Göteborg 2020-01-05

Aerospace Vehicle Here is as follows in five chapters of Aerospace Vehicle 1800145-3 for which there is a highlighted contrast comparison with WO2004024484 A2 propeller as being known - Cubis Specific, Magnetic Crane, Rebound Propeller, Orbital Propeller and Haptic Propeller.

WO2004024484 A2 as presenter does not give instructions to enable the building of orbital propeller with all pertinent detail. WO2004024484 A2 is limited in scope as we have found with US5860317A which was evaluated by breakthrough propulsion project at Glenn research centre in 2004 publishing results finding of potential technologies (2009 Frontiers of Propulsion Science Editors: Marc G Millis and Eric W Davis Publisher: American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics ISBN: 978-1-56347-956-4) exhaustive search. What is presented by WO2004024484 A2 leaves it for the builder to solve and provide a sequence configuration algorithm which can be of any combination of ad hoc thousands sequences. Notwithstanding with what is proposed by orbital propeller out of hundreds of algorithm sequences which were simulated and evaluated from which we propose orbital propeller sequence algorithm. We know of no way to sequence and build a functional aerospace propeller with the chassis configuration presented by WO2004024484 A2 Should one be able to build a working device following the instruction given by WO2004024484 A2 The two would be as distinct devices as a unicycle is to a bicycle not even comparably similar as a gyroplane is to a helicopter. This evaluated configuration does not work in our opinion as evaluated for participation in breakthrough propulsion project cirka 2003 as proposed should we be compliant and give it a second counter rotating disk rotating counter to the one disk offered by this design it still would not work. When two rotors are introduced bracing against one another using mirrored deflection it becomes possible to identify quarterly sine transition as pointed out by AIAA help desk; for a rotating frame of which we have identified four transitions when mirroring deflection. A single rotor device lacks any reference of sine transition having 360 transitions of sine and no directional pinion reference. A sine transition is a frame directional distinction of shuttle mass acceleration away from compass fulcrum fore and aft and deceleration away from fulcrum in conjunction to traversing left to right of said transition where we can reference four transitions relating to fore and aft propulsive force. A single rotor does not define for rotating shuttle mass any reference of fore nor aft pinion reference from a brace of frame with dual axis rotation such as for example that embodied by rebound propeller stating forward and aft reference . The WO2004024484 A2 device is limited to an x. y. axis of shuttle mass rotation with which one cannot accelerate a frame using a rotor assembly. One is tempted to try any sequence out of a potential of thousands of sequences to be able to produce movement for a vehicle chassis. The sequences in attempt one notes for use is not given in this documents author to effect a constant pressure of momentum commensurate with the velocity of the shuttle or actuator rotation speed or otherwise. Sequences available to use with this rotor configuration can in no way resemble what is given for orbital propeller and should we use the pattern given for use with orbital propeller deflecting second and third quarters of pinioned reference it still would not work rotating in an x. y axis where deflecting perpendicular to shuttle mass allows the decay of shuttle momentum to a z axis which is counter balanced decay of momentum not within the same plane of rotation. The configuration of WO2004024484 A2 is not the configuration of orbital propeller and the two should not be compared as instruction for building a device as WO2004024484 A2 does not have directional reference fore and aft. On review our instruction set for building a device as stated by the two documents are distinct from one another and there can is no comparison or overlay as such. It is to be pointed out that when orbital propeller is proposed for construction that WO2004024484 A2 by design has been evaluated and to the uninitiated seeming similar in that they are both rotating assemblies not having studied the two closely . The magnetic assembly for orbital propeller is a magnetic deflector perpendicular to a magnetic on the spoke whereas WO2004024484 A2 is a configuration with a single rotary rotating assembly deflecting within the same plane of rotation; orbital propeller uses two rotating assemblies

repelling magnetically perpendicular to chassi pinion and one another affording pinion reference for mirrored rotor sequence and configuration as described in documentation of orbital propeller. Orbital propeller is not a known configuration rather the challenge of producing a propulsive force with rotation is known for which orbital propeller provides a distinct device solution. The device described by WO2004024484 A2 could not be built nor understood following the instructions set given for orbital propeller and orbital propeller cannot be built from instruction set given for WO2004024484 A2 for WO2004024484 A2 it's shuttle mass moves towards and away from axis of rotation in absolute reference in the same plane effected by force along the same plane where as for orbital propeller shuttle mass is deflected to a transitioned orbital plane which is the same metric distance from point of rotation yet relatively closer via angular planar axis of rotation at a transitioned orbital relative to a dominant center of gravity plane of rotation pinion. The sum of displaced shuttle rotations are in opposition to one another through the application of magnetic force perpendicular to rotation for which one can accelerate shuttle masses to a transitioned plane where as with WO2004024484 A2 when moving to and away from axis stored momentum is released within the same plane of rotation for a net null gain of directional momentum since shuttle mass both decelerate and accelerate with equal force respective center of gravity which for a single rotor device is a rotation force. For WO2004024484 A2 If one were to move in and away from axis with shuttle mass opposing one another using a single rotor or dual counter rotating rotors the hemisphere of rotor gain and loss of momentum is equal for which effects of this shuttle mass accelerates and decelerates in the same plane of rotation equal to forward and rear pressure of momentum resulting in there being no propulsive force produce. Should one place a single rotor frame on a flat surface against which to pinion rotation providing a bracing surface a propulsive force cannot be effected. We further submit that the instruction set given for WO2004024484 A2 is not adequate for a builder to understand build intent nor does it guide in lending understanding to the uninitiated builder in knowing what a build is intending to accomplish. Orbital propeller is a distinct and complex device construct for which the instruction set given by WO2004024484 A2 is not the same, further more it is functional even if satisfied by an instruction set for orbital propeller. Relative planar metric configuration of orbital propeller allows for an acceleration of employed shuttle mass into an orbital plane which is a relative deceleration respective center of gravity and frame rotation plane employing a z axis. There can be no consolidation of invention of device should proposal of aerospace vehicle fail to successfully communicate to engineering ongoing and realize a functional usable vehicle build which does not for 2020 in situ exist for contest theoretical or otherwise.

Commercial companies seek a solution to propellant less propulsion and are privy to exhaustive search for a solution reporting in a 2019 executive interview reported on by Time magazine.

" I wish there was some way to do rockets without burning things. But there isn't. I mean, Newton's third law, no way around it. So, you know, balancing what is best for humanity—well, there's just no other way to do it except rockets."

We took part in breakthrough propulsion project circa 2002 orchestrated by Glenn research center and have been working researching a communicable solution to propellant less propulsion since.

In 2020 we have three propeller device types offered by aerospace vehicle distinct from one another for building and developing aerospace vehicle, rebound propeller, orbital propeller and haptic propeller all of which are manipulation of rotation haptic pressure. These solutions are all distinct from WO2004024484 A2 And US5860317A which have been available for evaluation by engineering commission finding in them no viable solution. Should a partner engineering team succeed in building a functional device from our instruction set solutions this would be considered a successful conclusions of effort. We seek to document and accredit documented solutions developed by us our work which have no excerpt of WO2004024484 A2

Nor US5860317A there is no relation of work and these abstracts have in no way contributed to our efforts other than to serve as nonviable examples.

Having researched rotation propulsion we can offer for review of WO2004024484 A2 that as with balance supporting a standing load on a surface, one requires at least three points of contact with that surface and in order to exert dimensional stress in free space for propulsion a pinion reference of more than two rotating bodies is required to do so. It has come to our attention that Eric R. Laithwaite, Paul T. Baskis and John R.R. Searl spent their lives pursuing related studies which although having no relation to our invention no doubt lends to a conducive atmosphere which in light of this should we succeed in monetization of our invention we would in compassion consider awarding prize for pursuit of an amenable goal.

We recompile Aerospace Vehicle 1800145-3 with redaction removing for example attenuation which is an all together different approach and resubmit it herewith having taken care to address any vagaries to the best of our ability..

Stefan Helmz Tubman 700811-9278