



User page

Discussion

Read

Edit source

Add topic

View history

Search Wikiboc



The Wikibooks community has accepted [video game strategy guides](#) on this wiki! See [Wikibooks:Strategy guides](#) for the newly-created policy on strategy games. We're looking forward to your contributions.

[dismiss]

- Main Page
- Help
- Browse
- Cookbook
- Wikijunior
- Featured books
- Recent changes
- Donations
- Random book
- Using Wikibooks
- Community
- Reading room forum
- Community portal
- Bulletin Board
- Help out!
- Policies and guidelines
- Contact us

- Tools
- What links here
- Related changes
- User contributions
- Logs
- View user groups
- Upload file
- Special pages
- Permanent link
- Page information

- Sister projects
- Wikipedia
- Wikiversity
- Wiktionary
- Wikiquote
- Wikisource
- Wikinews
- Wikivoyage
- Commons
- Wikidata
- MediaWiki
- Meta-Wiki

Print/export

User talk:Vinyasi/sandbox

< User talk:Vinyasi

Contents [hide]

- 1 Wikibooks
 - 1.1 Criticisms, suggestions, etc...
 - 1.2 Free Energy does not Exist (*backup copy, here...*)
- 2 Wikiversity
 - 2.1 Let's Chat ...
 - 2.2 Wikibooks Request for Deletion Discussion
 - 2.3 Why is my transwiki in the Deletion List?
- 3 References

Wikibooks [edit source]

Criticisms, suggestions, etc... [edit source]

Let's make this an awesome text! [Vinyasi](#) (discuss • contribs) 01:37, 8 October 2022 (UTC) [reply]

Free Energy does not Exist (*backup copy, here...*) [edit source]

This is unsuited to Wikibooks. It starts with a contention that accepted physics is false and asserts pseudoscience to claim that free energy can be created from nothing. 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. [MarcGarver](#) (discuss • contribs) 15:29, 21 October 2022 (UTC) [reply]

“... and asserts pseudoscience to claim that free energy can be created from nothing.”

[MarcGarver](#) is correct as far as loaded coils are concerned. Took me until now to deduce that the use of standard techniques for loading motor coils won't work with my type of circuit since it is not standard. So, I had to use something more severe. I discovered that [a full diode bridge](#) works just fine! Thanks, Marc, for challenging me to grow. I doubt I would have otherwise. -- [Vinyasi](#) (discuss • contribs) 05:44, 28 October 2022 (UTC) [reply]

Where did I go wrong in leading you astray? Specifically? For, I never make those claims by intention. Physics is not false. Yet, our misunderstanding of Free Energy oftentimes leads to the popularization of flamboyant statements which ignore the exception to the rule that the conservation of energy within [Noether's Theorem](#) cannot apply itself to frames of temporal reference which change. This alteration of temporal reference must occur whenever current is



inverted from voltage arising from non-digital (analog) techniques involving: coils, capacitors, spark gaps, etc.

Please draw my attention to where I have claimed that: "free energy can be created from nothing", for I am not aware of having ever made that statement. I always claim that "[more can be had from less](#)" through the recycling of reactance per half-cycle of oscillations since reactance is not energy (it is lossless) and, thus, the conservation of energy has no jurisdiction/relevancy over the reversal of current (relative to voltage) until said reversal meets up with simple (non-reactive) resistance by which this value of "negative watts" gets converted into "positive watts". If anything, I claim recycling lossless reactance gives the "appearance" of more output resulting from the "appearance" of less input without it actually being the case!

Quote:

We can avoid being charged for our energy usage by recycling its electrical reactance to such a degree of excessive **conservation** that a mere factor of 99% reuse (for instance) constitutes a 100 to 1 gain (of output versus input) without any violation of physics.^{[1][0]}

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

Fringe science is useful.^{[2][0]} I'd be more intrigued if you wrote a book of your own countering all of my claims with counter-claims of your own. *That* would be science (if I am not misquoted) and a quid pro quo: a *give and take*.

Your contentions are too vague for merit. Please be more precise. [Vinyasi](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 16:45, 21 October 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

You've made the point yourself "Six years of independent research". This is therefore Original Research, out of scope for Wikibooks and is actually eligible for speedy deletion. As for your contention that we are all too stupid to understand you, I suggest you are struggling with the ability to understand the policies here. Even if what you are writing is TRUE the fact that you yourself did the research and it isn't part of accept science = it is out of scope and will be deleted. [MarcGarver](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 09:22, 24 October 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

- **Delete** Wikibooks isn't a host for nonsensical rouged content. --[SHB2000](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 07:20, 22 October 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

Granted, I got a little carried away with myself enjoying the process of elaboration if that's what you mean by "rouge". Since you misspelled "nonsensical", I can help you out by locating the crux of my discussion in case you overlooked it...

The section: [Mathematical Consequences](#) and the subsection: [What's reversal of current good for?](#) -- [Vinyasi](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 16:54, 22 October 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

Everyone makes typos; [WB:AGF](#). That still doesn't change my argument nor does it change my point. --[SHB2000](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 11:39, 22 October 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

How can I engage you in good faith if you don't even bother to read the section that I pointed out to you was the whole reason for me posting this Wikibook irrespective of its embellishments? Why are you ignoring my suggestion to focus on the math? And why are you bringing up deletion, now, when you could've said some thing about any errors, beforehand? Don't you have something to contribute instead of just hitting the red button? Normal behavior, which could solicit trust, would be to work with me - not

against me.^{[3][0]} By initiating deletion before offering any constructive criticism on the book's talk page you destroyed good faith. What am I supposed to possess faith in? Your ability to perform damage without cooperation? What arguments? You don't back up what you claim with examples from wherever you are pulling your arguments from. You're not focusing; you're just making unqualified statements directed at nothing in particular except the book and its entirety but not against any citations within its content. So let's talk about the title since that seems to be the only thing you're arguing against? You can't be arguing against its content since you haven't brought up anything in particular within the content to focus on. So, let's discuss the title. What's wrong with the title? Do you think that the title is not backed up by the content? I don't understand why you think electrical reactance is pseudoscience. Just because it's not physics? This is not a book about physics; it's about *the simulation* of electrical engineering.

I added this book to a shelf: [Category:Shelf:Strategy_guides](#) since it already gives strategy advice for working with video game-like simulations of electric circuits and how to produce gainful results. Since you have already stated how this book is inappropriate to position it here, within Wikibooks, professing to be a book about *physical* circuits when it is actually basing its conclusions and advice upon *simulations* of virtual-reality game-like circuits, then what do you think of my resubmitting it over at [StrategyWiki](#) and removing it from here? Or, merely adding this new shelf: [Category:Shelf:Strategy_guides](#)? And/or removing the other shelf of: [Category:Shelf:Electric_circuits_series](#)? -- [Vinyasi](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 16:54, 22 October 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

I placed a warning under [Synopsis](#) ...

WARNING — These criteria are intended to garner success *under simulation* and usually within the context of the Berkeley SPICE family of simulators^{[4][0]} (but not all the time; other simulators^{[5][0]} are, also, useful depending upon the situation). Although they are supported by standard mathematical criteria describing the conventional engineering of electrodynamic theory, they are not intended to qualify the physics^{[6][0]} behind these simulated strategies. That implication is left to the reader to vindicate, or not, through verifiable experience at your own risk of safety and success. *User, beware.*

...as well as modifications to the text within that section to reflect this book's new status as a *simulation of virtual reality*.[Vinyasi](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 18:13, 22 October 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

Do simulations clarify *rouged* content? "Rouged", as in: "don't get people's hopes up to unrealistic expectations when it comes to them considering building any of these simulations which I rely upon as my citations for virtual strategies?" Isn't my lack of clarification the cause of what these various complaints, here, are all about?[Vinyasi](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 18:43, 22 October 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]



I think my addition of a stern WARNING within the Synopsis section satisfies any need for a [neutral point of view](#) since I know of no one, other than myself, who has

ever bothered to simulate "reversal of current among severely starved analog (not digital) circuits" who is able to contribute a point of view. Hence, any complaints made as to this book's content is not going to be helpful unless someone contributes the results of their experimentation along similar lines. But I'm still capable of making mistakes of presentation especially since I am one-of-a-kind making it that more difficult for me to engage my audience without "leaving them behind in the dust" of what-the-heck-is-he-talking-about. Hence, there is a very real need for *collaboration*. Anyone disagree? -- [Vinyasi](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 23:19, 22 October 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

Added another warning, this time in the form of a preamble at the very beginning.[Vinyasi](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 05:33, 23 October 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

Maybe I should have named this wikibook, "Free Energy does not Exist. Yet, Politicized Science does exist!?" -- [Vinyasi](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 01:54, 24 October 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

Nominators for deletion are invited to join the conversation: [Wikibooks:Reading room/Assistance#How do I improve my wikibook, or is it impossible to improve it?](#)

"Deletion is not inevitable. I don't see a problem with the book but maybe the person who tagged it for deletion can share their thoughts."--[Xania](#)   [talk](#) 04:29, 24 October 2022 (UTC) -- [Vinyasi](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 18:29, 24 October 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

[@Vinyasi](#): Let me ask this: in your "Mathematical Consequences" section, you try to find $(A + iB)^2$. Are A and B matrices, vectors or what? You then perform cross-product on them, but isn't matrix multiplication an inner product operation? Also, where are you getting your theories from? Can you cite relevant sources that describe what you are trying to say in your book? [Leaderboard](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 12:54, 30 October 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

[@Leaderboard](#) ...

in your "Mathematical Consequences" section, you try to find $(A + iB)^2$.

Are A and B matrices,...?

No.

vectors, ...?

No.

~~...or what? You then perform cross-product on them, but isn't matrix multiplication an inner product operation?~~ — This is not applicable since these are not matrix computations.

"A" is the real coefficient of a complex number.

"B" is the coefficient associated with the imaginary term of a complex number.

Both of these, namely: this format, could be considered equivalent to a linear polynomial of two terms: a real term and an imaginary term.

So, their *double* cross product is just two of the possible combinations resulting from finding: $(A + iB)^2$. The other two products are the squaring of the "A" term and the squaring of the "iB" term (which, in the case of electrical engineering, "i" would be replaced with the symbol of: "j").

All of this squaring business is for a purpose...

The inversion of the phase of current relative to the phase of voltage has to come from somewhere. From where does it come?

It comes from the squaring of the imaginary term of a complex number if the inlet, the input port, of a circuit's real voltage is kept extremely low. Or else, it comes from a spark gap flashing ON.

The squaring of a complex number happens during each cycle of calculations for determining the outcome of a circuit per time-frame when that circuit also contains reactive components.

Since I have discovered from six years of simulated trial and error that a reactive circuit fed a starvation diet of input voltage through a single portal of inlet – with no other chance for escape since any other outlet is not made available to this type of circuit (unless I gain the skillfulness of getting away with having additional grounded escape outlets while retaining this second requirement of restrictive throughput to disallow the formation of a normal direction for current to flow), then this type of circuit has a high likelihood of succeeding in producing a runaway condition of output surging at a rate which is faster than the thermodynamic rate of decline imposed by conventional experience.

Maybe I did not make this clear in the text? Since you asked, then I have to assume that I am not clearly stating the situation to prevent your confusion.

Also, where are you getting your theories from?

When students of electrical engineering are taught how to perform the same calculations that a simulator performs upon a "live" circuit (such as the format of equations taught at Khan Academy; I'm sure there are other locations), and when a simulator can do this for me without me having to do them, myself, then simple logic is staring me in the face that answers the timeless question, "From where does free energy come from if not from the loony bin of fantasy?"

Can you cite relevant sources that describe what you are trying to say in your book?

I remember reading (somewhere) that a voltage source is equivalent to voltage regulation; that the amplitude of a voltage input is directly related to its ability to regulate the voltages of a "live" circuit and prevent reactance from becoming a positive feedback. This positive

feedback is what I design my simulated circuits to possess in which the inductive and capacitive reactances of each cycle, or half-cycle, of the circuit's oscillations become the inductances and the capacitances for each subsequent cycle, or half-cycle. This is where reactive impedance becomes our friend: under conditions of starvation (stimulating a circuit without feeding it any significant amount of power) and a restricted throughput (to discourage the formation of current) produces a backlash similar to the short-lived responses of a diode whenever voltage polarity switches and just before the diode cuts off the flow of current. This backlash is the inversion of current whose sustained consequence is the increase of voltage differences rather than their thermodynamic equalization.

This, then, is what constitutes electrical free energy if power factor conversion (of the inverted current) is taken care of (such as through a simple resistive load or a full-bridge rectification involving a square formation of diodes).

So, unless I overlooked something, I am missing two citations...


1. Khan Academy
2. Equating the term, of: "Voltage regulation" with the term and function of a: "voltage source".
3. And a hole of knowledge never fed to budding students of electrical engineering, but can only be gained by their experience.

This third point I bank on since I am one of a kind. I have no one's quota of expectations to fulfill, but my own, which is: to make discovery and share.

Electrical engineering goes to a lot of trouble avoiding surges. They are never studied except how to subdue them as quickly as possible. They are certainly not studied for their value of renewability unless its according to prescribed plans already in use, such as: synchronous generators/motors, or a simple capacitor placed in parallel with a motor (see, screenshot, to the right).

Anyone who has studied math knows that there are infinitely various approaches to a solution of a problem. And electrical engineering is heavily engrossed in the math which models their subject.

The study of physics kills this incentive to find a solution by telling us that we can't discover anything new, or old and forgotten. But this limitation is intended for little children. It is not relevant to adults – if by adult, is to suggest someone who can think for themselves.



Conservation of energy does not pertain to reactive power since reactive power is not power; it is merely reactance. It cannot be conserved under the circumstances outlined, above, since it is not being "stored" and then "released" to, and from, inductors and capacitors. It is being "reflected" without storage and without discharge. Storage and discharge would entail a delay due to an assumption of "energy" being transmitted from one component in a circuit to every other component. This delay prevents overunity of output.

This "reflection" is what diodes do on a momentary basis. But if inductors and capacitors can be induced to do this as well, and in a sustained manner, then inductors and capacitors become analogous to the reversal of current inside of a spark gap with the added advantage of manipulating amplitude and frequency to a much better degree than the limitations of a spark gap could accomplish all alone and by itself without any assistance from inductances and capacitances outside of itself.

So, ... Is this Original Research?

You can bet that it is! Where else are you going to find this except from personal experience: yours and mine. You're not going to find this in a book or from taking a class due to it being against social protocol of a well-regulated society. Just as operating from the assumption that you have to calculate the requirements of a load and feed it that much, plus a little extra (to cover thermodynamic inefficiencies), will suppress reactive feedback, likewise do we seek an authoritative answer outside of ourselves with similar results of missing opportunities of self-discovery.

Did I miss something?

Thanks for asking. -- [Vinyasi](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 22:04, 30 October 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)] [@Leaderboard](#), I forgot to mention...

Electrical engineering always allowed for free energy circuits by renaming them: unstable. In other words, "energy IN does not equal energy OUT" defines an unstable circuit in which you can't predict the output based on the input, alone (ignoring the ability for a shift in time due to electrical reactance disqualifying Conservation of Energy under Noether's Theorem). Thus, Conservation of Energy is not a law so much as it is a yardstick by which circuit topologies are measured to determine a circuit's type. If a circuit's output is unpredictable (based on its input, alone), then it is unstable since its output was not conserved within the boundaries imposed by its input. Type-casting is not disallowance; it is merely prejudice.

Considering how unstable circuit simulators are (due to their consistent use of matrix algebra as a shortcut for calculating a circuit's outcome), simulating an unstable circuit within the context of an unstable simulator yields "matrix is singular" error messages more often than not. Only stable circuits yield predictable outcomes. Simulators find no fault with these types of circuits.

Using an inherently unstable simulator to calculate a circuit's behavior is a predisposition (ie, prejudice) towards favoring stable circuits since only stable circuits will pass through this artificial, manmade act of filtration without coughing up and freezing in mid-stride. This is not

due to some Law of Nature. It is due to flagrant social engineering. -- [Vinyasi \(discuss • contribs\)](#) 03:15, 31 October 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

Yes, [@Leaderboard](#). There are relevant citations. Giving it some more thought, and engaging in a little brush-up reading, I remembered something I read a few years ago and added one sentence with two references attached to my wikibook's subsection ...

[Free Energy does not Exist#Block Diagram](#)

quote...

This situation is best described as when **an open IDEAL^{[7][0]} transmission line is terminated by a shorted IDEAL transmission line** encouraging the formation of a *purely imaginary impedance at the input*.^{[8][0] [9][0] [10][0] [11][0]} -- [Vinyasi \(discuss • contribs\)](#) 01:45, 4 November 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

[@Leaderboard](#)

Can you cite relevant sources that describe what you are trying to say in your book?

📢 **FYI:** Yes, I can (now)!

[MrPreva](#), on YouTube, makes a good case for the reversal of current using a shorted step-up/down transformer. Although this is not overunity of output, it is a significant first step of simplicity! His video has been translated into English (from the Russian) by [MrJohnK1](#) and comments have been offered by [Chris Sykes](#) among others. When simulated within [Paul Falstad's electronic simulator](#), an ideal condition manifests in which the wattage of the A/C source shifts most of its power into the negative side of its virtual oscilloscope tracings throughout each cycle of oscillation. This goes beyond the mere recycling of reactive power via the use of a capacitor placed across an inductive load (in the screenshot, up-above, of recycled reactance). -- [Vinyasi \(discuss • contribs\)](#) 17:18, 6 November 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

🔒 **Keep** -- [Vinyasi \(discuss • contribs\)](#) 17:34, 6 November 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

Comment: You can call me completely stupid for this ([Go on, I won't deny it](#) - just don't make fun of me), but I am totally confused... Would it have been simpler just to say "this is original research on power simulation games"? That's just about all I caught... —

[L10nM4st3r](#) / **ROAR at me!** 20:56, 7 November 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

[@L10nM4st3r](#) You pegged it accurately and succinctly. Yes, it would have been simpler, but not as interesting since I am a curious fellow who wants an explanation as to "why it is" and "how it is" as well as "what it is" plus "who cares?" and what does history have to say? *Good ideas are always rediscovered no matter how readily they keep getting forgotten since good ideas are eternal ideas which can never entirely die!* And I want feedback from other people who are, and are not, like-minded to fertilize my understanding so that I can grow and not merely feel comfortable. "Challenge me" is my motto. 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. Take my latest foray into the work of [MrPreva](#) for instance. I never would have discovered him had I not been assembling a slideshow the other day and needed slides of shorted coils. That led me to his [shorted transformer video](#). His data, and its simplicity, blows me away – especially since he did his experiments on the bench

while I am limited to [performing them under simulation](#). Yet, my limitation does not hamper me from appreciating his handiwork. Far from it! Thanks for asking ... --

Vinyasi ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 09:17, 8 November 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

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. —

[L10nM4st3r](#) / [ROAR at me!](#) 10:53, 8 November 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

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. — [L10nM4st3r](#) / [ROAR at me!](#) 10:57, 8 November 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

@[L10nM4st3r](#) Help me to understand this concept of: "primary research". So, I can't quote it if it's a lone wolf? But what if another source can be found? In other words, how many primary sources of research does it take for each of them to be considered secondary? Or, if quantity of independent citations are not enough, then how deep does a string of citations have to go, as in: me citing someone else, who cites someone else, etc.? -- Vinyasi ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 21:18, 8 November 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

This is how I understand it @[MarcGarver](#): tell me if I'm wrong. You research something, say, the moon is slowly shrinking. You find proof, but you can't post it on [w:Moon](#). Not yet anyway. Then you post your findings somewhere where it gets verified. If the moon really is shrinking, news sites everywhere (or some news sites) say the moon is shrinking. Before you know it, somebody adds "the moon is shrinking" to the wikipedia article. Obviously the moon is not shrinking, but as an example it works well. 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. I suggest having it sent to wikiversity. **Transwiki to Wikiversity and delete from Wikibooks** - that's my new vote.

Transwiki basically means it will get transported to a potentially more suitable wiki - if they want it. — [L10nM4st3r](#) / [ROAR at me!](#) 21:47, 8 November 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

@[L10nM4st3r](#)

[Wikiversity:Import#Free_Energy_does_not_Exist](#)

[wikiversity:Free Energy does not Exist](#) -- Vinyasi ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 02:49, 10 November 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

Ok, it can probably be deleted from Wikibooks then. —

[L10nM4st3r](#) / [ROAR at me!](#) 13:43, 10 November 2022 (UTC)

[[reply](#)]


@[L10nM4st3r](#) To whomever this may concern... ~~OK~~, but

Can a redirect be placed (in place of the deletion) to redirect readers to its new location at Wikiversity? An automatic redirect, or else a notice with a link to the new location, would be very courteous since I've already scattered numerous links to this Wikibooks' location. Thank you. --

[reply]

That's not up to me - I'm not an admin. — L10nM4st3r /

ROAR at me! 18:48, 10 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

 **Keep** I still want to keep it here at Wikibooks, or have a redirect to its new location if that's possible. If it has to go, then at least it has a copy in another location in case deletion occurs. -- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 18:51, 12 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

@L10nM4st3r, MarcGarver, SHB2000, Leaderboard: quote, "... where are you getting your theories from? Can you cite relevant sources that describe what you are trying to say in your book?"

Please see: [Acknowledgments](#):

snip...snip

I always assumed that I don't need to cite anyone other than myself – not due to any presumed brilliance of mine, but – due to common sense and simple logic.

snip...snip

If I perform a single caloric unit of energy every time I strike my hand with my other fist, and I am doing this per second, then if I should increase my frequency of strikes per second, doesn't this increase the quantity of energy which is delivered to my hand (by my fist) during each period of one second?

This is why we're charged for our electrical energy usage using Ohm's Law – in Kilowatts – *blended with per units of Hours* since time is one of the three variables of [Electrical Reactance](#) Formulae. Time matters to electrical engineering and is not to be undersold since it works in conjunction with the other two ingredients of electrical reactance, namely: capacitive and inductive reactance.

Electrical reactance formulae don't bother to measure themselves using units of amps or volts. And, likewise, Ohm's Law doesn't bother to quantify itself in terms of the temporal-factors of frequency and phase relations, nor with the dynamic field-properties of capacitance and inductance. *Yet*, it is the combination of these two mathematical relationships which quantifies our electric bill.

snip...snip

Assuming that you accept the analogy, up-above, of energy expenditure per unit of time along with its consequences, and since time is merely one of three variable parameters of electrical reactance, then it stands to reason that *free energy* is the manipulation of *all of the parameters of electrical reactance*, not merely one of them (ie, time), while diminishing the significance of energy (under Ohm's Law) even though *some energy, no matter how small and insignificant*, is *always needed* to **run a circuit**.

snip...snip

-- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 01:33, 15 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

@Vinyasi: If it has been determined that the book is better suited for Wikiversity, I see no need to keep a copy here. [Leaderboard](#) (discuss • contribs) 06:57, 15 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

@Leaderboard:, I think what Vinyasi meant is to change it to a soft redirect. See for example [School of Mathematics](#) which is a soft redirect to wikiversity. I think it should be moved to wikiversity in a way that preserves the revision history of the page and the associated talk page. - [Слава Україні Героям Слава](#) (talk) 10:24, 15 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

@Slava Ukraini Heroyam Slava 123: That's fine by me. It seems that the user was referring to something else though when they pinged me. [Leaderboard](#) (discuss • contribs) 11:42, 15 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

@Slava Ukraini Heroyam Slava 123 OK. May I do this, myself? -- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 22:03, 15 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

@Slava Ukraini Heroyam Slava 123 Is it necessary to have the hash sign at the start of the wiki code? ...

1. [Wikiversity:Free Energy does not Exist](#)

This page is a [soft redirect](#).

versus ...

[Wikiversity:Free Energy does not Exist](#)

This page is a [soft redirect](#).

-- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 22:09, 15 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

@Vinyasi:, I'm not an admin. @Leaderboard: is and told that it's fine by him. Honestly I have no idea why the hash sign is there. To import with the revision history, you need importer rights in Wikiversity. Hope this helps. - [Слава Україні Героям Слава](#) (talk) 22:45, 15 November 2022 (UTC)

[reply]

I'm tired of this discussion. -- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 23:02, 15 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

@Slava Ukraini Heroyam Slava 123:, I believe that it was already imported (with revision history) at Wikiversity. I don't think there is anything else to do as a result and unless @Vinyasi: thinks otherwise, this can be closed. [Leaderboard](#) (discuss • contribs) 08:40, 16 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

@MarcGarver

→ "physics is false"

↓ I can't help it if physics doesn't want to take advantage of a missed opportunity to exceed our expectations.

→ "free energy can be created from nothing"

I wouldn't call [impedance nothing](#). Impedance is a substantial force to be reckoned with giving us losses or gains depending upon how we take advantage of it, or not, as the case may be.^{[12][0]}

-- Vinyasi (discuss • contribs) 06:17, 18 November 2022 (UTC) [reply]

Let's Chat ... [edit source]

You may deposit your criticisms, suggestions, etc., here. [Vinyasi \(discuss • contribs\)](#) 00:48, 7 October 2022 (UTC) [reply]

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

"This isn't research"

Versus...

- There (their usage)...

[https://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?](https://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=Free_Energy_does_not_Exist&diff=4208966&oldid=4208936)

[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

"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](#). 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."

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... ;-\)](#) ↗-- [Vinyasi](#) ([discuss](#) • [contribs](#)) 17:10, 16 November 2022 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

References [[edit source](#)]

- ↑ Through power factor correction, using a capacitor in parallel with an inductive load, we can reuse 99% of our electricity [in this example](#) ↗. This spawns *the*

appearance of a 100 to 1 gain of output relative to input. Yet, this *appearance* is a mirage since no law of physics has been violated.

- ↑ [Quote: Michael W. Friedlander](#) suggests that

"fringe science is necessary so that mainstream science will not atrophy".

- ↑ [Wikibooks: Deletion policy](#); [Requests for deletion](#) *"You should be especially sensitive to discussions*

about brand-new works, particularly by new contributors to Wikibooks. Unless there are obvious problems that are unlikely to be rectified, your time would be better spent mentoring new contributors and trying to help clean up new works, even if the work is currently a blatant violation of current procedures. Remember you were once a new contributor too."

4. † [The SPICE Page](#)
5. † [Paul Falstad's electronic simulator](#)
6. † ["Physics on the Fringe": Smoke Rings, Circlons, and Alternative Theories of Everything](#)", by [Margaret Wertheim](#) (Walker & Company, 2011).
7. † [Jeffrey Denenberg's](#) answer to: [When an open transmission line is terminated by a shorted](#)

transmission line, do they produce a purely imaginary impedance at their input? Can this reactance grow at exponential rates if input is kept extremely small and restricted to a single moment?

8. † [Reflections](#) cause several undesirable effects, including modifying [frequency responses](#), causing [overload](#) power in [transmitters](#) and [overvoltages](#) on [power lines](#). However, the reflection phenomenon *can also be made use of* in such devices as [stubs](#) and [impedance transformers](#). The special cases of open circuit and short circuit lines are of particular relevance to stubs.
9. † [Zip compressed file](#) of two Micro-Cap simulations of this phenomenon. They

both produce the same result despite the use of three galvanic-style batteries in one version versus not in the other version. Peruse [this directory](#) on my website (as an alternative to downloading this ZIP compressed file) and hunt for any filename which begins with *simplest-overunity-circuit-you-will-ever-see*.

10. † [Is it Possible to Generate Current without Voltage?](#) – (posted to my website)
11. † [Impedance is a Source of Energy](#) – Quora
12. † [What does "negative impedance" mean in electricity and electronics? Has the capacitor negative impedance? How do we create a "negative" capacitor?](#), by Cyril Mechkov

Category: [Links to external webpages](#)

This page was last edited on 18 November 2022, at 07:06.

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](#).

[Privacy policy](#) [About Wikibooks](#) [Disclaimers](#) [Mobile view](#) [Developers](#) [Statistics](#) [Cookie statement](#)

