An Ideal Circuit...



...should have all of the <u>basic elements</u> of a <u>transmission line</u>. In this example, one of the pair of coils is replaced by another conductive element: a spark gap filled with a noble gas, such as: neon or helium.

This circuit is shaped like a fractal (snowflake) which self-regulates its overunity so as to avoid the use of mechanical switching to toggle into, or out of, its acceleration towards infinite oblivion. This is achieved by pulsing its alternating cycles of triangular waves into hyperbolic surges of amplitude before periodically collapsing them...



Such an ideal status (of an overunity circuit) must also prevent its voltage from overwhelming its amperage by preferentially dominating its voltage by its amperage...



It should also have a built-in correction for power factor...



And its nodal voltages should not be too elevated from ground potential...



But in order to amplify power beyond miniscule levels of mediocrity, ...



... it may be necessary to build-up the modularity of this circuit to improve its output...



...which (unfortunately) increases its nodal voltages...



...and increases the output from each of its eight inductive loads...



...while at the same time altering the ratio of units of volts per units of amps per coil...



Yet, conditions improve by adding another module...



...improving its output a bit more...



...which slightly reduces its nodal voltages...



... is quite steady in its output over long durations...



...and continues to exhibit triangular waves with zero degrees of phase shift between their current and voltage waveforms...



...and entertains a leisurely cycle of pulses...



Multiplying the magnetic output (of amperage) by a factor of twelve is intended to illustrate how all twelve inductive loads are wound upon the same bobbin. This factor of multiplication is also intended for the dielectric value of voltage since all three modules are electrically linked together...



I have felt for some time that the story of Peter Savo is not a hoax, nor is it a fabrication.

This is due to the possibility that <u>Tesla's EV conversion of 1931</u>, and the <u>Ammann brothers' EV</u> <u>conversion of 1921</u>, may be identical in their essential elements.

In other words, using one quadrature ($\frac{1}{2}$ of the first image, pg. 4) may help to explain why Tesla used (what appeared to the untrained eyes of Savo) to be twelve radio vacuum tubes when, in fact, they may have been eight vacuum tube capacitors (a Tesla invention) and four, sparking, gas discharge tubes if two of my 100 femto Farad, grounded capacitors are replaced by the mysterious pair of copper spheres which the Ammann brothers prominently displayed in the headlight sockets of their EV conversion (while Tesla may have hid them inside of his two foot long, by one foot square, wooden project box).

I have my own notions of how these spheres may have been constructed, but am unable (at this time) to simulate them to verify the accuracy of my speculative thinking. But I can attempt an approximation of these two spheres (and describe this speculation) on pages 15 and 16 of this document.

Remember when Einstein said that changing the speed by which <u>two twins</u> traveled in opposite directions could alter their ages? Well, this is not Quantum Physics. This is straight out of electrical reactance in which time, magnetism and dielectricity can interfere with the overly simplistic view of electrical energy offered to us by thermodynamics. Because direct current does not explain the whole situation.

Yet, conservation of energy demands our ignoring the ability for electrical reactance to modify how matter becomes energetically excited.

This is the true testimonial of how energy behaves: not as a standard of consistency.

But as an expression of electrified matter governed by more than mere voltage drop since direct current, and its simplistic voltage drop, is an under-assessment.

Direct current exists as a fictional, half-truth ignoring the other half of direct current in which the battery gets recharged or replaced with a new battery. This completes the cycle of alternating current and establishes direct current as a manmade fiction along with the conservation of energy.

Electrical energy is not equivalent to matter. Electrical energy is an expression of complex matter.

This may not seem like much of a distinction and may even suggest word play;

But it is an important distinction since the expression of electrical energy is governed by energy's reactance; not by the mass of an object.

Mass is merely the limit of nuclear energy. Mass is not the limit for electrical energy. The latter is limited by the valence electrons and chemical bonds of matter holding atoms and molecules together.

<u>Perpetual Motion Machines of the first kind</u> are machines which do not run on any power inputted into themselves from outside themselves.

My circuit simulation is not a Perpetual Motion Machine of the first kind due to the presence of an initial input of precharging a few (100 femto Farad) capacitors (located adjacent to the grounded points of this circuit) with one micro volt, each. *{Nor is it a Perpetual Motion Machine of any other kind.}*

In real life, I will assume that this precharged condition would be a continuous source of input if these grounding points are not connected to the Earth, but are serving as crystal radio-styled aerials.

But on the point of an initial precharge, alone, invalidates anyone's attempt – or intention – to libel this circuit as defying physics.

I take libelous statements very seriously for they are a suit worthy of legal action.

Besides, how could a (\$4k+ formerly priced) simulator – <u>Micro-Cap from Spectrum Software</u>; a standard in the industry among electrical engineers – lie?

Would that not entitle the application of a refund be made towards all of their previous clients?

The following circuits, and their screenshot tracings, are not practical. Yet, they indicate how reactive power defies thermodynamics...

















The reason why ...

...the circuit simulations of the previous four pages (page 11 through page 14) are able to produce such an abundance of electricity at an accelerated rate of synthesis (from its raw, proto-electrical forces of: time, magnetism and dielectricity) is due to the inclusion of an alternating (sine wave) voltage source (V1) acting as a frequency regulator.

And its inclusion (on these four previous pages of circuit simulations) is also able to avoid regulating voltage by keeping its injection of voltage to a very low value of one micro volt. Anything much greater than this would have suppressed the ability for reactive components to synthesize electricity from proto-forces. This is why we never see this phenomenon taking place within our conventional appliances except on rare occasion within the power grid resulting in explosive fire and severe arcing similar (in all appearances) to a lightning strike.

By the way...

Magnetism is the all-too-familiar field surrounding wires and coils. And dielectricity is the all-toofamiliar (di-)electric field held in close proximity to the magnetic field. This is well-known from the work of Oliver Heaviside whose <u>Telegrapher's Equations</u> defined the problems of long-distance transmission of both power and communications across the Atlantic ocean in the late 1800s.

These two fields define electricity within a context of time. Without these two fields, and without time, electricity would have no meaning. Nor would it have any existence as a phenomenon which we have come to know as electricity.

This is also why electricity may be fabricated (synthesized) from these three factors as if we were constructing apple pie from its constituent ingredients of apples, flour, sugar and butter.

Electricity is no different from apple pie in this respect. And I have <u>Eric Dollard</u> to thank for <u>this</u> <u>illustration</u> without which, my simplistic simulations of a monopolar electrical system would have no meaning... "Where is electrical ground if you're transmitting through the Earth?"

This single feature is the foundation for "free energy" and its commonplace misrepresentations within physics, etc.

Even Nikola Tesla had something to do with this misunderstanding. For he invented new terminology renaming reactive power with his substitute expression of "radiant energy". This confuses the general population and prevents our acceptance of this gift from Nature.

Oliver Heaviside came immediately prior to Tesla within the historical timeline of electrical engineering. Even though Oliver was not an electrical engineer, he was a mathematician capable of analyzing electrical problems and coming up with their solutions.

Charles Proteus Steinmetz coexisted within Tesla's lifetime and continued the time-honored tradition which Heaviside had originated. Both these two men used the correct terminology (of reactive power) to designate the foundation of their work. Only Tesla had to be different. He had to be a showman!

We can thank Tesla for his wizardry. But we must clear up this misconception (of free energy) spawned by his elevated egotism (which all of us are guilty of, at one time or another, in our lives).

Up until pages ten, eleven, twelve and thirteen of this document, the previous and subsequent circuit simulations are not regulated. Due to the highly reactive nature of these circuit simulations, their frequencies vary-at-random at whatever is the resonant frequency *at each moment in time*.

But I measured the wattage of each of the reactive components (ignoring the non-reactive resistors) of the circuit simulations (of pages ten through thirteen) and am able to confidently state that the

elevated wattage is NOT coming from the voltage source, for that is the electronic component which is the least affected by the reactive elevation of electricity resident within the circuit. This is illustrated in their oscilloscope tracings. I've included two of these tracings on page 12 as evidence of the distinct difference between the behavior of the voltage source, V1, and the behavior of one of the capacitors, C3. This is also illustrated on page 14 wherein the voltage of inductor, L1, and the capacitor, C1, are diametrically opposed to each other (out of phase) in time indicating a negative unity, power factor associated with the (generation) synthesis of electricity. *{I have to say, "synthesis", and avoid using the usual terminology of, "generation", since there is no prime mover whenever electricity is synthesized from its constituent ingredients. An example of a prime mover is a waterfall, or a gasoline-fired generator, obeying the laws of gravitational motion and thermodynamic heat dissipation within the context of physics. We are not talking about physics, here. We're talking about <u>electrical reactance.</u>}*

{By the way, a change-of-state between a liquid and a gas, in the case of a gas-fired generator, is a chemical reaction not unlike that of electrical reactance. This is due to the difference between the positive resistance "Law of Ohms" dominating the conductivity of the solid and liquid states of matter (in which current is inversely related to voltage) while the negative resistance of the "Law of Conductivity" (Mho's Law) varies directly and is reflected in the direct relationship between the temperature (analogous to electrical current) and pressure (analogous to electrical voltage) of a gas. The additional trade-off is that the gasoline is consumed during this reactive process within an internal combustion engine; namely, it is a one-way reaction. Unfortunately, the byproducts of this combustion cannot easily be converted back (reverted) to their liquid equivalents. Yet, within the context of electrical reactance, we can readily accomplish this bidirectional conversion which makes electrical motors ideal candidates to serve as the work-horses of modern-day life.}

V1, like all of the other reactive components, dissipates wattage after its initial surge.

But C3 does not dissipate its initial surge. Instead, it continues to sustain this surge as a peak experience which plateaus at a fixed value of energy storage.

This indicates, to me, that capacitor C3 is accumulating the voltage-oriented byproduct of the synthesis of electricity while all of the other electronic components are thermodynamically dissipating electricity in a normal manner.

The following circuit illustrates a conjectural emulation of two copper spheres which are filled with either helium or neon and have a dielectric coating their interior surface. Their center (simulated as the left- and right-most spark gap) act as foci (similar to the foci of a parabolic reflector) which concentrates current in a tight orbit (surrounding their center) simulated by a pair of one Henry inductors possessing relatively zero resistance (1e-20 Ohms). One 1 pico capacitor flanks the grounded side of this inductor-sparkGap-inductor sandwich while the other 1 pico capacitor is in parallel with this sandwich. Both capacitors are precharged with one volt. Each of these six electronic components constitute my speculation of merely one of the copper spheres of the Ammann brothers' EV conversion of 1921 acting as a specialized aerial...





The following variation has greater overunity probably due to its being asymmetrical...





The following examples illustrate how, more often than not, it's best to keep the voltage input low so as to <u>refrain from suppressing</u> <u>reactance</u>... (part two)

This output...



...resulted from precharging one capacitor with too much voltage (one volt in this example)...



.999 HEEEES L1 L4

All resistors are 1µ Ohm. All capacitors have 10m Ohm of equivalent series resistance. The parameters of this circuit are optimized for power at the expense of frequency of pulses. ...while this output...



...resulted from *not* overcharging the same capacitor choosing, instead, to precharge it with a mere single milli volt (instead of the whole volt in the previous example)...



In some cases, it becomes necessary to use a very large precharged capacitor if you're trying to overcome resistance. But in these examples, resistance is not the problem.

Since we overfeed our electric vehicles on the presumption that we have to supply them with all of their energy (instead of encouraging them to "fend for themselves after giving them a tiny kick-start", then – as a consequence – overunity is not a normal observation and, hence, is considered a ridiculous possibility.

And who would want to be caught up in a state of frivolous ridiculousness? No one!

All types of configurations are possible if we're not trying to pulse the output as a self-regulation...





