

Table of Contents

Posted with permission of Jeane Manning

1. Quantum Leap

Part I Past Revolutionaries

2. Nikola Tesla - The Father of Free Energy
3. Other Innovators - In Harmony With Nature

Part II Space Energy and the New Physics

4. A New Physics for a New Energy Source
5. Solid-State Energy Devices and Their Inventors
6. Floyd Sweet - Solid-State Magnet Pioneer
7. Rotating-Magnet Energy Innovators

Part III Emerging Energy Technologies

8. Cold Fusion - A Better Nuclear Technology
9. Powering Up on Hydrogen
10. Turning Waste Heat Into Electricity
11. Low-Impact Water Power - A New Twist on an Old Technology
12. The World of Power Possibilities

Part IV The Energy Revolution--Potential Amid the Problems

13. Harassing the Energy Innovators
14. Society and a New-Energy Economy
15. The Power Is in Our Hands

Resource List

Glossary

Permissions

Bibliography

Index

Dedication:

To the pioneering inventors in the new-energy scene, and especially to all those whose stories did not end up in this overview--your struggles and triumphs nevertheless touch and inspire me.

Foreword:

by Brian O'Leary, Ph.D.
Physicist and former astronaut

Excerpt from the book

Posted here with permission of Jeane Manning

This may be one of the most important books you will read. It describes the rapid progress in making available a source of energy that many of us in the scientific community believe will

radically change the face of the earth--zero-point energy from quantum fluctuations in the vacuum of space. Many people call this "space energy" or "free energy."

Because the free energy that surrounds us in such a vast source, so potentially clean and decentralized, some of us believe a revolution is brewing. Afterward, existing energy sources may be seen as dinosaur nightmares that littered our landscape and polluted our air. This revolution could open a new paradigm of science and technology that would make the Copernican and Industrial Revolutions appear tame....

Electrical power systems based on compact solid-state devices will probably replace the fuse boxes and circuit breakers of individual homes and buildings. We finally will be able to get off the power grid. The new energy boxes will also be portable, eliminating the need for storage units such as batteries. They will replace the internal combustion engines in our automobiles and other transportation and industrial systems. And they can be used in the field to dramatically increase agricultural efficiency (for example, pumping for irrigation) and therefore can help eliminate hunger in Third World countries.

But we will need to develop policies in which these energy devices are scaled appropriately to their end use and not overused or applied to weapons. In the longer term, I believe we will discover that space energy can also be used in a practical way for antigravity propulsion systems.

So why don't we get on with it? It seems that since the time of Nikola Tesla a century ago, we have been suppressing "free energy." We have all developed some deep-seated fears that are blocking the way, ones that haven't yet reached the public consciousness. Yet with all the suppression, the energy genie is finally out of the bottle, as Jeane Manning clearly shows in this book.

First, I'd like to share some background to these dramatic statements. About twenty years ago, when OPEC raised its oil prices and an energy crisis erupted, I began to look at how we in our culture were abusing energy.

Do you remember the gas lines of the mid-1970's, the grim statistics of increasing oil scarcities, air pollution, oil spills, oil wars, prophecies of nuclear meltdowns, radioactive waste contamination, nuclear weapons materials proliferation from foreign domestic power programs (like North Korea's now), and other predictions of doom and gloom? As we head toward the turning of the millennium, whatever happened to the energy crisis? ... Many of us can recall that as the 1970s further unfolded, the OPEC cartel began to lose its grip, oil prices dropped, and Ronald Reagan was elected U.S. president.

As if by magic decree, the mass media and public consciousness decided there was no energy crisis after all. The oil glut resumed and any perception that there was a need to develop alternatives seemed to drop out of public awareness.

....

Two decades ago, the fleeting public perception that we did have an energy challenge helped to spawn a Department of Energy (DoE). It was expected to support research and development in alternative energy sources. But much of the DoE was simply bureaucratic old wine in new bottles, combining existing special interests in both fossil fuel and nuclear power.

Until this day, it is apparent to me that little true progress has been made to stop our abuse of energy and the environment. Rather than moving Manhattan Project- or Apollo Project-style into the future, we instead reinvent the wheel of vested interests in fossil fuels and internal combustion engines and nuclear energy, and we continue to supply electricity from large central power stations through an ugly grid system that may be a major health hazard (electromagnetic pollution from power lines). So why didn't we do anything about this?

A switch to clean "free energy" could almost totally alleviate air pollution, global warming from carbon dioxide emissions, waste heat, Saddam Hussein's ecocidal fires, black skies, oil spills, acid rain, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, hydrocarbon and ozone emissions, unsightly oil production

and refining facilities, supertankers, gas stations, power stations, transmission lines, and the rest of it.

Use of "free energy" could also end our thirst for oil and natural gas. This thirst is draining precious resources from the Earth at alarming rates. This lifeblood, formed over tens to hundreds of millions of years within Earth's crust, has been greedily extracted as if there were no tomorrow. Oil production and consumption has more than tripled since the onset of the energy crisis. Almost half of the world's available oil and more than half of the natural gas have already been skimmed off the top of our best deposits and burned, mostly within one human generation!

At present rates of consumption, proven U.S. oil reserves will last just ten years, and world oil reserves will last forty years. Even if these reserves were to prove to be twice as abundant as the estimate, we will run out of oil by the middle of the twenty-first century, with inevitable sharp price rises.

...We are indeed borrowing the Earth from our children rather than inheriting it from our parents. An ecological consensus is emerging--*we must stop this and build a sustainable future.*

The economic impact of converting to space energy would be enormous. Revenues from the use of electrical power worldwide are now \$800 billion per year, a doubling over the twenty years that have passed since awareness of the energy crisis was articulated and then withdrawn. This staggering cost even exceeds by twofold the size of the automobile industry, and is comparable to the amount that taxpayers annually pay to a debt-ridden United States government.

The worldwide energy infrastructure that depends primarily on burning oil, coal, and natural gas, and on the use of radioactive elements, consumes about \$2 *trillion* each year, a figure so high it is hard to imagine the enormity of its grip on all of us. In the time it takes for you to read this sentence, the world is burning up more than one million dollars of fossil and nuclear fuels for use in electrical applications, heating, cooling, and transportation systems.

During the early 1980s, while I was studying advanced space power concepts at Science Applications International Corporation, it became very clear to me that any radical new idea in the energy field was in for tough sledding. It would face vested interests within the U.S. government and established industry.

Most of the billions of dollars of Department of Energy research and development funds are still spent each year to expand the use of fossil fuel and nuclear energy. In my years as a science policy analyst, I learned that government R&D projects form the thin edge of a wedge of great political and economic clout; today's blueprints leverage into tomorrow's multibillion dollar realities. Once a project's investment goes over a billion dollars, the project becomes a new special interest, with contractors in Congressional districts and so forth. This guideline appears to hold regardless of the merit of the project.

The largest single advanced R&D project in the DoE is the more than a billion dollars spent on the (still infeasible) "hot" fusion concept. Hot fusion would involve both building large power plants and more pollution from excess heat, radiation, and power lines. Another significant portion of DoE funds is spent for high-energy physics and weapons research not directly related to energy production. Much smaller amounts go to developing solar and other alternative sources, and to energy conservation. Nothing--not one penny--of American public funds (outside the black budgets that we don't know about) is invested in looking at the source of energy that I believe will change the way we do things--the free energy which surrounds us.

An entrenched interest has become so powerful that we seem to be blind to any new concepts, especially those as radical as "free energy" and cold fusion. We seem to be more interested in the controversy about whether these developments are real, rather than in seizing a golden opportunity.

....

Much theoretical and experimental information already supports the credibility of space energy. I

have been surprised to see a breadth and depth of knowledge, dedication and professionalism, and substantial achievements among leading theoreticians, experimenters, and inventors in the "free energy" field. These are the explorers of a new reality. They are cut off from the mainstream because the mainstream debunks this reality, with a denial based on the most superficial reasoning.

Rather than the public's stereotypical image of the eccentric out-of-touch garage inventor who is probably wrong, many of our "free energy" inventors and researchers are Ph.D.s working in mainstream settings, such as Shiuji Inomata at the Electrotechnical Laboratories in Tsukuba (Japan's "Space City"). He has been a full-time government employee for the past thirty-five years.

In India, Paramahansa Tewari has a prestigious government position as Chief Project Engineer of that nation's largest nuclear power plant under construction. Both governments have permitted these two men to build their "free energy" devices..., something that has been unthinkable in a DoE lab in the United States.

Dr. Inomata recently lectured government and industrial leaders (more than 600 professionals showed up at his last seminar), and Thoshiba Corporation invested \$2 million to develop superconducting magnets for his new unipolar generator...

Few other qualified scientists bother to take the learning and relearning time to learn about "free energy"; most of the vocal naysayers have not addressed the puzzle. They are limited by peer pressure and funding pressures, and by a strong bias against probing the unknown outside their own specialties. I know; I was there!

A common error made by the debunkers is the assumption that if these machines were real, they would have heard about it. The history of science is full of examples of leading scientists ridiculing--sometimes emotionally--new ideas because of this assumption, and later being shown to be wrong. Of course this is about as far from science and rationality as you can get, and it suggests that the suppression syndrome starts with scientists themselves.

Government officials and the media turn to the scientists for their information, and so also ignore the obvious....

By default, it seems, these establishment mouthpieces define what is meant by credibility--which may actually have little to do with the truth. One phone call from a mainstream journalist to a mainstream luminary such as Carl Sagan, for example, could quash a story. Unfortunately, our most revered news sources do not have the final word on the truth, and this causes the slow progress of science.

So why haven't we adopted "free energy" if we've had it for so long?

How could so many decision-makers have kept "free energy" so completely from us, so that there is still not a single machine on the market? After all, the technology for making it available is probably not that far beyond our reach. It is probably much less challenging of a project technically and financially than the Manhattan Project scientists faced in developing the atomic bomb, or than the Apollo program scientists and engineers faced in sending men to the moon.... Inventors have apparently been demonstrating "free energy" results for mere thousands of dollars--not the billions and trillions spent on perpetuating more traditional approaches. Why has it taken so long for money to flow in logical directions?

In other words, how could the suppression of "free energy" technology have been so complete, so airtight for so long? If our government and scientists are ignoring the obvious, why haven't market forces gotten wind of this and briskly moved ahead? It seems that everybody is waiting for the other shoe to drop.

I have come to a conclusion I had previously thought to be unlikely: that the Suppression Syndrome pervades every aspect of any revolutionary new development. Usually the more radical the concept, the stronger will be the forces of suppression.

For example, most inventors are underfunded or have been "bought out" in exchange for keeping their trade secrets under wraps. This closes them off from sharing knowledge within the interdisciplinary teams that I feel will become necessary to develop this new industry. In my opinion, we will need a moderately funded effort of perhaps tens of millions of dollars to make the necessary breakthroughs.

I disagree with those who see this potentially paradigm-shattering development as a purely competitive private-sector issue--a horse race motivated by the chance that a particular system might be the winner which could yield millions or billions of dollars to lucky investors. In such a competitive situation, other new energy systems fail to be developed because of bad timing or underfunding or other suppressions.

In such a win-lose system, we are spinning our wheels. In the Western world, the entire complex of denials from scientists and secrecy from industry is gridlocking us. It's a crazy system!

In summary, most inventors and researchers of "free energy" systems are underfunded, so progress is slow. The prospect of becoming a millionaire by being among the first to develop a commercial model encourages secrecy and suppression. Instead of this all-or-nothing approach, I propose that we develop win-win funding strategies that would virtually eliminate the cancer of suppression. (Because of our fear of the unknown, we are suppressing what we need the most.)

There appear to be three main challenges for "free energy" proponents:

1. *Suppression* of all kinds has been efficiently blocking availability of the new energy technologies.
2. The potential of "free energy" for replacing existing infrastructures will cause *displacements* in jobs, income, and power, to a degree that it is unprecedented in our economy.
3. The *abuse* of "free energy" technology could lead toward its overuse or use as a powerful weapon. However, devices can be designed to be safe. I feel we cannot let the potential for abuse be a reason to stop or to suppress the technology.

Harnessing the clean "free energy" is too important for the planet and for ourselves, and is inevitable. But we must develop standards for appropriate use, to meet the strictest guidelines for sustaining our global environment. We need to be responsible creators--learning lessons from our abuses of nuclear energy, for example.

I do feel that once "free energy" devices pass the usual tests, such as cleanliness, cheapness, and convenience, the technology will quickly flood the worldwide marketplace. We all know of the profound effects that earlier inventions have had on our lives--inventions such as electricity, telephones, automobiles, airplanes, television sets, transistors, and computers, to name a few.

....

The challenge is not to decide whether or not "free energy" is real. It is. Instead, the challenge is to our collective will, to break free of our ignorance, the electric jail, the ecocide, the gridlock, the Newtonian rigidity, the greed, and the vested interests.

Now I think you can see why I believe this book is so important. "The energy revolution," Jeane Manning said to me in a candid moment, "could affect people's lives--their practical everyday choices--profoundly, because decentralized power means freedom. It means empowerment to clean up our environment instead of feeling helpless. The megaproject-builders no have no leg to stand on when they claim their projects are necessary."

....

Jeane Manning is a highly qualified journalist who has researched the new-energy scene since 1982. She brings an international perspective to the topic, being in ongoing contact with many inventors, theorists, and other networkers in about a dozen countries. She has attended more than twenty energy-related conferences in Switzerland, West Germany, Canada, and the United States.

....

The time is right to share this with the world. ...She is the first experienced journalist to cover this important and neglected topic in a trade book, and it fills a unique need.

End of book excerpt