Q

[dismiss]



Main Page

Recent changes

**Guided tours** 

**Browse** 

Random

Help

**Donate** 

**Portal** Colloquium

News **Projects** 

Sandbox

Help desk

What links here Related changes

Special pages Permanent link

Page information

Wikimedia projects

Commons

Wikibooks

Wikidata

Wikinews

Wikipedia Wikiquote

Wikisource

Wikispecies

Wikivoyage

Wiktionary

Meta-Wiki Outreach

MediaWiki

Wikimania

Print/export

Languages

Download as PDF Printable version

Tools

Community

## Why create a Wikiversity account?

Search Wikiversity Edit source | Add topic | View history

Read

## Draft talk:Free Energy does not Exist

Contents [hide]

1 Wikibooks Request for Deletion Discussion

2 Why is my transwiki in the Deletion List?

3 I like your addition of my text to the category of "energy" since it made me think about conservation of energy 4 Why I moved this to draft space

5 It already has its appropriate tags. What more does it need?

6 Why?

Draft Discuss

Wikibooks Request for Deletion Discussion [edit source]

See Wikibooks: Requests for deletion#Free Energy does not Exist of for criticism discussion related to this research. -- Dave Braunschweig (discuss • contribs) 16:29, 16 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

@Dave Braunschweig – A backup copy of deletion request discussion placed on the talk page of that former Wikibook. -- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 21:40, 16 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

Why is my transwiki in the Deletion List? [edit source]

I thought I was taking the suggestions from the editors over at Wikibooks to move my page over to here in view of the fact that they want to delete it over there.

For some reason, someone has reverted my edits and added a Categorical tag which wasn't there to begin with which places my page in the Deletion Requests Category. Is this a mistake? Or, is this intentional? How can I remedy this? Thank you. -- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 03:03, 14 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

It has been corrected by the editor who acknowledged the mistake on their talk page. Please disregard this question. -- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 03:11, 14 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

Actually, the page in question -- Free Energy does not Exist -- probably should be deleted. This content was already under discussion for deletion at Wikibooks, and all the exact same arguments which were presented

got (rightly) rejected from those other sites, especially when it's likely to be actively misleading to students trying to use this site as a learning resource. Omphalographer (discuss • contribs) 08:27, 16 November 2022 (UTC) [ reply ] @Omphalographer It is certainly research. Whether or not it is junk research and a waste of everyone else's time is a different question. And, so far, the Wikiversity community has agreed to accept this type of research

there also apply here. This isn't research, this isn't educational, it's simply nonsense. Wikiversity may have looser policies on content than other Wikimedia sites, but that doesn't make it a dumping ground for everything that

if it doesn't cause disruptions. However, it also doesn't have to be hosted in main space. It can be moved to either user space or draft space. User space seems more appropriate for this resource. You should also use the resource's talk page to provide a brief summary of the concerns that would help others understand why the article cannot be trusted as is. -- Dave Braunschweig (discuss • contribs) 15:31, 16 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

@Dave Braunschweig I placed a tag at the top of the text, entitled: { {Original research} }. Thanks. -- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 16:16, 16 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

@Omphalographer Where, among the various uses of the term of: "research" over there did anyone ever say what you are saying, now, and for the first time, here?

Here (your usage)...

"This isn't research"

Versus...

My usage...

There (their usage)...

https://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=Free\_Energy\_does\_not\_Exist&diff=4208966&oldid=4208936 년

And, there... https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Wikibooks:Requests\_for\_deletion#Free\_Energy\_does\_not\_Exist <a href="mailto:Lambaudocolor:">Lambaudocolor: Lambaudocolor: Lamb

"Six years of independent research does not amount to made-up-at-school stuff."

"<u>This is original research</u> of the most **egregious** kind trying to pretend that the laws of physics are a fantasy. It doesn't belong here."

"This is outside the scope of Wikibooks which, while more tolerant of original research than Wikipedia, does not accept out-and-out made-up-at-school stuff like this."

Their usage...

"You've made the point yourself "Six years of independent research". This is therefore Original Research, out of scope for Wikibooks...'

My usage... " ... Is this Original Research? You can bet that it is!"

"Even if what you are writing is TRUE the fact that you yourself did the research and it isn't part of accept science" [ergo, egregious] "= it is out of scope and will be deleted."

Their usage...

"Would it have been simpler just to say "this is original research on power simulation games"?"

My usage...

Their usage...

"But it's more than a mere game since, by posting it, and <u>researching</u> it (online), I bump into people whose experiments may help me understand."

1. Primary research — Wikibooks is not a place to publish primary research. Examples of things not allowed on Wikibooks include proposing new theories and solutions, presenting original ideas, defining new terms, and coining new words. In short, primary research should be published elsewhere, such as a peer-reviewed journal, or our sister project Wikiversity.

"Read that link. OR seems to be accepted at Wikiversity - "Wikibooks also allows instructional guides, but that resource doesn't allow original research" - which indicates OR is allowed there."

2. Wikiversity is the place for original research, including primary or secondary research. This includes interpreting primary sources, forming ideas, or taking observations. Ethical guidelines must adhere, see Wikiversity: Research ethics. Pages with original research should be marked with the original research or research project templates.

"Changed vote - see below Hathink I vote to delete, because of WB:NOR. You said it yourself twice: it was your own research, and there are no reliable (non-primary, and non-original-research) sources for it. If you want

My usage...

"Help me to understand this concept of: "primary research"."

"...how many primary sources of research does it take for each of them to be considered secondary?"

Their usage...

"This is how I understand it" ... "You <u>research</u> something" ... "But your case seems to be able to just <u>post it on a wiki that allows *original-research*-that-is-not-outright-false. <u>That would be Wikiversity</u>."</u>

to post it, post it somewhere that accepts original research. That's my opinion, and I hope you consider it."

Among all of these dozens of examples, I would suggest that MarcGarver said it best by using the word, "egregious": reflecting the positive connotations of "standing out from the flock". I believe he used this choice of adjective because these wikis are comprised of a community of editors who, if they can't agree on anything, have decided to delete whatever they cannot collectively contribute (to) since its tolerance would constitute a

own, I am blamed for somebody else's problem merely because I am trying to fix it! Go back to sleep, or else accept me. This is not my choice. This is yours. I cannot change my "skin" (my psychological profile) any more than anyone else can (apparently). It'll probably take a miracle, otherwise. I am not a miracle worker despite my egregious mannerisms. By the way, after doing the research to write this response, I've learned of the necessity of posting an appropriate tag at the top of the text, entitled: { {Original research} }. Thanks. -- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 16:14, 16 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

blockade (of sorts) and, thus, a lack of their collective accessibility. This would be a contradiction of their desire and intention to participate. Hence, "egregious" is the operational word, here. Nothing else matters. Nothing else matters. does it matter that this problem is not my fault! Yet, because I attempt to make-up for whatever discrepancy of education may have occurred from our collective sources of learning by providing original research of my

@Vinyasi and @Omphalographer This is not the place to discuss specific merits and issues with the article itself. Please use Talk: Free Energy does not Exist so the history of the discussion is retained with the resource, and hopefully any improvements can be incorporated. Use this page to discuss whether or not the article should be kept as is, deleted, or moved to a different namespace. Thanks! -- Dave Braunschweig

(discuss • contribs) 16:45, 16 November 2022 (UTC) [reply] @Vinyasi: We include both the Original Research tag and also a notice or warning on controversial research. At this point, noted by multiple users at Wikibooks, your research and/or findings are controversial. --Dave Braunschweig (discuss • contribs) 16:47, 16 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

@Dave Braunschweig Egregious versus controversial... ;-) ♂-- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 17:10, 16 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

I like your addition of my text to the category of "energy" since it made me think about conservation of energy. [edit source] @Dave Braunschweig I like your addition of my text to the category of "energy" since it made me think about conservation of energy upon reading the Wikiversity article on energy. This made me wonder if all manifestations of overunity acquire their gainful outcome by extracting their gain from their environment regardless of what ingredients are included within their environment, including (but not limited to) manmade sources of energy, such

for any lack of environmental voltage if the reversal of current is strong enough to extend its vacuuming suction of environmental current to include whatever it takes to satisfy its hunger (ie, the demands made upon it by its load/s)? I can't imagine where else this anomalous "free energy" comes from since its conversion from the reactive potentials of: frequency and phase shifts, working in conjunction with the other reactive potentialities of: capacitance and inductance, are not standard concepts within electrical engineering, yet. I'd call this anomaly a special case of "electrical reactance" in which reversal of current occurs under a prerequisite condition of the starvation of input. For that reason, I created a subcategory of "electrical reactance", but made the mistake of not creating another subcategory of the "reversal of current", or more simply: current reversal since this is more specific. But I see no reason to remove the category of energy since it is a subcategory of physics which contains the subcategory of electrical which contains the subcategory of electrical engineering which contains the subcategory of electrical reactance which contains my newly created subcategory of

as: transmission lines and household wiring, and natural sources of energy, such as: the ambient backdrop of environmental voltage at ground level (constituting a few microvolts). I guess the reversal of current makes up

Thanks, again! -- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 07:26, 26 November 2022 (UTC) [reply] Why I moved this to draft space [edit source] Wikipedia states that this use of Free Energy is Pseudoscience. See w:Free energy#Pseudoscience. For that reason I moved this article to Draft space. People can still read it here. Guy vandegrift (discuss • contribs)

current reversal since the subcategory of electrical energy has not been created yet and may not need to be created since the subcategory of electrical reactance loosely (approximately) takes care of that.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free\_energy#Pseudoscience

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Perpetual\_motion <a>™</a>

02:49, 14 December 2022 (UTC) [reply]

Beginning with your linked reference, ...

... I assumed it to be correct that I select the linked reference which leads to ...

Next, I selected the following link assuming that I may be pseudo-scientifically claiming success with violating the ... https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second\_law\_of\_thermodynamics \(\mathbb{Z}\)

2022 (UTC) [reply]

Am I correct in assuming this is a logical step in this flow of deduction as to what you are alluding to so far?

It already has its appropriate tags. What more does it need? [edit source] Draft: Free Energy does not Exist already has its appropriate tags. What more does it need? I don't understand. Honestly, the tags are appropriate for they accurately describe the situation to any casual visitor who might

arrive for the first time. I don't get what your goal is. Could you please explain it to me? I'm definitely too close to my work to be able to guess at people's motives unless they're explicit about them. Thank you. -- Vinyasi

(discuss • contribs) 02:51, 14 December 2022 (UTC) [reply] I have no motive other than improving the reputation of Wikiversity. Wikipedia declares this definition of Free Energy to be Pseudoscience. Pseudoscience is an appropriate topic for Wikiversity, but only if it is abundantly

clear at the top of this article that it is pseudoscience. If you agree that it is pseudoscience, then write a coherent lead paragraph to that effect. If you do not agree that this "electronic" free energy does not exist, then that question needs to be debated on **Draft talk:Free Energy does not Exist** I guess what really bothered me was that the Google key words free energy wikiversity listed "Free Energy does not Exist" at the top of the page.

@Omphalographer and Dave Braunschweig: Do either of you object if we sort this one out on Draft talk: Free Energy does not Exist? -- Guy vandegrift (discuss • contribs) 03:32, 14 December 2022 (UTC) [reply] Done. It is copied there. -- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 03:34, 14 December 2022 (UTC) [reply]

OK. Let's see if I can allay your concern. "Free" means an extremely reduced continuity of cost of energy since it's mostly a cost upfront when an appliance is purchased due to the majority of its energy is in the format of reactive potentials silently stored

within the circuitry of the appliance. Most of the continuity of cost for running the appliance is supplied by all of the reactive potentials already supplied by the circuitry. Its kinetic cost, derived from external sources of kinetic energy, are severely reduced to less than the electricity needed to view this page. This is the ideal case, or goal, of maximum efficiency since it's theoretical possibility for our achieving it is not impossible just

equipped I become in writing and talking about it because I am not limiting myself via isolation. All of your consciousnesses are contributing to mine making it that much easier for me to do my job. Does this help? --

As I said before, you need a coherent lead paragraph that clearly states that you are using a definition of "Free Energy" that is not only controversial, but regarded as pseudoscience by the scientific community. --

because it is generally unheard of. That's my job: to initiate our attention span so that its condition of mystery is reduced as much as is possible during the remaining years I have left. Because the more I talk about it, and write about it, the better

Guy vandegrift (discuss • contribs) 04:30, 14 December 2022 (UTC) [reply] Isn't there a tag for that? -- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 04:32, 14 December 2022 (UTC) [reply]

I think it's easy to draw lines in the sand, and wait to be suckered in a debate, to defend or cross those lines. The more difficult intellectual endevour, is to find the "what" to do with the theories that need to be ammended. For example, if the conservation of energy is indeed a myth, what do we need to do? I'm only building context because today it was announced that a fusion reaction was created that produced more energy than it took to create it. What we need to say here is: "What" we thought was wrong, where else were we wrong, and how can that epiphony help humanity?

My response was:

XR IX 🛂

Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 04:12, 14 December 2022 (UTC) [reply]

To quote someone else who made a comment in my direction ...

The first place I'd look for assessing whether or not more energy was produced than what was spent is to investigate what potential forms of energy have we overlooked which can be reused without being spent. These potentials would be classifiable as "catalysts" since that's what happens with catalysts: they get reused many times before they become not usable anymore. That's a heck of a savings of cost of energy.

You asked "Isn't there a tag for that?" (referring to the pseudscience claim). I personally didn't think that was enough. You can try to get the page back on mainspace with only that tag. My guess is that it will not be accepted by the community -- we are currently trying to cull what is on Wikiversity. It's your decision, but I don't think your page will get on mainspace in its current form.--Guy vandegrift (discuss

contribs) 05:20, 14 December 2022 (UTC) [reply]

-- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 04:37, 14 December 2022 (UTC) [reply]

@Guy vandegrift I have to admit that free energy exists on shaky ground. But only because physics' claim of Conservation also exists on shaky ground. I cite the editors of the Wikipedian article on the isolation of energy which inadvertently serves as the Achilles' heel for Conservation and thermodynamic entropy. Subsequently, I cite the initial five chapters, especially: the opening paragraph of the first chapter of my wiki-draft ... 1. Energy versus Power

1. Free Energy is the presumption that Energy is infinitely available (some of the outputs or internal states grow without bounds) due to a potentially limitless supply of Reactance (both, Magnetic and Electric) versus Power is the method of regulating the rate at which Energy is used per unit of Time. Consequently, Free Energy has more to do with the non-accountability of Power than it

and effectively uphill. This overrides the diffusion of energy which would have resulted in entropy and the elimination of voltage differences between any two points in space. Without these

has to do with Energy since Reactant Energy is assumed to be extremely variable when it is stolen from its surrounding environment by the eminent domain of the electric utility grid or by perpetual motion machines. This charade makes the byproduct of Reactance, namely: Energy, appear to be limitless for all intents and purposes so long as there is always sufficient Reactance which can be stolen from somewhere. This is what makes Energy: "Free". 2. The **reversal of current**, which is brought about by various reactances of one kind or another, is the method by which energy may be shuffled around the Universe <u>against voltage gradients</u>

voltage differences, we are powerless to make use of energy no matter how much energy may reside within our Universe. Thus, the negation of current allows us to supersede the side-effects of the natural order of Cosmic Law as our Universe winds down from exhaustion (as described by physics) and safeguard our material existence despite its natural tendency and because of this safeguard.

2. What Free Energy is Not ...

4. Thief or Victim of Theft? 5. The Lies We Keep Telling Ourselves Become Truths In all honesty, this is as good as an opening paragraph as you'll ever get from me since we're all pseudoscientists practicing at becoming better scientists. -- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 12:03, 2 January 2023

3. An Example of What Free Energy Is ...

(UTC) [reply] Why? [edit source]

vandegrift (discuss • contribs) 14:39, 2 January 2023 (UTC) [reply]

@38.52.161.25 🗹 Or, in the alternative, what's to stop me from reverting it back to my latest edit if this anonymous user does not provide an answer to my inquiry at his IP address user page, or here, within 24 hours? https://en.wikiversity.org/w/index.php?title=Draft%3AFree\_Energy\_does\_not\_Exist&diff=2459817&oldid=2459812 2 -- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 04:12, 17 December 2022 (UTC) [reply]

That user's IP address has been blocked. Not only was his edit reverted, but you see no sign of him in the history of the article. The vandal is well known, even on Wikipedia. There is nothing else anybody can do. Guy

@Guy vandegrift Thank you. -- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 21:36, 2 January 2023 (UTC) [reply]

Privacy policy About Wikiversity Disclaimers Mobile view Developers Statistics Cookie statement

This page was last edited on 3 January 2023, at 01:12. Text is available under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike License; additional terms may apply. By using this site, you agree to the Terms of Use and Privacy Policy.

Powered by MediaWiki WIKIMEDIA

Am I correct in assuming this is a logical step in this flow of deduction as to what you are alluding to so far? Yet, I find no fault with the opening paragraph. How does my presentation err in this regard? Did you take a different route involving different steps? What were they? -- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 12:37, 14 December