A Very Short Synopsis of Free Energy

Question posted onto Quora...[1]

"If light rays consist of both electric and magnetic components, why doesn't it have any charge or magnetic properties?"

Answered by Franco Bruno Cortelleti...[2]

"It doesn't. Free light, which is the part that is travelling, is only electric (dielectric). Illumination, or light that interacting with matter (the thing we see), is both magnetic and dielectric.

The part which travels is not electromagnetic, only the so-called "photon" is, which is the point where the ray lands on matter. Rays can't be magnetic, it's a straight line from source to matter, it involves no rotation until it is blocked by gross matter."

My comment to Franco's response...

The error exists in our theory about the geometry of the magnetic field.

We've got it partly right to consider that the electric field is strung out along the length of the path from point A to point B.

But we've got it wrong when we theorize that the magnetic field is at right-angles to the electric and is stretched out along the length of the path from point A to point B. It isn't. Instead, it is a cross-section of, and perpendicular to, the length.

So, whereas the electric field is linear, the magnetic field is two-dimensional. This can be inferred from an improved interpretation of Ohm's Law.

For starters, let's ignore the way in which Ohm's Law is usually taught as being: "power equals volts times current"...

...since this is a short-hand for the more thorough version which is also more telling of what is going on: "power equals voltage squared divided by resistance." This latter statement has been mathematically reduced by removing "voltage divided by resistance" and replacing this removal with

---

1   * https://is.gd/vutadu = https://www.quora.com/If-light-rays-consist-of-both-electric-and-magnetic-components-why-doesnt-it-have-any-charge-or-magnetic-properties

2   * https://is.gd/atacow = https://www.quora.com/If-light-rays-consist-of-both-electric-and-magnetic-components-why-doesnt-it-have-any-charge-or-magnetic-properties/answer/Franco-Bruno-Corteletti?__filter__=all&__nsrc__=notif_page&__sncid__=16582281900&__snid3__=23375948034

the capital letter "I" to represent a fiction known as "current" along with a fictional massless photon to carry the charge of current.

The only reason why we get away with this sham, is due to the intrinsic nature of voltage divided by resistance implies a change in voltage (over time) due to resistance. Thus, is born the mathematical fictional short-hand notation known as current along with its fictional partner in crime against the truth known as the photon.

So, getting back to the OP's question...

The magnetic field, if it exists at all(!), is within the cross-sectional plane which slices through a piece of wire across its girth (diameter) at right angles to the length of that piece of wire. The electric field defines the potential (voltage) along the length of that piece of wire.

The length of a piece of wire is a one-dimensional usage of voltage while the cross-sectional slice through the girth of a piece of wire is a two-dimensional usage of voltage and its implication of resistance since an increase of girth yields a decrease of resistance.

The reason why we mistakenly assign resistance to the length of a piece of wire is due to the factor of time which adds a parameter of delay to the resistance of the wire which has already been defined by its cross-sectional diameter, also known as: voltage squared.

These are two realities defined by the diameter of a wire: voltage squared and resistance. Yet, each is a different (unique) property of that wire.

Voltage squared is its cross-sectional dielectric (potential) charge state.

Voltage (alone; not squared) is its longitudinal dielectric potential, charge state.

Resistance is the wire's diameter considered as an abstraction on the presumption that resistance is a property apart from its state of charge. Instead, resistance is considered as a property of the wire, itself; its geometry and material of construction (copper versus aluminum, etc).

This is the correct manner of teaching Ohm's Law which does not obliterate its implication, suggested by Lord Kelvin and swept aside by the international body of people who govern our usage of the units of measurement. This suggestion was to use the reverse spelling of "ohm" to designate conductivity (admittance). Instead, the international body has designated the term of "Siemens" in place of Lord Kelvin's suggestion of the "mho." And to further the repression of free energy, also known as super-conductivity at room temperature, this same international governing body has named absolute zero degrees in honor of Lord Kelvin as if to suggest that this is the only way of creating free

energy when all we had to do was induce the condition which pertains to Mho's Law in our circuits!

Mho's Law defines admittance (which replaces the unit of power of Ohm's Law) as being equal to the negation of resistance divided by the square of voltage. This negation results from capacitors instantaneously reflecting voltage (and, thus, negating it) by the simultaneous imposition of two capacitive reactances occurring at 90°, but of opposite polarity within the context of the back EMF of neighboring inductive reactances.

The charge and the discharge of a capacitor takes time. But its reflection of the dielectric charge is instantaneous since no current is involved and, hence, no time delay is involved. This reflectivity is born of a saturated condition in which the capacitor can no longer absorb any further charge for most of the duty cycle of each alternating cycle of voltages in an oscillating circuit.

Thus, is born the negation of voltage squared which we erroneously observe as a reversal of the phase of one-dimensional voltage (not squared) relative to the phase of our fictional current. This condition is what defines a generator, or a battery, in which the current is negative and the voltage difference between its terminals is positive. Only the consumption of power is real power and measured in watts while the production of power is always reactive as measured in volts/amperes since its voltage and current phases are out of phase by one-half cycle of alternating voltages, or 180°. A negative power factor of unity is the result. This is Mho's Law.

Mho's Law is not a law, per se, but can be inferred from Ohm's Law if we don't do anything to discourage ourselves from thinking about it!

Mho's Law encourages the reduction of input voltage and the increase of resistance to amplify conductivity since Mho's Law puts resistance in its numerator while placing voltage squared in its denominator. This is opposite to common sense born of our restricted awareness focusing exclusively upon Ohm's Law as if this intense focus could answer all of our theoretical questions about free energy without recourse to Mho's Law working in conjunction with Ohm's Law.

This method of encouraging the production of freely available reactive power by severely reducing the input voltage of a free energy circuit, I learned by trial and error, creating many free energy circuits in Paul Falstad's electronic simulator by always using an input voltage of one micro volt usually installed in a precharged capacitor.

I also learned from trial and error that, sometimes, an enlarged resistance also improves power gain in conjunction with a low input voltage.

Thus, it is no surprise to me that I have found mathematical vindication, along with historical suppression, of these facts hidden in plain sight all this time within Ohm's Law.

Simulators don't lie. We lie to ourselves by telling ourselves fairy tales.

Simulators don't know physics. They don't know philosophy. They often times possess policies which make the study of overunity difficult, such as: their persistent use of matrix algebra to approximate the outcome of a circuit encourages underunity circuits (since those outcomes always converge on a definitive answer) while discouraging overunity circuits whose peaks and troughs oscillating on the simulator's virtual oscilloscope move apart away from the midline of zero amplitude, or else both move together upwards or downwards away from the midline. This results in a divergent set of outcomes which do not signify an indeterminate answer. They signify an answer which grows at an exponential rate of growth of diversification between the peaks of an oscillating wave and its valleys. Hence, simulators are programmed to assume indeterminacy when, instead, the beliefs of physics is being violated.

By the way, the Conservation of Energy is a pseudo law not founded on any equation other than Ohm's Law. This pseudo law of physics defines the real power consumed by a component, such as: the resistive element of an incandescent bulb, and its conversion into light and heat and, thus, subtracting a little bit from the watts of power entering into that light bulb. This pseudo law does not define the generation of reactive power. This latter definition remains for Mho's Law to spell out.

But by focusing everyone's attention on this law of physics, rather than on its original derivation from Ohm's Law, ignores the multiplicative inversion (Mho's Law) implied by Ohm's Law since the Conservation of Energy pseudo-law does not possess a mirrored inversion of itself. Instead, the Conservation of Energy pseudo-law monopolizes the domain of electrical engineering by shoving aside Ohm's Law and Mho's Law.

And our fictional installment of current to replace a portion of Ohm's Law oversimplifies the situation and replaces small case letter "i" (representing the complex value of the square root of negative one) with capital letter "I" representing nothing of meritorious honesty since we have, thus, eliminated from our awareness the square root of a negative square of voltage will result in the square root of negative one times voltage. Shorthand notation does not alter reality. Yet, it has within our collective perception of electrical reality!

Only by performing a segregated analysis of every single component in the simulation of an overunity, or underunity, circuit could I discover these facts. Jim Murray suggested that we do this in

his presentations at the Science, Energy and Technology Conference in Hayden, Idaho, in 2013, and on other occasions and in his new book, "The Meaning of Unity in Energy Conversion Systems."[3]

I performed these analyses upon a simple flashlight circuit and upon more complicated circuits involving spark gaps. The results were truly amazing defying every known convention.

Then, I recently published my results on Amazon[4] and on PayHip[5] and filed for a provisional patent as well (under the correct spelling of my name, which is: Vinyasi).

Try it (a segregated analysis of any circuit). You'll like it! It's worth the effort.

3   The Meaning of Unity in Energy Conversion Systems, by Jim Murray → https://is.gd/memika = https://duckduckgo.com/?q=the+meaning+of+unity+in+energy+conversion+systems+jim+murray&t=ffsb&ia=web

4   Search for: "mho's law" on Amazon, or visit: https://amazon.com/author/vinyasi

5   * https://payhip.com/vinyasi