



Comments to Electro-Reactive LIFTER News

Alexander V. Frolov, Russia

General Director, Faraday Laboratories Ltd
E-mail: office@faraday.ru
<http://www.faraday.ru>

March 21, 2003 we got news from France about electro-reactive propulsion system.

Blaze Labs reached 100g PAYLOAD level.

You will find all the details of the Saviour's experiment at: <http://blazelabs.com/exp14.htm>.

This electro-reactive ionization-flying model requires 46 kVolt, 4 mA, i.e. about 200 watts to fly with 100 g useful load.

It is interesting to note that Jean-Louis Naudin's previous opinion of 1997 – 1999 about priority of the Frolov's asymmetrical capacitor now is changed. Sometimes people wish to re-write the history. It is possible and it is easy. Naudin's web page about <http://jnaudin.free.fr/lifters/story.htm> (see Fig. 1) is not started from the real beginning of the story. He forgot our discussion of 1997 and also photos and MPEG video I have send to him when he has started his way in electrograviticis.

If you remember the name of Naudin's first asymmetrical capacitor "Frolov's Hat" (see Fig.2) then you know why there is this name of this technology. But really it is not important to try for some serious reply from Jean since he has no personal post address, phone, or his photo on the web site...

Also it can be useful to visit this page <http://www.faraday.ru/t-cap.html> to know about something **more important than electric ionization flying models (Lifters)**, since it is just a reactive ionization way, which is similar to rockets.

Ideas now developing by us are not aimed to increase the power level (from 1 gram to 100 gram propulsive force). It is **a qualitatively new idea**; it is really electrograviticis instead of "electro-reactive Lifter".

So, **what is about real "history of the question" instead of the French version?** The question here is not about a priority, it is nonsense after T.T. Brown's

patents. As an example the NASA patents on asymmetrical capacitors can be mentioned since the ideas were opened before the NASA patent and there is nothing new in it. The problem is that people who develop reactive ionization Lifters develop only primitive reactive technology. **It is not essence of T.T. Brown research but it is the distortion of his ideas.**

So, the team in France is working to develop and support ideas of secondary and wrong method. Why? Perhaps they either do not see the real way or have payment for the wrong way **to mask a real work.**




Fig. 1





Fig. 2