av Leif Erlingsson
2010-02-14

Faktum är att de med yrkeskunskap på området inte vet vad energi är. Man kan räkna om mellan energi och massa, och till kraft. Men... Det går bara runt. Det finns ett vetenskapstrossystem som ej tål ifrågasättande: Big Bang. Med Solen som kärnreaktor, o.s.v.. Men det finns MÅNGA forskare som inte köper detta trossystem. De kallas inifrån vetenskapstrossystemet "pseudovetenskapare". Vetenskapskotteriet har alltså bestämt att vissa av de vetenskapsmän jag studerar skulle vara pseudovetenskapare. Det funkar så här: För att inte bli definierad som pseudovetenskapare så måste du genomgå en invigningsrit som kallas Peer Review. I en starkt formulerad protest undertecknad av en lång rad fysiker & andra vetenskapsmän mot hur denna anpassning till det vetenskapliga trossystemet fungerar konserverande skriver man bl.a. - och det är sannerligen inga nobodys! - (i *New Scientist*, May 22, 2004): "
An Open Letter to the Scientific Community
" ... "
Today, virtually all financial and experimental resources in cosmology are devoted to big bang studies. Funding comes from only a few sources, and all the peer-review committees that control them are dominated by supporters of the big bang. As a result, the dominance of the big bang within the field has become self-sustaining, irrespective of the scientific validity of the theory.
" D.v.s. att finansiering av vetenskaplig forskning i stort sett är avhängigt att man stöder Big Bang paradigmet.

Det finns alternativ med mycket starkt stöd. Tänker på det elektriska universumet med starka polaritetsskillnader mellan det inre och yttre av stjärnor. Där polaritetsskillnaderna öppnar upp för energiströmmar mellan fler dimensioner, d.v.s det så kallade "Fri Energi". Då behövs det plötsligt inga kärnreaktorer i centrum av stjärnorna! Jag skrev lite om detta 2007-12-05: " Fanta sikrisen
".

Energi och massa, eller kraft, kan ses som krusningarna på en ocean av mer verklig energi. Jag tänker på det så kallade vacumet, det som också är huvuddelen av allt vi kallar materia, där så kallade virtuella partiklar hela tiden kommer på besök, och återvänder till den bakomliggande etern, som man kallade den på 1800-talet.

Lee, Oehme och Yang fick nobelpriset 1957 för att ha förutspått bruten symmetri i motsatta laddningar, vilket tidigare det året bevisades experimentellt av Wu *et al*. (Jag har här stor hjälp av Lt. Col. T.E. Bearden:s “
Energy from the Vacuum Concepts & Principles
“, han nämner detta på många ställen, som på s. 121 i en fotnot.) Jag nämnde att massa ingår i definitionen av kraft. Kraft är något universum skänker gratis för att återställa just bruten symmetri. Studera "Dirac Sea", etc. - kapitel 9 i nyssnämnda bok är en bra start. Dirak kan sägas ha återinfört etern bakvägen, under nytt namn! Så här har vi skapelsehemligheten enkelt formulerad, iallafall från vår materiella horisont sett - men om vi ser det hela från ett lite större perspektiv så har vi ju naturligtvis bara nuddat vid ytan!

Se även virtuella partiklar som hela tiden kommer på besök, och återvänder till den bakomliggande etern/"Dirac Sea", som krusningarna på denna ocean av energi. För "*the bare charge and the bare mass of every electron each has infinite energy, as is well known in particle physics. For confirmation in very straightforward language, see Nobelist Steven Weinberg, "Dreams of a Final Theory", Vintage Books, Random House, 1993, p. 109-110.*
" (Fotnot 140, s. 254, Lt. Col. T.E. Bearden:s “
Energy from the Vacuum Concepts & Principles
“.)

Ang. termodynamiken så gäller den inte i alla lägen. Detta har visats experimentellt. Se t.ex. G. M. Wang, E. M. Sevick, Emil Mittag, Debra J. Searles, and Denis J. Evans, "*Experimental Demonstration of Violations of the Second Law of Thermodynamics for Small Systems and Short Time Scales,*
" Phys. Rev. Lett., 89(5), 29 July 2002, 050601. Starka gradienter skapar bruten symmetri. (*Lt. Col. T.E. Bearden: "Dilip Kondepudi and Ilya Prigogine, "Modern Thermodynamics: From Heat Engines to Dissipative Structures", Wiley, New York, 1998, reprinted with corrections 1999. Areas already known and recognized to violate thermodynamics are given on p. 459; one such area is sharp gradients*
.
") Och därför förutsättning för att universum gratis "vill" återställa denna brutna symmetri med gratis kraft. Som kan bli massa eller energi.

Rekommenderar även Dr. Peter Lindemann, "*Thermodynamics and Free Energy*", Journal of Borderland Sciences Research, Third Quarter, 1994. Finns som APPENDIX III i det följande högintressanta dokumentet, som nu la ut och hade tänkt klippklistra från:
http://lege.net/Lindemann__Peter_A__Free_Energy_Secrets_Of_Cold_Electricity__2000.pdf
. Tyvärr var det en del fel i PDF-en just i denna artikel, så jag fick leta upp den på nytt
från Journal of Borderland Sciences Research
istället, för att kunna citera:
http://lege.net/Lindemann__Peter_A__Thermodynamics_and_Free_Energy__1994.pdf
. Ett utdrag ur artikeln, min emfas på “
Second Law of Thermodynamics
” nedan:

"Before we go on, it is important, for our purposes, to be reminded that this new idea expressed as the “First Law of Thermodynamics” consists of a number of overlapping ideas and assumptions that can be expressed as follows:

1) Perpetual motion machines are impossible
2) The nature of heat is reduced to the random motions of molecular matter
3) Energy can be changed from one form to another without any explanation as to how this conversion is actually accomplished in any specific case
4) Energy is not created in or destroyed by its passage through a mechanism
5) All forms of energy behave the same way

All of these ideas are fundamentally inherent in “The First Law of Thermodynamics.” From an alternative science point of view, the experimental work of Carnot and Joule will stand for all time. It is the intellectual overlay of Helmholtz and Clausius, on this experimental work, where the problems are introduced. The theory of conversion and the ideas about the nature of heat will be taken up again later in this article, after more ground work has been laid.

The “**Second Law of Thermodynamics**” evolved out of further studies of the behavior of heat in closed systems. Remarkably, there is no one statement that is universally recognized as the definitive expression of this so called “Law”. Among the more popular statements which reflect the general understanding of the “Second Law of Thermodynamics” are the following: “In a closed system, entropy does not decrease”, “The state of order in a closed system does not spontaneously increase without the application of work”, “Among all the allowed states of a system with given values of energy, number of particles and constraints, one and only one is a stable equilibrium state”, and “It is impossible to construct a device that operates in a cycle and produces no other effect than the production of work and exchange of heat with a single reservoir.”

For those who can fathom the language, these statements clearly do not all express the same idea. Some have broad ramifications while others are more narrowly defined. All of these statements grew out of the idea, expressed fairly well as the last statement in the series, that a perpetual motion machine could not be made that operated on the principle of a work/heat exchange when this process was limited to a known quantity of heat at the start. After that amount of heat was converted to work and the temperature of the reservoir was reduced to the ambient temperature outside, no further work could be expected to be produced. This is not only reasonable, but it is backed up by thousands of experiments. As long as the “Law” is clearly and narrowly defined as a statement that reflects upon the behavior of heat in closed systems, this author has no problem with agreeing completely.

Problems arise, however, with some of the more generalized interpretations of the “Law” such as “the state of order in a closed system does not spontaneously increase without the application of work.” In order to understand why this statement is not universally true, it is important to clearly define our terms. We must understand what is meant by the “state of order” in a system, and we must define the boundaries of the “closure” of that system. In the first case, the “state of order” in the system is generally regarded as the temperature.

Understanding this, we can rephrase this statement to say, that in a thermally isolated enclosure, the temperature will not increase unless work or energy is added to the system. Here again, by clearly defining our terms, and limiting the discussion to heat and work, we have a universally true statement backed up by mountains of experimental data. If, however, we define the “state of order” as a generalized “quantity of energy”, and we further define the

“closed system” as the Universe, we are led to believe that under no circumstance is it possible to create a condition where the concentration of energy will increase spontaneously. This is not true!

While it should be understood that most known chemical processes, standard electrical equipment and heat generally do behave this way, the Etheric Energy Field of the planet does not. The Etheric Energy Field behaves in direct opposition to the more generalized understandings of the “Second Law of Thermodynamics” and this fact is backed up by considerable experimental data. One of the best documented examples of this is the spontaneous temperature rise observed in the “orgone accumulator”, invented by Dr. Wilhelm Reich in 1940. Here, a simple enclosure made of alternating layers of organic and inorganic material, allows the ambient density of the Etheric Energy Field to become more concentrated in the local area, without the application of work.

This new and higher energy concentration is then reflected as a spontaneous rise in temperature. This situation does not break the “Second Law” in the narrow case, because we admit that new energy is entering the system. It does break the “Second Law” in the general case because this energy is entering without the application of external work. Reich’s accumulator was designed as an attempt to shield and isolate this energy from its presence in the environment. His data clearly showed, however, that he was not able to isolate the energy effects inside the accumulator because the Etheric Energy Field easily penetrated the walls of the enclosure. He eventually realized that with regard to Etheric Energy Fields, it was impossible to “close the system” in the local sense. This is important to understand because it directly refutes the assumption that the universe consists only of closed systems at all levels of activity.

Here then is a major problem with how the scientific community regards the “Laws of Thermodynamics.” When the discussion is limited to the behavior of heat in closed systems, the “Second Law of Thermodynamics” is a well tested and accurate description of what happens under those circumstances. It is when it is incorrectly assumed that all forms of energy behave this way and that enclosure of the system is possible at all levels, that grossly false conclusions can be drawn from what started out as experimentally derived observations. The scientific community-at-large obviates these problems simply by denying the existence of the Etheric Energy Field because it doesn’t fit within their intellectual model. Unfortunately for them, the mounting experimental evidence is making this increasingly hard to do."

Vetenskapsetablissemanget hanterar detta med hjälp av skygglappar och förlöjligande av "pseudovetenskap". Men det är i sig ett stängt trossystem som ifrågasätts allt kraftigare av de vetenskapsmän som vågar - det är inte ofarligt att ifrågasätta dem med makt över pengarna...

Som om ovanstående citerat inte räckte, så finns det ingen "conservation of work" lag i termodynamiken. Det är energin som konserveras inom de dimensioner man arbetar i. Samma energi kan användas om och om igen till nyttigt arbete!

Jag ser fysiken som en kunskapsfråga som berör hela befolkningen. Därför tar jag mig rätt att

ifrågasätta skråtänkande och vetenskapliga prästerskap. Det är inte heller så att jag tanklöst klippklistrar kunskap, utan jag arbetar mycket hårt för att integrera den och göra den till min egen. Då skiter jag i om den är "*auktoriserad eller godkänd av kungliga vetenskapsakademien eller av svenskt högre lärosäte* ". För "*Den är insamlad genom sökande av mönster och samband under några års tid, mönster som för författaren gör uppgifterna trovärdiga* ".
("
Fantasikrisen
", 2007-12-05.)

Glöm inte Arthur C. Clarke's "Clarke's First Law": "*When a distinguished but elderly scientist states that something is possible, he is almost certainly right. When he states that something is impossible, he is very probably wrong.* " Och det är dessa herrar som bestämmer över vem som får pengarna i forskningen. Vad som därför har inträffat är att det har bildats nätverk av forskare som skapar sin egna Peer Reviw och sin egen kunskapsuppbyggnad, men som tyvärr inte får några forskningsanslag från de som sitter på de normala forskningsanslagen. Se t.ex. Alpha Institute for Advanced Study (AIAS):
http://aias.us/
. Uppenbarligen finns det välgörare, men då privata donationer.

Leif Erlingsson
2010-02-14