

It is a Minor Detail to Strive for **Hardware Confirmation** of a Design

Quote:

Originally Posted by **BroMikey** 

*Okay now thats better we are all on the same page. Of course you understand why I questioned you. Many others would like to but are unwilling to point out that your book is only a little more than speculation without some form of **hardware confirmation**.*

Of course you understand that we all have heard hundreds of claim and the inventor can not back any of it up. Of course you understand that this all get tiring UNLESS you state that your book is only a thought and not an actual working unit. That is fine.

Thanks for clearing this all up.

Success is Born of Taking Complete Responsibility

You're right on one point: I have an articulate imagination amounting to a simulator for a brain. But it takes more than this to adequately, and accurately, emulate reality. To do the reverse direction: to build an imaginary object exactly to its specification requires a certain responsibility towards that thought. If it worked in principle, but not in its actuation, then the fault does not lie with the design; it lies with the builder for failing to build it first in their brain. In other words, they fail to "own it". This is where belief takes a hike. Belief will never get you to the goal of success. Belief belies an inadequacy of understanding. If you thoroughly understand your design, no belief is required.

You think I believe in reincarnation? Hogwash! Yet, I've understood it since childhood. It's built into my brain at birth whether I want it to be there or not as a consequence of having been born with access to my soul's memory: the memory shared among countless individuals whom I've never met, nor would I want to take responsibility for their unfinished business. Yet, the fact remains that I have complete responsibility towards their unfinished business or else "enlightenment" is an impossibility in this lifetime. Complete responsibility for karma attached to a human soul is a dire prerequisite for achieving human fulfillment. Anything less than complete responsibility will surely spawn failures of one sort or another.

Where is the failure in this? Surely it does not lie in the design. We certainly have the best of intention to succeed in building an entire life around success. But do we take complete responsibility for success, or do we lean upon some gimmick or another to cut corners and avoid taking complete responsibility? Such as the gimmick of: build it first and then we will believe you? That's a cop out.

Take the coupling coefficient of 99% among the four coils of: VC1, VC2, CC1, and CC2 for instance. That's no easy accomplishment to achieve. Yet, it is mandatory if success is to be achieved in building a working model of this design. This is just one stipulation of this circuit which must be met. There are several others. Yet, if even one stipulation is not met, the whole thing won't work.

So, what do we do to insure success? Turn the pages of history to find out.... What did inventors do in the past in this regard? Oliver Heaviside, Nathan Stubblefield, and Nikola Tesla all used bare iron wire or bare iron ribbon mixed in parallel with insulated copper wire for some reason. I suspect it was to achieve a nearly, or precisely, 100% magnetic coupling among the copper strands of wire. This is the [Heaviside Solution](#).

Imagine burying a copper wire in a magnetic field such that absolutely none of its magnetism escaped without being captured and recovered. If the iron wires are electrically connected in parallel with the copper wires, and these same iron wires surround each and every copper strand such that absolutely none of the magnetic field of each copper strand escapes without also being captured and recovered, then perhaps it is possible to achieve a complete coupling of 100% among each and every copper strand?

This is where the “Devil is in the Details” such that we are hounded, and tormented, with failure if we also fail to actuate each and every stipulation of a design. [My circuit](#) is not complicated. But it does demand a lot of the builder to achieve success with it. Asymmetry, the foundation for overunity, is a condition of stress. There is nothing easy about *asymmetry*. If you want easy, stick with flashlight circuits. They're easy since they're *symmetrical*. But, they require brute force – aka, lots of voltage – to achieve success with them. This is the Ferranti Effect. Or, should I say: the Ferranti Technique which spawns his Failure? Simple-minded, over-simplification not unlike that of an archaeologist who comes upon an ancient site and discards countless clues thinking them to be worthless shreds of evidence of technology occurring in prior civilizations. That is our loss, too!

If you build it, then they will come and gawk and not rebuild it in their hearts.