



[Why create a Wikiversity account?](#) [dismiss]

## Talk:Free Energy does not Exist

<b>Contents</b> <span>[hide]</span>
1 <a href="#">Wikibooks Request for Deletion Discussion</a>
2 <a href="#">Why is my transwiki in the Deletion List?</a>
3 <a href="#">I like your addition of my text to the category of "energy" since it made me think about conservation of energy.</a>

### Wikibooks Request for Deletion Discussion [ edit source ]

See [Wikibooks: Requests for deletion#Free Energy does not Exist](#) 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 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 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 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)...

[https://en.wikiversity.org/wiki/Wikiversity:Requests\\_for\\_Deletion](https://en.wikiversity.org/wiki/Wikiversity:Requests_for_Deletion)

"This isn't **research**"

Versus...

- There (their usage)...

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

"[This is original research](#) of the most **egregious** kind trying to pretend that the laws of physics are a fantasy. It doesn't belong here."

- And, there...

[https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Wikibooks:Requests\\_for\\_deletion#Free\\_Energy\\_does\\_not\\_Exist](https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Wikibooks:Requests_for_deletion#Free_Energy_does_not_Exist)

"[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."

- My usage...

"Six years of [independent research](#) does not amount to made-up-at-school stuff."

- Their usage...

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

"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."

- My usage...

" ... Is this [Original Research](#)? You can bet that it is!"

- Their usage...

"Would it have been simpler just to say "this is [original research](#) on power simulation games"?"

- My usage...

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

- Their usage...

"Changed vote - see below ~~I think 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 to post it, post it somewhere that accepts [original research](#). That's my opinion, and I hope you consider it."

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

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](#).
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.

- 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 [research](#) something" ... "But your case seems to be able to just [post it on a wiki that allows original-research](#)-that-is-not-outright-false. [That would be Wikiversity](#)."

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 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. ***Nor 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 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 ]

[@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... ;-\)](#)  [ edit ] -- [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 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 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 [electricity](#) which contains the subcategory of [electrical engineering](#) which contains the subcategory of [electrical reactance](#) which contains my newly created subcategory of [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.

Thanks, again! -- [Vinyasi](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 07:26, 26 November 2022 (UTC) [ reply ]