Free Energy idea + re from Bob (ca 6000 words)

By Thor Fabian Pettersen 2018

Preface:

Free energy is the dream of driving your car forever without having to rely on gas stations. Just drive. Forever.

How can that be accomplished?

One way is a perpetual motion machine. However, this will not work because, the way I understand perpetual motion machines, it basically boils down to having no source as source, which is nonsense. Or, if it was possible, then I will sell my brain on auction because then I have no need for it.

Alternatively, the free energy dream could be accomplished with an overunity device, but such devices are nonsensical too, because if everything is this thing we call reality, then overunity must mean you get more than what reality has to offer, which is nonsense.

Then we have ZPE or zero-point energy. This is “close enough” to free energy, but, eventually, cosmic death may be the final outcome here. But I want real free energy. I want immortality. How is that possible?

Rick Rosner is arguably the smartest man on earth; my idea is the opposite of his! Rick’s universe is the “Junkyard Universe,” while my idea is cleaner, neater, and, if I may be so bold: smarter. (But don’t tell Rick that!) My idea is the Recycling Universe. Just to be clear, this universe is in accord with physical law.

How can free energy be in accord with physical law? That is because the definition of free energy is the dream of free energy. The definition is not “perpetual motion machine.” That is, a perpetual motion machine could make the dream of free energy a reality, but that does not mean that free energy = perpetual motion machine. There is an error of thought occurring here. You need to step away from it.

For example, Nikola Tesla had a dream of free energy, but that does not mean that Tesla believed in perpetual motion machines.

Free Energy: Must reality be fundamentally beautiful?

Note: This work is made by fusing old material with new, so there will be a little repetition throughout. Also, note that my idea is truly simple.

What I mean by beauty concerning my own idea is that everywhere we look in Nature, things grow, which would mean that, if the universe (and the earth etc.) grows too, it would mean that Nature is consistent on a fundamental level—and that to me is beautiful. It also means that evolution itself started at the dawn of time. And the best thing: free energy.

We can understand free energy through QM:

Quantum Mechanics, for example, is absolutely beautiful if you understand John Archibald Wheeler.

How to make sense of QM on a philosophical level:

Actually, only QM can make sense of the nothing out of something phenomenon because QM is this dual creature that displays lungs (particle) and gills (wave):

The tetrahedron is both unbound (wave) and bound (particle). It is like asking, “How did life go from water (nothingness/wave) to land (something(ness)/particle)?” Well, obviously, there was a creature that could (both) breathe underwater and breathe on land. That creature is QM.

Ok. My big point here is that, if you want to move from nothing to something, then you have to have certain properties. You have to have lungs and gills. There are not a lot of options here, which means that the basic building block (bbb) of the universe is like a mermaid that has her tail (wave?) in the water of nothingness (quantum reality?) and her breasts (particle?) swelling in the air (classic reality?). In addition, if evolution only copies what is (because there is nothing else to copy), then we got a haven of mermaids. If these mermaid’s tails allow them to communicate through the medium of nothingness, then, there you go: The only thing that can emerge from the nothingness is a creature that is a master communicator. What does this picture look like? Well, it looks like what it looks like, which is a brain or mind. This is not that far-fetched when we humans possess brains and minds. It from bit! (Some who take Ayahuasca experience that reality is the mind of God. Maybe it is?)

But is the wave-reality a realm of nothingness?

What is nothingness? Nothingness can be seen from the light's own point of view. What that view is, is a stripping away of all boundaries. Just imagine sitting on a ray of light, all time dissolves. Everything freezes and goes by in an instant because you are entering an absolute world where there is no up/down, big/small. There is no boundary that can tell you that this thing is small and this thing is big—and this is our wave! And note that nothingness has properties and therefore, nothingness exists; nothingness is therefore not nonexistence, if nonexistence is that which has zero properties. So nothingness is like water and something(ness) is like ice. They are the same, yet different.

Note that space has no size and is therefore one with the nothingness.

Why is there nothingness rather than nonexistence?

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.

Why do we get the stationary phenomenon when we remove the absolute position? Why can't we just remove the absolute position and accomplish nonexistence? In your mind's eye, you can simply extinguish a flame with your thought. In actuality, you need, say, water. Similarly, when we reduce all the velocities in existence to a complete stop, we do not get nonexistence but a state that is completely frozen, which must look like the points in Zeno's paradoxes. The paradoxes make motion impossible, so if you want to create nonexistence, then the best you can do is to create the paradoxical pictures you will find in Zeno's paradoxes.

Alternatively, you would not create Zeno's paradoxes as such, but you would simply have a frozen landscape; which means, if nonexistence always was, then you would have this frozen landscape, but then you are back at the problem of origins, "How can the frozen landscape have always been there?" If we have this thing called existence and, the thing comes in the form of motion, then we solve the paradox, because now you can create a velocity that is so fierce that you curl the frozen landscape up into a "zero-dimensional" knot. That is, nothingness is the speed of light in a vacuum.

Timelessness is not the opposite of time; timelessness is a high speed, the ultimate expression of time.

Reality is a creature that spins with a great fury for all time. She spins so fast that all boundaries dissolve = nothingness.

Nothingness/the absolute universe = that which has no size/boundary

Something(ness)/the relative universe = that which has a size/boundary

Note that the nothingness is “in” our universe and not “outside” it.

The basic building block of matter must be a thing that is both absolute and relative because of this move of going from nothing/absolute to something/relative. In fact, I believe the tetrahedron actually is the bbb of reality because it is both absolute and relative.

The tetrahedron can truly explain QM on a fundamental level. Everything is therefore a process or a system, which means there is no such thing as an “object” or matter which exist independently of each other. That phrase “cannot exist independently” explains QM because, if size is an illusion, then the behavior of particles interacting over huge distances is not that odd or difficult to explain. If all is this great oneness, then there you go. And all must be this great oneness because everything is contained in this thing we call reality—which means reality itself is not contained as there is no elements/things left in this picture to contain her—which means she is alone/absolute—which means she is not relative—which means you cannot measure her—which means she has no size—which means size is ultimately an illusion cooked up in the animal brain as, e.g., a means for survival—which means, when the illusion fades, all is one. (A true Buddha can make the illusion go away, which must amount to messing with your brain functions, like you can consciously override the filters in your brain; or, alternatively, you can escape through reality’s communication channels (above) like the ones on Ayahuasca. Who wants to meditate? Raise your hand! You will start to hear a loud noise! Keep going!)

A sidenote: If QM is ugly from a logical and mathematical perspective, then have you considered the opposite: logic/math is ugly. There are myriads of paradoxes inextricably linked to logic/math, but we keep those paradoxes locked up in a closet and then we muse how beautiful logic/math is. The reason why logic/math is ugly is that reality is the oneness, and then we take that oneness and chop it up into pieces (like X and not-X) and call it logic. The result is that we destroy the flow of motion as seen in Zeno’s paradoxes where we use logic to form the paradoxes. With a little bit of insight, you would see the paradoxes for what they really are, namely, the logical system itself. More: We say, “The cat is not on the mat.” From the perspective of the oneness, there is no such thing as “the not.”

The cat has simply moved. But there is no such thing as “the not.” If you cannot have “the not,” then you cannot have X either. Without the X, you cannot have logic. That is, the universe knows no logic. So maybe QM is truly beautiful after all? Note that we can use logic/math as a tool, without which QM would not be possible. But that is a separate issue.

Moving on: The boundary of a boundary is zero. Let zero stand for a point or dot and let the dot stand for the nothingness. Take a piece of paper and draw some dots that you can later draw into, say, a triangle. Make some more triangles/dots. The boundary of a boundary is zero in this example would mean that you take the piece of paper and fold it such that all dots sit atop each other. (You don’t need to do that, you can just imagine it.) You will see that all the dots are connected and therefore, all the triangles can communicate seemingly at a distance because their boundaries start and end in the medium of nothingness. We can now imagine causality happening in this atemporal reality, where every triangle simulates the entire state of the universe internally. There is no external universe in this picture; all the inhabitants/triangles of the universe simulate the universe within themselves. They share the same reality, even though they, in a sense, do not actually share it, as there is no external universe where they actually communicate.

The boundary of a boundary is zero, meaning that our triangles are one with the nothingness; however, at the same time, they ARE triangles, which means they are dual creatures with one foot in the ocean of nothingness and one foot on the island of time. The light itself is a good example of this. From the light’s point of view, we can see that the light dwells in the absolute universe where nothingness rules, and, at the same time, the light travels in our relative universe of stars.

The Causality Debate: Dominoes versus Rock Band

The beauty of this picture is that causality happens in timelessness, which means we escape the embarrassing infinite regress of real causality, namely, if this caused that, then what caused this, and so on ad infinitum and turtles all the way.

Instead, timelessness is like a concert: The drummer doesn’t cause the vocalist to sing. But the vocalist knows when to sing because the whole show is in unification, in communication, and sharing and passing information. That is, that reality communicates is the ONLY way to explain causality without invoking the infinite regress paradox, which means, reality MUST be a mind. There is no other way.

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 Richard Buckminster “Bucky” 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.

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

What created the cuboctahedron? A: Nonexistence is impossible, meaning the cuboctahedron had always been. It is motion itself.

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. Which means: All is fine.

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

However, if the cuboctahedron has always spun, then does it spin to the left or right? Is it spinning clockwise or anticlockwise? 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.

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.

So, how did everything start from ... absolutely nothing?

I think the answer is so simple it has eluded philosophers for thousands of years. Basically, the philosophers equate nothingness with nonexistence. Nothing is nothing and therefore it cannot exist, nor create anything. If you believe that, then you must be stupid (dual pun there!). But what if the simple answer is a simple question: What if real nothingness exists? (meaning it has properties, whereas nonexistence would have zero properties). How?

I think the key to the mystery of creation lies in the fact that true nothingness can only be accomplished with a high speed as seen with the light's own eyes. From the light's point of view in a vacuum, there is only nothingness. Well, the light's point of view, is not merely a "view," but the true state of things. That is, the high speed of nothingness is motionlessness or timelessness. That is, timelessness is not the opposite of time; timelessness is a high speed, the ultimate expression of time. What does that mean? It means that timelessness does not need a cause or a beginning therefore it never moved, that is, it has no trajectory or history that needs to be explained. The universe has a history, you need to explain that, but you do not need to explain the trajectory of the nothingness because there is none. However, you do need to explain why there is nothingness rather

than nonexistence. And I believe the answer is hidden in the question: If it was possible to form nothingness without motion, then true nonexistence would rule and we would not be here. However, it is impossible to create real nothingness without motion (well, just try), thus, nonexistence is impossible. Existence and motion always were, but this is not a real paradox because motion in its primal state is motionlessness or nothingness.

Ok. Then the trillion-dollar question arises: “How DID our universe come from the true state of things?”

The cool thing here is, we know that nothingness is accomplished with speed. We then need to find a geometry that is built for ultimate speed. As I said many times, that geometry is the cuboctahedron. When we fold the cuboctahedron, we get the tetrahedron. And the tetrahedron is the key to the wonder of creation.

The tetrahedron is special: it can exist in the relative world of stars and in the absolute world of light simultaneously, which means it is in motion and in motionlessness simultaneously. The way to explain this is that the tetrahedron’s boundaries amount to zero. A zero energy universe, so to speak. A way to visualize this is with a spinning gyroscope where motion is the actual spin of the thing and motionlessness is the fact that the gyroscope does not tilt over but is stable. Therefore, motion and motionlessness go hand in hand. Two sides of the same coin. I believe this dual nature of nature is the wave/particle phenomenon. Nature CAN be both a wave and a particle, and that explains the mystery of creation.

However, the cosmic gyroscope, so to speak, cannot tilt over because there is no gravity, nor do we have an environment that can affect it. But this may be the point, if you could “tilt it over,” then existence would come crashing down and paradox, nonexistence and clowns would rule supreme.

No. Motion must always be.

In other words: The only true view of the universe is that of the light because the light is absolute for any observer. The light’s point of view is pure nothingness. Mull on it. We came from this nothingness. To find the solution to the riddle of nothingness, we employ the geometry that is best suited for the task of generating speed. The cuboctahedron is a system much like your lungs, which means it breathes in and out generating a torus. Maybe this is so because our lungs are based on the primal forms in the universe. That we are a mirror of the universe is not so puzzling because we came from the universe. The twelve vectors in the cuboctahedron form a state of absolute stillness or

equilibrium. This is what the nothingness is. Again, this stillness can be seen as the speed of light in a vacuum.

But ... how is the nothingness moved to create space and time?

A bit of repetition and other words: When we fold the cuboctahedron, we get spin. This spin is responsible for generating the stillness, thus spacetime is a by-product of nothingness-generation. This fact can be seen in the tetrahedron (you get the tetrahedron when you fold the cuboctahedron) whose boundary of a boundary is zero. Again, what does that mean? It means that reality is a dual creature that lives and can live in both worlds simultaneously. This is perhaps why we have the wave/particle nature of the universe. In other words, what mechanism folded the primal cuboctahedron in order to create the spin that generates the nothingness? There was no such mechanism; meaning, the cuboctahedron has always spun. This is not a riddle from the light's own perspective because here the spin is totally frozen. Motion is motionless in the absolute world of light. In our relative universe, the cuboctahedron spins with a fury generating spacetime, which is a cosmic dual torus. However, how do we switch from the absolute world to the relative world in order to explain the something from nothing? Again, we look at the tetrahedron whose boundary of a boundary is zero: if you start with a dot, then make a line, and then you got something from nothing. No. In order to get something from nothing, you need to start at the dot, and then draw a circle that ends with the dot you started out with. This way, you will always carry the dot, and the dot will be the center no matter what. Creation out of nothing. It takes some time to see it, I guess. The dot represents the nothingness. In the world of speed, then the speed of light would be the nothingness, and creation would be a lesser speed. God taps on the brakes and the universe becomes visible. In reality, nothingness is very unstable. Just try to breathe in, you reach a point where you want to breathe out. The system we call nothingness is exactly like that. Liken the nothingness to a cosmic gyroscope that is only stable (breathes in and out) when spinning. The stable part is the nothingness and the spinning is the spacetime that whirls around the cosmic whirlpool. At the center of this whirlpool, space and time do not exist, or, they exist as motionlessness/timelessness/nothingness/absolute spacetime. We thus solve the infinite regress problem: What caused motion? What set motion going? The answer is, motion has always existed and always been motionless (due to spinning so fast) as seen in the center of creation, the lowest levels of our reality. Then, further out the cosmic whirlpool, the arms do not spin as fast; this *Major Traffic Jam* is responsible for the creation of the universe. "When" becomes "where" the arms of the whirlpool do not spin as fast. When did time begin? There is no such thing because absolute time has always been. Where did relative time start? At the slower parts of the cosmic whirlpool. By "whirlpool" I mean dual torus.

In summa: The infinite regress paradox or the First Mover problem is solved by understanding the dual nature of reality. That is, that reality can be both motionless and in motion at the same time. This is not a paradox, only a clever gyroscope.

Also, note that duality = oneness. (Like in the Yin and Yang or right is left.)

The dual torus is the picture of Eternity: that which ever was.

Say that nothingness is your lungs that breathe in and out forever. Then spacetime (or matter) is the air that fills and escapes those lungs.

More: A soap bubble can explain what is meant by boundary. The soap bubble is isolated from the environment it sits in, because, if it was not, then the bubble would join the environment and become one with it, that is, the bubble would burst. The tetrahedron is such a clever creature that it can be both a soap bubble and a burst one at the same time. It is therefore both nothingness and something(ness). This explains how you can get from nothing to something because you can create this boundary within the no-boundary reality by setting up a boundary that is = to having no boundary. Like that of the doorless door: You mark the outside from the inside by setting up a frame of a door. The air moves from the outside, through the frame, and then inside. From the air's point of view, there is no outside/inside, thus your frame does not violate it and can therefore be made. But this means that the universe can only exist as a clever illusion. And it must, or else you would have a real creation out of nothing, which is impossible.

Now to free energy:

Ok. Now we have spacetime. In the spacetime 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 cannot become immortal.

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, existence needs to recycle old stuff, that is, turn the unavailable energy into available energy again. How? Well, through something like Roger Penrose's CCC. The CCC itself is what I call a stupid Wolverine (X-Men) 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 whole of existence can be copied (without violating symmetry laws) and thus the resurrection happens individually, which means resurrection can happen while the universe is still around. That is, the mutant can heal while he is still alive. That is beautiful.

In short, the cuboctahedron infused with Roger Penrose's CCC, will recycle matter.

But matter from where? From, say, another galaxy. The beauty of the cuboctahedron is that it spins so fast that it lives in this "zero-dimensional" world of light where all spacetime is connected as all spacetime came from that world. So Nature's resurrection machine can take old stuff from, say, Andromeda, resurrect it, and then spew it out in the Milky Way, if she chooses to. Thus, in your free energy apparatus, you will get something that looks like overunity. But this is not real overunity.

Note that nothingness is this "zero-dimensional" world of light. But is it real nothingness? Well, let us see: From the absolute state's point of view, we have no visible spacetime, which means we have no white; no black ... It is truly nothingness. This is the real nothingness. Again, our nothingness is not the same as a state of nonexistence because the nothingness has properties while any nonexistence would be, by definition, devoid of all and everything. Nothingness is only devoid of visible spacetime, as it were. Nothingness, then, is absolute spacetime.

Moving on, the cuboctahedron is like your lungs, which means we do not get a Big Bang because inflation is impossible as the lungs would explode. The only way to get an exponential expansion of space, is to copy the lungs.

What happens when we copy things: 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, 1024, a few seconds later ... 549755813888 ...

What if the rapid torus flow is the cause of the exponential expansion of space?

The Big Bang thus becomes the Big Growth. (Yes. I coined it!)

The Big Growth has more explanatory power because the Big Growth answers where evolution came from. Evolution did not start on earth. Evolution started at the dawn of time.

The Big Growth has more explanatory power because Nature is organic. That is, the Big Growth has more explanatory power because we must be a reflection of Nature. So maybe the fetus in the womb is not that different from the nothingness everything came from? As above, so below. This fits perfectly because man, then, is simply a reflection of spacetime, which is the dodecahedral phase of the cuboctahedron.

If all this is true, and, the earth itself is a giant cuboctahedron, then the earth grows due to the copying process.

*Free energy, then, would be to put, in your car, a smaller cuboctahedron that does the same as the earth-cuboctahedron, thus you can drive forever, as fuel would grow in your fuel tank.*

For comparison, if we put the sun in your car, then, on the classic picture, it would burn out. If we put a smaller cuboctahedron that does the same as the earth-cuboctahedron, then you can drive till the universe ends or your car breaks down. And the sun is so big and hot too, so you would have a serious time implementing it.

Note: The cuboctahedron can be scaled, so we can fit *the whole of existence* in your car. If that is not ingenious, then nothing is.

To the reader: 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.

Free energy = to turn the unavailable energy into available energy again while the universe is still operational.

Also, note that free energy has nothing to do with perpetual motion machines or overunity devices.

The final idea:

If the cuboctahedron is the whole of existence and, if the cuboctahedron has always spun, then the cuboctahedron will continue to spin forever because there is no agent outside the system we call existence that can act upon the cuboctahedron and kill it. That is, if nothing can change the picture, then the picture will stay as it is.

You can symbolize the cuboctahedron with a stone that produces recyclable matter forever.

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. Thus, reality is a clever car simulation.

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

—We can also explain the 12 Devil's Graveyards around the world as these would be the 12 vectors in the cuboctahedron if the earth is indeed a giant cuboctahedron. The Bermuda Triangle would be one such vector.

—What does the cuboctahedron produce? A: A dual torus. Therefore, if the earth is a giant cuboctahedron, that would explain the geomagnetic field as this field would be a dual torus.

—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.

Free energy is simple: If the nothingness has properties, then it can be used/employed/manipulated—which means we can replicate the mechanism and put the earthlike-cuboctahedron in our car and spaceship and drive till the end of time—fuled by the cosmic birthing-process itself. Then we will get something that looks like overunity, but it is not so in fact because of this recycling-process I talked about. But if we do it right, then it will truly look like overunity, which must look like magic and inspire awe the first time we see it.

Re: *"Is there any way to measure if the Earth is growing?"*

***Bob Cormack: ***I can think of several:*** ***1) The force of gravity would be increasing. A company in Boulder, CO. developed (about 20 years ago) a gravitometer -- that is, an instrument which measures the acceleration of gravity at it's location. This instrument is fantastically sensitive; able to measure the change in gravity from a change in altitude of the instrument of only one millimeter!*** ***Here is a description of the instrument (and links to the company) used for an earlier answer I wrote on Quora.(******World's most sensitive gravitometer*** (https://www.quora.com/Why-can-t-we-aim-light-at-an-object-from-all-sides-to-get-it-s-position-or-put-it-in-a-tube-and-a-measure-how-far-it-goes-in-from-once-place-to-another-to-get-both-position-and-velocity/answer/Bob-Cormack)***). This instrument has been around long enough that there are probably long term data from some locations. Most of the things that affect local gravity average to zero over a few years. The exception is the hypothetical slow convection currents within the Earth's mantle, and those would average out globally.*** ***What you would do is search for scientific papers (on Google/scholar, say) analyzing long term data from a number of these instruments. What you would look for is a tendency for gravity to increase globally. This data would give limits on any rates at which the Earth might be growing.*** ***2) The Moon's orbit. Low satellites are affected by too many uncertain short term things to be useful for long term gravity analysis, but the Moon's orbit is known extremely well. One thing we know is that the Moon's orbit is increasing in diameter slowly (representing an increase in angular momentum). The current explanation for this is that this is due to torque produced by friction of the Lunar tides raised on the Earth by the Moon. These cause the Earth's rotation to slow down -- essentially transferring angular momentum from the Earth to the Moon.*** ***The details of tides are too***

*complicated to know precisely, but what is known with a very high degree of precision is the rate at which the Earth's rotation is slowing and the rate at which the Moon's orbit is increasing. * The Moon's mass, the Earth's mass + the rate at which the orbit is increasing give a measure of the rate that the Moon is gaining angular momentum.*** **** The Earth's mass and mass distribution + the rate at which the day is lengthening gives a measure of the rate that the Earth is losing angular momentum.*** ***These rates should balance. Any unbalance (plus the accuracy with which the relevant values are known) would give limits on how fast the Earth could be growing.*** ***What you would search for are papers that proport to show that these rates are unbalanced more than can be accounted for by the uncertainty in the values going into the calculation. (I would expand the search beyond Google/scholar here, as it is not unlikely that such research has not been published in the classic journals.)*** ***3) The diameter of the Earth would be increasing. I can't think of any ways to measure this, currently, that would be particularly accurate (at least, compared to the measurements referenced above). The size of the Earth's shadow on the Moon during a Lunar eclipse, and the precise timing of that eclipse are measurements of the Earth's diameter, but probably fail to be accurate enough to be useful.*** ***Now, when we have some observatories on the Moon's surface, that will be different.*** ***----------*** ***I would be glad to help 'decode' any papers you find, if you need help. I have a lot of experience at that. When I teach (occasionally) a graduate class at the local University, I always expose my students to the essay "Mathsmanship" (in the the humor book, ******A Stress Analysis of a Strapless Evening Gown*** (https://www.amazon.com/Stress-Analysis-Strapless-Evening-Gown/dp/0138526087)***, which exposes the 'tricks' scientists use to make their papers seem more complicated than the actually are. Quote:*** ***All scientific ideas are simple, once you understand them. A scientist, however, cannot gain status if everyone realizes his ideas are simple. One of the main goals of publishing is, therefore, to keep others from realizing the essential simplicity of your ideas.The easiest way to do this is by the misuse of mathematics, which we call "Mathmanship".*

*(The essay goes on to list the methods of Mathmanship. One of the simplest and most effective is to leave out 3 pages of derivations and substitute the word "hence".)*

*This essay poses as humor, but it is all too true.*** ***Bob***