

Re: Perpetual motion assumption (stay away unserious monopolian conservative, welcome clear mind)

## Re: Perpetual motion assumption (stay away unserious monopolian conservative, welcome clear mind)

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2007-11/msg01480.html>

---

- *From:* [nottotooily@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:nottotooily@xxxxxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* Thu, 22 Nov 2007 02:12:37 -0800 (PST)
- 

The problem is that the clown won't be able to move such a heavy ladder just by leaning from side to side. If it really was several tons, he'd have to move a long way horizontally to get enough leverage to tip it. You can see this by finding the center of mass of the ladder-clown system and look what the clown has to do to move the center of mass away from between the legs.

Although it seems that a tall thin heavy tower would be unstable and easy to unbalance, the weight actually makes it pretty hard to tip over. Once it starts to fall, yes it can be hard to stop, but getting it to sway takes more force than a light tower.

On Nov 22, 12:15 pm, "gb6...@xxxxxxxxxxx" <gb6...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

A tall ladder, a very tall ladder and the two legs stand close.

What is done here is that a person who walks on a rope in the air in a circus is standing on the top of the ladder. Gently he moves the pole so the ladder tips on one leg, then gently he moves the pole so the ladder tips slightly to stand on the other leg.

The ladder is so tall that the gentlest change of the balance would make it tip to the side from both legs to stand on one leg.

The effect is that even if the ladder is extremely heavy, it is easy to tip it to stand on side, on one leg if pushed at the top, but it would be hard to tip it through pushing it on the bottom.

So the point is, the legs are very close. A ladder as this really has two sides to climb and four legs, so the very tall ladder is tipped to stand on the right legs or the left.

Re: Perpetual motion assumption (stay away unserious monopolian conservative, welcome clear mind)

Re: Perpetual motion assumption (stay away unserious monopolian conservative, welcome clear mind)

The weight of the ladder is very heavy, and what happens is that one ton of weight can shift from one side to the other side of legs by a gentle disbalance at the top. Also this ladder is really tall when observing it from below.

Now the weight that shifts between the right and left legs can produce pressure energy, one ton should produce maybe a 100 watts if the balancing is rapid.

One way to imagine this is seeing a giant walking and carrying a large weight, but using little energy for walking.

Tipping side to side takes a little strength, but what comes down in a ton of weight on each side respectively, and with one ton one can imagine a bicycle pedal or pump being pressed down and producing electricity.

What I see is that with a control of little energy, one can produce giant energy. It is like the statement: one small step for the six meter tall woman, one giant step for manrot. This is not the era of kindness but the era of big brother produce of brainfart.

Or in other words:

A very small disbalance on the top, a giant disbalance on the bottom.

Here are more hints on how this looks like:

Imagine a skier with closed legs standing on skis, but this skier is very tall and long and thin and heavy like iron.

On the top of this iron skier who is maybe 6 meters or more in height, stretched up, on the top of his head is a rotating iron pole, rod, stick. The stick reaches out from the center to the side and goes round and round like one propeller above this skier's head. This pole when on the right side disbalances the 'stretched up skier' so he tips to stand on one ski, then the pole rotates to the other side and makes the whole weight tip to stand on the other leg. I see a long pole and little energy to rotate it on the top around and around, while a huge weight shifts from one ski to the other, the whole weight of this metal structure.

It's been calculated that a person's step makes 7 or so watts, one article on the web suggested the possibility of 200 watts being produced by a walking person simply from extracting energy from the weight of a step. To disbalance a narrow structure needs very little energy and I see the

Re: Perpetual motion assumption (stay away unserious monopolian conservative, welcome clear mind)

Re: Perpetual motion assumption (stay away unserious monopolian conservative, welcome clear mind)

possibility of say if this structure is on ton in weight, to make 50 watts continuously, but I think the rotation of a rod would be less requirement. The overall concept is what matters. One is able to shift a small weight (on the top) and disbalance a large weight between two legs and displace a huge weight pressure as a result.

Does anybody know a Japanese company that might be interested?

So the assumption is that the weight displace between two legs gives sufficient energy to rotate the weight displacing metal on the top of the 'robot' 180 degrees which in turn displaces the weight to the other leg and ski, which in turn creates sufficient force to rotate the displacement weight pole around 180 degrees. So somehow, as a foot steps down with a lot of weight and the other rises, the process needs to connect to the half rotation of the pole after the step is made.

Re: Perpetual motion assumption (stay away unserious monopolian conservative, welcome clear mind)