

The Laws of Thermodynamics have been accepted without question in the scientific community for about 200 years. But everything else changes, everything else evolves.

We've seen other scientific laws change over time as we learned new information.

What if the Laws of Thermodynamics are outdated?

And what if, by not questioning these old laws, we are preventing innovation that can positively address Climate Change?

Technological advancements that would assist in the battle against climate change are being dismissed by scientists/engineers based solely on the scientific community's unconditional acceptance of the Laws of Thermodynamics.

We have a patented solution to reduce pollution: why no scientific interest?

Design drawings and functional models were made available to many scientists/engineers. Here are the results:

- Most declined the invitation to test the physical models at all
- Most provided no feedback on the actual design, but still rejected the invention based on the existing Laws of Thermodynamics
 - Appendix "A" (page 13.303): The responses from engineers/scientists with respect to the invention; it's all about the laws – nothing about the actual design or models

Unconditional faith in textbook opinions is blocking application of real Climate Change solutions.

But some in the scientific community who decided to look at our designs and drawings provided positive feedback...

Some scientists/engineers have tested the models with approval

- *"I believe that Mr. Strain's invention will advance the scientific community's understanding of thermodynamics relating to pressurized fluids and energy to a new level. If fully developed the invention has the potential to reduce energy and as a result a reduction in the use of fossil fuels, thus assisting in the battle against climate change."*~ Donald M. Gorber PH.D, P. Eng.
- A control systems expert, representing SIEMENS, one of the world leaders in automatic controls, peer reviewed the control logic and initialled the drawings with no changes.

Again, what if accepting the Laws of Thermodynamics without question
blocks innovation that can reduce Climate Change?

Here are some questions we need to consider (and ask!) when thinking about our
ongoing acceptance of the 200-year-old Laws of Thermodynamics

| | YES | NO |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1) Is it true that in the pursuit of absolute truth, some past scientific laws and beliefs that were held as true have been proven to actually be wrong and untrue? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2) Is it logically possible that some scientific laws and beliefs we hold now could be wrong? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3) Is it scientific to update old/wrong laws and beliefs, to new proven designs and understandings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4) Experts often quote the Laws of Thermodynamics when contesting innovation designed to combat climate change. Should they be allowed to simply cite the laws and block progress, without a modern and thorough explanation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5) Experts will often recite that energy cannot be created or destroyed. Many of the same experts maintain that in the “Big Bang” time, space, matter and energy came into existence from nothing. Is the contradiction apparent to you? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6) Many scientists today say that we don’t know what energy actually is—which is fundamental to fully understanding the Laws of Thermodynamics. Could the developers of the Laws of Thermodynamics in the nineteenth century understand what energy is in its entirety, yet more technically advanced modern-day scientists do not? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7) Imagine a hydraulic product exists (Product A) and through innovation, a more efficient version is patented (Product A+). As it turns out, Product A+ can derive its total hydraulic fluid requirement, pumping it from Product A, with work potential remaining in product A+ ($W_{in} < W_{out}$). This outcome contests the Laws of Thermodynamics. Can the Laws of Thermodynamics remain valid with this consideration? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Answered yes to 4, 6, 7 and no to 1, 2, 3, 5? Please send your explanations, we’d love to hear your thoughts.

Answered no to 4, 6, 7 and yes to 1, 2, 3, 5? Then pass this on to scientific experts and ask for urgent support to developing good solutions to address climate change.

Take action AND demand answers and accountability

When people participate in coordinated rallies in cities across the globe, it visually shows collective desire for change, but after a day, everyone disappears from the public eye. To effect real and lasting change, we need to be consistent and persistent in our pursuit of answers and accountability. We need to knock on every door and ask “why” over and over and over again until we hear a real answer.

So, (1) if it's true that the Laws of Thermodynamics are outdated, and (2) that fact is preventing innovation from being used to fight climate change, then the younger generation must demand answers from the governing bodies and professors for their unconditional acceptance of the Laws of Thermodynamics. Innovations must be assessed on whether they produce the desired outcomes or not.

Do not let 200-year-old laws stop innovation. We must address climate change now.

THE NEXT PRACTICAL ACTION

Concerned youth should search for an Engineer, Scientist or Professor who believes they can publicly contest the drawings illustrated in section fifteen in the APS training manual (linked below), that describes work output greater than work input ($W_{out} > W_{in}$), contesting conventional knowledge.

Quoting the Laws of Thermodynamics is an unacceptable faith statement, not a technical argument.

If no technical contesting position is presented in detail, concerned youth should collectively demand this advancement be brought to practical application. The other inventions rejected based only on faith in the Laws of Thermodynamics should be reassessed respecting technical merit, not unsupported faith in the Laws of Thermodynamics.

Relying on the established laws with faith only is a very serious error.

Link to patent offices for subject invention:

<https://worldwide.espacenet.com/inpadoc?submitted=true&DB=EPODOC&CC=US&NR=2002178719&KC=&F=8&OREQ=0&textdoc=TRUE&FT=E>

Link to You Tube videos presenting the subject invention:

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCVqNrHjb2nj-wo-h7Shzigw>

Link to the APS WEBSITE that contains the APS training Manual:

<https://www.apscontrols.org>

APS respects the advancement of science through practical methods with the goal of global environmental betterment. So, we ask all scientists to test our designs and drawings based on technical merits and not simply restating the Laws of Thermodynamics, but engage the drawing and designs and come to conclusions based on logical assessments, as the evolvement of science starts with the questioning of science itself. The questioning serves to either strengthen the pre-existing scientific understanding or belief, or it serves to advance science as a whole by changing the pre-existing scientific understanding or belief. So we ask everybody who reads this to be a part of science and the scientific process.

Please send any questions or comments.

Dave Strain
President
APS
analystsofpneumatic@bellnet.ca
Office—(905) 640-2333

Appendix A

Some actual quotes from engineers'/scientists' responses with respect to the invention, based only on their faith in the Laws of Thermodynamics:

- A. "You claim that the diamond-shaped actuator produces a greater displacement of fluid at a lower pressure than for a conventional piston-cylinder configuration. From this you conclude that there is an excess of energy output compared to the energy input. Although I confess to only a rudimentary understanding of your principle of operation, I cannot accept the conclusion that this device would produce more energy output than is put in." ...Same letter...
"Finally, I must admit that I cannot fully understand your arguments. Regretfully, though, from what I already know I doubt that I could be persuaded that this device is a perpetual motion machine as you claim." (University Engineering Professor and Engineering text author)
- B. "Quite frankly, I reject outright any proposal that claims to overcome the basic laws of physics."
(University Professor and environmental organization leader.)
- C. "As you know, your results contradict the First Law of Thermodynamics. Despite numerous attempts over the centuries to demonstrate otherwise, this fundamental Law has never been violated. In fact, the theory and all available evidence support this Law so strongly that we hold it as true. All modern science and technologies are developed and work based on the truth of this Law. Examples of experiments, demonstrations, and machines developed and/or built that purportedly invalidate this Law, have, without exception, all been shown to be false." (University Professor and director of applied technology at that University.)

D. **“Discussion and conclusion [TO BE COMPLETED]**

Figure 7 compares the estimates of equation 5 with the data of Ref. 2. As compared with the calculated results including the effects of both actuator and fluid weight, the measured pressures are significantly lower, being about 26% low at $z/L = 0.25$, decreasing to 19% low at $z/L = 0.42$. Since the possible effects of such sources of discrepancy as solid and fluid friction might be expected to increase the pC required to lift the weight—at least in the process of raising the it—this appears to support Mr Strain’s claim.”

“To my knowledge, in two centuries of scientific development there has never been a case in which the laws of classical physics when used in their proper sphere of applicability have been violated. I have 50 years of direct personal experience using these laws, leading me to believe that I can no more question them than I can make two plus two equal five, and thus improve my financial affairs.” (University Engineering Professor and renowned scientist.)

NOTE: The differential test model proves that less than 4% efficiency differential is required for the diamond-shaped actuator to produce its full fluid requirement by pumping the fluid from a conventional piston. This fact leaves 22% remaining work potential in each operation, allowing a reciprocating machine to run itself and produce external mechanical work with no external energy input.

- E. “I chose to write to you on my personal, rather than business stationary. I figure that you get enough of the formal business stuff. Most importantly, you should understand that in building your piston system, you conformed to the laws of Newtonian Mechanics. Those laws helped you build something better than was before, but at the same time, restricted you to the validity of CPE. More simply, you can’t have your cake and eat it too. Take it all, or take none of it. That’s the rules.” (Scientist used by the NRC to assess “out of the box” inventions)
- F. “I have understood novelty of the diamond-shaped actuator and its potential advantages. Also, I do not question validity of experimental data that you and Mr. Blanchard collected. Quite contrary, I trust that the experiments and all measurements were conducted professionally. Our views differ with regard to the system that uses the diamond-shaped actuator to produce useful mechanical work without spending any external energy. Even in this case I do not challenge validity of your experimental data (that is, I trust that the system worked at some point). I only think that the data is incomplete -- some part of the process went unnoticed. Thus, I trust that the system can work, but you/we do not have a proper explanation for how it works.” (NRC scientist)

Quotes A to F are typical of comments based on unconditional acceptance in the Laws of Thermodynamics.

Not one has provided any scientific or technical logic to support their position specifically addressing the invention’s design drawings they possessed.

SIEMENS, via one of their controls experts, peer reviewed the detailed control drawings and initialled the drawings with no changes, confirming the control circuits. Pages 13.305 to 13.310 present the SIEMENS assessment. Pages ten to fifteen of the link below present the same, plus other scientists/engineers assessments in the report.

Patent examiners from the PCT (Patent Co-operation Treaty), European, USA and Canadian patent offices examined the design data and granted the patents.

Rejection should be based on technical assessment of the actual invention, with supporting arguments.

<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5ee6829b4abd4867f862c3ca/t/61e6fb5a7ea4d658250bc320/1642527582218/SCIENTIFIC+AND+ENGINEERING+OBSERVATIONS+AND+OPINIONS.pdf>