certainty of momentum, or the unlimited uncertainty of both. Nonexistence would be void of everything, even certainties and uncertainties. And this is the trick: We want to form nonexistence by removing the certainties. We do that and, in our void, we get uncertainties. Then, in order to truly create nonexistence here, we remove the uncertainties; but, lo and behold, in our void, we get certainties. Then, in our frustration, we remove the certainties and the uncertainties simultaneously. Then, in our void, we get uncertainties for the certainties and, certainties for the uncertainties. Thus, we end up with certainties and uncertainties. We cannot create nonexistence. Existence, then, has always been.

Why is there existence rather than nonexistence?

A: There is an existence because nonexistence is impossible.

Let me explain in another way:

First, we need to find the state of absolute position in order to know what it is. We start by shrinking the space-time in our mind's eye so that we can truly home in on our position. We arrive at some point. The question is, how do we accomplish this point in reality? Well, we already know the answer to this question because photons experience this zero-dimensional reality every day, as it were. The answer is: We discover the absolute position or timelessness with speed; viz., the speed of light in a vacuum.

Ok. Let us remove the photons in order to create nonexistence. If we remove the photons, we remove the absolute position. We remove that which is absolute. What do we get? We get that light is stationary. To me, this looks like a paradox of Zeno, which means it is an impossibility. You cannot do it. You cannot create nonexistence because nonexistence is impossible to create.

Step 2:

Existence always was, which means we have things like atoms. But, did the atom start "over here" or, "over there." This is the infinite regress paradox. We solve it by fusing "over here" and "over there." Now, we have one place, one point of origin for all atoms. This point is known as the Big Bang.

Step 3:

What caused the Big Bang?

Existence always was, but what, exactly, is it? We start with our absolute state, which is the only logical place to start. This state was the speed of light in a vacuum. We then need to find a geometry that is built for speed. A man called Buckminster Fuller found it: the cuboctahedron.

We build the cuboctahedron, fold it, and see what happens.

We get clockwise and anticlockwise spin.

If existence always was and, if existence is the cuboctahedron, then we have always had spin.

The question arises then, when did the cuboctahedron first start to spin? What set it going? This is the First Mover problem.

Our solution to the problem was that, the cuboctahedron has always spun. However, this is puzzling because, then the spin itself does not have an origin, and we are back at the infinite regress problem.

The resolution here is that, we only see the problem from our point of view. From the light's point of view (in a vacuum), the spin is timeless or absolute.

Imagine that you had godly speakers and godly ears; then you could keep turning up the volume. What would happen if you just continued to turn up the volume? I believe the volume would be so high you would get silence. That is, motionlessness is an extreme form of motion. That is, our everlasting spin is motionless in actuality, which means we solve the infinite regress problem.

Step 4:

Ok. Now we have the cuboctahedron. The cuboctahedron spins. The spin is frozen. Then, how do we get space-time out of this frozen spin? How does motionlessness or nothingness birth space-time?

Step 5:

This is the ingenious part: When we fold the cuboctahedron, we get, among other things, the tetrahedron. The nature of the tetrahedron answers how we get something out of nothing. Note that "nothing" is not nonexistence. Nothingness is the state that came before the space-time.

What created the cuboctahedron? A: Step 1. Meaning, the cuboctahedron had always been.

So, how can nothingness birth something(ness)? The answer is: We find a creature that is both. We find a creature that is both nothingness and something(ness).

So, how did the nothingness become something? A: As I said, I believe that the nature of the tetrahedron answers it. The tetrahedron is both unbound and bound. It is like asking, "How did life go from water (nothingness) to land ("something(ness)")?" Well, obviously, there was a creature that could (both) breathe underwater and breathe on land. That is, the boundary of a boundary is zero. Meaning, the unbound dwells in that which is bound and vice versa.

Ok. But what does this mean? How does it work?

It works because existence is a dual creature. Existence is absolute and relative. The absolute is the speed of light in a vacuum. And the relative is, e.g., two planets relative to each other. Note that duality does not mean "separate." We are only dealing with one reality here. The absolute and the relative embody the same coin, so to speak.

The tetrahedron is both absolute and relative, I muse. The absolute is the wave and the relative is the particle. The tetrahedron is both a particle and a wave because of its bound/unbound nature.

So, back to our frozen spin. The thing is, our frozen spin is only frozen in the absolute state. In the relative state, the frozen spin is not frozen but spins with a fury. This is because, in the absolute state, you are all alone, which means you cannot tell if you are big or small or what. However, on the relative side, we can find out what you are; and, we find what the cuboctahedron is by folding it.

Which means the infinite regress paradox only applies to the relative side of things. From the absolute side, there is no paradox. All is fine.

Seen from our point of view, then, things simply pop from the nothingness. And the Know-How is the spinning cuboctahedron.

However, if the cuboctahedron has always spun, then does it spin to the left or right? Is it spinning clockwise or anticlockwise? A: The answer is both? Why, because the cuboctahedron lives in the absolute state. Just stand in front of a mirror and left becomes right. The cuboctahedron folds both ways because there is no such thing as left and right. Right is left.

About nothingness:

When you fold the cuboctahedron, you get the tetrahedron whose boundary of a boundary is 0. The cuboctahedron produces nothingness by its 12 converging lines that make perfect equilibrium/balance. The cuboctahedron is built for speed and, if we look at the universe from the light's point of view, we see only nothingness. It all fits.

Step 6:

Ok. Now we have space-time. In the space-time we have available energy. However, that energy will die, which means death for us as well. The question is, is Nature immortal? This is a Yes or No question. I will simply answer Yes and move on because a No is equal to suicide. That is, if Nature is not immortal, then we can never become immortal. If I knew that for a fact, I would hang myself. I am serious.

So, Yes. If Yes, then: If the cuboctahedron is the whole of existence and, if existence is immortal, that is, if existence will always produce available energy, then, in order to avoid overunity, then existence needs to recycle old stuff, that is, turn the unavailable energy into available energy again. How? Well, through something like the CCC. The CCC itself is what I call a stupid Wolverine because this mutant can only heal after he dies, which means free energy is impractical. However, if we merge the CCC with the cuboctahedron, then the mutant can heal while he is still alive. That is beautiful.

However, I contacted a guy whose IQ was, they say, 180. He had done some work for NASA, which suggests that he does have a high IQ. He is a member of Mensa Norway. (I'm Norwegian too, by the way.) I gave him my idea and he

said, among other things, *"Your zero understanding of reality, geometry, logic and science is so absolute that it can work only as fiction. I don't want to waste more time on this. You fall in the "Not even wrong." category: Not even wrong - RationalWiki"*

He texted in Norwegian, so I took the liberty of translating his words into English.

Anyway, my high esteem for high IQ people just dropped to zero. Not because of his ultimate character assassination skills--which I allegedly asked for--but because of his link to RationalWiki. Forget it, I cannot take him seriously.

The main issue he had with my idea, I believe, is the following: *"And when the said matter escapes the zero-dimensional hole, don't you think that it will end up even more disorganized than before as it gains its old temperature back? Yes, it would."*

Basically, this high IQ guy did not understand my idea, at all. I have tried to work out what happens in his mind when he said what he said, and I think it is something like this: Take a piece of white paper and then draw whatever. Let this "whatever" symbolize high entropy. Then fold the piece of paper to represent my idea. Now, what happens when we unfold the piece of paper? Well, let's just do it and see what happens. Wow, the high entropy is still there! He must think that I'm a moron, because I have spent 10 years on this idea. And I would be so embarrassed if I just saw how stupid I was. To be honest, I could become a member of Mensa also. I scored high on their online test, a test which shall give you an indication of your IQ. I scored 136. Then, to make sure I wasn't just having a good day, I tried the Swedish one, which I nailed. Then I took the Danish one. I scored 130. This one was tough. Overall, membership is waiting for me, if I choose to join their little club. I will never know, though, because I refuse to join their club if RationalWiki is the source of their divine power.

Personally, I think having an IQ of 180 is bullshit. You cannot measure that high. You cannot truly measure higher than the 130 mark: http://charltonteaching.blogspot.com/2012/07/problems-with-measuring-very-high-iq.html

More: Mr. 180 called Penrose a crackpot, or half a crackpot, to be exact. And half mad! So, one can only deduce that, for Mr. 180, information cannot be destroyed.

Mr. 180:

"When the gas compresses, the heat (and also the entropy) in the gas will leak out into the environment."

A: You have not read my idea at all or else you would not write this. Of course, the energy dissipates out into the environment! My idea was that, if a nothingness birthed our universe, then there may be pockets or holes leading to the nothingness, e.g., as remnants of the Big Bang. Then stuff can fall into these pockets and thus be revived.

Update: Here we can finally get a resolution as to what constitutes the fundamental misunderstanding of my idea: The environment. He thinks I'm playing in an environment! Of course free energy will not work if you are playing that game. Duh! My whole idea revolves around the idea that there is no environment at the center of Existence. That is where the matter ceases to be.

Note that I have been on my free energy journey for quite some time and that my idea has evolved in that time, which means my past notions may not be perfectly accurate, etc.. Nevertheless, I believe the core of my idea has remained intact through the years.

My idea consists of three elements that we fuse together:

1. The first element is Roger Penrose's CCC (or other models like that).

2. Then we take Buckminster Fuller's Vector Equilibrium (viz., the cuboctahedron).

3. The last element is a philosophical question, "Is Nature immortal?"

So, to the naysayers, how can my view of the world be "so fictional" when I take, arguably, two of the most brilliant brains that Nature has ever produced and fuse them together? The latter was even the second World President of Mensa.

Let us look at his genius: His genius is that he has found, in my opinion, the basic building block of everything. This building block is not just your average

building block, but it is Existence itself in its totality. In Fuller's own words, *"The vector equilibrium is the zero point for happenings or nonhappenings: it is the empty theater and empty circus and empty universe ready to accommodate any act and any audience."*--Vector Equilibrium & Isotropic Vector Matrix

If Fuller is correct, then you will see that the cuboctahedron is the whole of Existence, the great nothingness from which all things sprang.

The beauty of the cuboctahedron is that it can be scaled, so we can fit the whole of existence in your car. That is beyond wild. But, that does not mean that it cannot be true.

More, the cuboctahedron can be copied, which suggest the origin of evolution itself.

That is, the cuboctahedron has many things going for it, and we should not be so quick to dismiss it.

But why didn't Fuller come up with your free energy idea, then?

Maybe he did have something? See: http://www.geni.org/globalenergy/library/newsletters/1995/buckminster-fuller-on-the-global-energy-grid.shtml

Maybe because he didn't have the CCC.

Let us look at the CCC:

Basically, the CCC can be summed thusly: "What is entropy?" Entropy is information. Well, the only way you can have the information is if you have a room to place that information in. If you do not have a room or a space, then you cannot have entropy either. Another way of looking at this is with Penrose's Cosmic Clock. The clock (any clock actually) can keep time and therefore information and, by extension, sustain the existence of our room. But a clock requires mass: with the hot state that existed at the beginning of time, you would have such an intense speed that all things of mass cease to be, and thus your clock melts also. No clock, no information, no room, no entropy, only nothingness--which is an extreme form of motion as seen from the light's point of view in a vacuum.

So, let us take that piece of white paper again, and let us draw "whatever." Now, let us be true to the CCC here and let us, instead of folding the paper, we take an eraser and erase the information (the "whatever") such that we can start afresh. The eraser = the destruction of the cosmic clock.

This leads us to the third element in my idea: “Is Nature immortal?”

The answer to this question validates if Penrose is on the right track.

Let us run a couple of scenarios. Either Nature is finite, infinite or something else. And, information can be destroyed or it cannot.

Finite: Nature is finite and information cannot be destroyed, which means that high entropy will be our future and nothing can change that.

Infinite: Nature is infinite and information cannot be destroyed, which means that high entropy will be our future therefore the infinite is already behind us because we have to start from where we are. Entropy will increase and that will be that.

Something else: Ok. But without invoking miracles, entropy will increase and that will be that.

Conclusion: The only way we can have available energy again is if information can be destroyed.

You can believe in death, of course. I don’t.

But then you might say, “There was a Big Bang, entropy increases, the end. However, there might be a second Big Bang in another dimension. And a third. Etc.. So, you are right, there will always be available energy in the big picture that we call Eternity. Nature is immortal. But, we cannot take that available energy and put it in your car because any Big Bang would utterly destroy your car, plus the “eternal” available energy is in another universe. Your free energy idea, therefore, does not work.”

Basically, it all boils down to how Nature is wired.

If the cuboctahedron is the basic building block in Nature, then everything starts from a single point also. Then the cuboctahedron makes copies of itself. Instead of a Big Bang, we get a Big Cell Division. Put this process in your car and fuel will grow in your fuel tank just like a fetus growing inside a mother’s womb.

In the modern picture, new Big Bangs might happen inside black holes, and mini-big bangs will not affect us much. But if the Big Bang is wrong and the Big Growth is true, then we can have free energy. Remember, free energy is defined as Immortal Nature, that is, that there will always be available energy.

That is, free energy is absolutely true if we define it that way, or else you would have to believe in a miracle that births this one-time-event Big Bang, which converts the available energy into unavailable energy, and thus ends the story of creation right there. No. Free energy is true. The question remains if it is practical.

With the Big Growth (Yes, I coined it), it may be possible.

When we ask E.T., "What do you use for fuel?" He will reply, "We use Existence for fuel." "The whole bit of it?" "Pretty clever, huh?"

Big Growth vs Big Bang:

Pros for the Big Bang:

--Zero. At least from a philosopher's perspective. Why? Because, from a philosopher's perspective, the Big Bang needs to address every single question, even questions such as: "What is outside the universe?" "When did the inanimate become animate?" Etc..

Pros for the Big Growth:

--The cuboctahedron is a simple creature, made of triangles and squares, which makes sense as there were no evolution leading up to the beginning of time.

--The cuboctahedron is built for speed, and speed is how you make nothingness as seen from the light's own perspective.

--The cuboctahedron has equilibrium (nothingness) at its heart.

--The cuboctahedron answers the origin of spin (why galaxies spin). Just build one and see.

--The cuboctahedron has an expansion and contraction phase that answer many philosophical puzzles, such as, "What is outside the universe?" The cuboctahedron expands and contracts simultaneously, which means it never left its zero-dimensional world. 3D is therefore a clever illusion, which means there is nothing "outside" it when 3D does not exist as such.

--The cuboctahedron can also explain why we find planets and stars and etc., because planets and stars are cuboctahedrons themselves.

--The cuboctahedron's contraction-phase is the cause of the Big Bang, which shall in the future be seen as a Big Growth.

--The cuboctahedron also answers the question of how it all came to be, that is, how nothingness birthed something(ness). The nature of the tetrahedron answers it. That is, the tetrahedron is unbound and bound at the same time. Note: The unbound/bound idea (viz., the boundary of a boundary is zero) is ingenious and, for me, truly answers the biggest question of all time: "How did everything come to be?" More: The cuboctahedron is built for speed, and the ultimate speed is the speed of light; and, from the light's point of view, there is only nothingness. And when the vectors in the cuboctahedron converge, they create stillness/nothingness. So it all fits. And when you fold the cuboctahedron, you get the tetrahedron, which is to say that the "cuboctahedron/tetrahedron" is one and the same system. Now the picture has truly fallen into place!

--"When did the inanimate become animate?" The cuboctahedron answers it because the cuboctahedron can copy itself, which means that evolution starts at the very beginning of time. The animate always was. The universe is growing.

--And the list goes on to infinity ...

Simply put, the cuboctahedron is the prime candidate for the basic building block in Nature.

Find me a better one, I dare you.

I gave Bob this text: https://www.quora.com/What-is-your-theory-of-the-universe/answer/Thor-Fabian-Pettersen

Bob Cormack:

"I do not care if that prediction is 'allowed' by current theory or not." Re: Thank you. This was the first piece of reason I have ever encountered from others since

I began my free energy journey. "No. Our current models of reality say that said thing is impossible, so we're not gonna perform the experiment." That is the definition of stupid. Or, if it is not, then it should be the dictionary definition. However, there is one thing that is stupider: We are not investing a single dollar into the possibility of free energy. Isn't that truly stupid when science has got it wrong in the past?

"Something about the shape of a cuboctahedron is special." Re: You are absolutely right.

"A 'correctly' built cuboctahedron would concentrate matter and/or energy from elsewhere in the universe." Re: Let us put it in other words, if the cuboctahedron is the whole of existence and, if existence is immortal, that is, if existence will always produce available energy, then, in order to avoid overunity, then existence needs to recycle old stuff, that is, turn the unavailable energy into available energy again. How? Well, through something like the CCC. The CCC itself is what I call a stupid Wolverine because this mutant can only heal after he dies, which means free energy is impractical. However, if we merge the CCC with the cuboctahedron, then the mutant can heal while he is still alive. That is beautiful.

Note: If every cuboctahedron in the cosmos work synchronically, then we are back at the stupid mutant.

"So, my question is: What is the minimum structure (built of of what) that could demonstrate this effect, given current state-of-the-art instrumentation? Bear in mind that reasonably priced detectors today can respond to single photons, atoms and atomic particles." Re: The thing is, just because I am good at, say, hockey, does not mean that I am good at football. I am not an engineer. All I can tell you is where to ... not look. I know that the cuboctahedron is IT. I know that the cuboctahedron is a torus (or dual torus because the cuboctahedron can spin clockwise and anticlockwise). What is a torus? The geomagnetic field is a torus. In addition, I believe that the earth itself is a giant cuboctahedron, which would--if my idea were correct--seem to suggest that the earth is growing like our fuel would grow in our fuel tank (above). If the earth is growing, then we have no use for Pangea. So, any mind hung up on the status quo is back at labeling me a crackpot. What I can do is link you to inventors who employ the principle of the toroid in their designs. I believe you need a dual torus because that is what Existence is.

"What you need to do is to design an experiment. If that experiment is beyond your personal resources, then crowdfunding on the Internet is a good way to get support." Re: Crowdfunding is no good because I do not know how to design the experiment.

"Without an experimental test (at least a potential one), all you have is a philosophical argument, which has no guarentee of being correct. People can believe it or not and it will make little difference (unless one of those people comes up with an experimental test)." Re: That is my idea. My idea is that my idea will spark an Eureka, so to speak, in someone else. Memetic evolution and whatnot.

On a final note, I will link you to this place, I do not know if it is what you are looking for, but it is as far I have come to a real free energy device: http://www.doctorkoontz.com/Scalar_Physics/Energy/index.htm

Main: http://www.doctorkoontz.com/

Note that the Professor offers his math on free energy: http://www.doctorkoontz.com/Logs/index.htm

You should download the math before it is taken off the web.

Bob (2):

"[...] I go with Roger Bacon, that the only way to real knowledge about the physical world is through reproducible observations." Re: That is understandable.

"The scientists who quote theory at you to "prove" you wrong fall into this category." Re: Thank you for that tidbit. I will surely use it.

"But, from my perspective, your theory suffers from the same problem. It is based entirely on logic and hence is no more likely (or unlikely) to be right than

Aristotle's "proof" that heavy stones fall faster than light ones." Re: From what I hear on Quora, my work is anything but logical! This is a first.

Why did Meyer stop the replication of his invention?

"You are predicting that your ideas could conceivably power the world. There must be some smaller prediction you can make regarding something based on your ideas. Perhaps measurement of matter or energy appearing in empty space? Remember, modern measurement methods are very sensitive and photons and atoms are very small, and individual ones can be detected under the right circumstances." Re: The only thing that pops up in my mind right now, is the curiosity of the growing earth. Is there a way to measure if the earth is growing? If it were, then that fact would certainly project my idea in a bright light.

To be continued ...