

# Can the inversion of the phase of current (relative to the phase of voltage), by one-half cycle of oscillations, magnetize a stationary coil? [closed]

 electronics.stackexchange.com/questions/576651/can-the-inversion-of-the-phase-of-current-relative-to-the-phase-of-voltage-by



-4



**Closed.** This question needs details or clarity. It is not currently accepting answers.



Add details and clarify the problem you're solving. This will help others answer the question. You can [edit the question](#) or [post a new one](#).

Closed 3 days ago.

(Private feedback for you)

## [Edit question](#)

I'm not going to provide any data (initially), because I'm merely espousing theory which I have hypothesized from pre-existing theory...theory which we have been collectively programmed to ignore. I've done my homework to evince this awareness from my own experience. And there is no substitute for experience. Not even knowledge from the greatest source can trump experience. So, here goes...

The nomenclature of "passive sign convention" (Wikipedia) labels current as emanating from out of the negative terminal of voltage sources. And theoretical physics, likewise, labels the electron with a negative charge.

Additionally, we casually equate voltage polarity with the positive pole/terminal of a battery just as the nomenclature of passive sign convention does the same.

Hence, the consumption of power at an electronic component, such as: at a resistive load (an incandescent bulb inside a flashlight circuit) and its conversion into light and heat, labels its current as possessing the same polarity of sign as its voltage. So, if the current is negative, then its voltage is negative; and if its current is positive, then its voltage is positive.

But the current coming out of a battery is negative since it is exiting through the battery's negative terminal according to the nomenclature of passive sign convention. And its voltage is positive when its difference between its two terminals is summed: its greater value of voltage at its positive terminal minus its lesser value of voltage at its negative terminal still yields a positive answer.

Thus, the power exiting a battery is always negative while the consumption, and conversion, of this power at the incandescent bulb, representing a resistive load, is always positive. According to thermodynamics and energy conservation, the absolute value of these two components must cancel to a net value of zero due to their opposing signs.

But this is not the case whenever a spark gap is nearby.

The spark gap to which I am referring is macro-simulated by Micro-Cap as a sub-circuit equivalent to a neon bulb.

Under certain circumstances, the presence of a spark gap - even if it is not "lit" (arcing), can cause coils to emit power greater than their input as if an invisible hand were moving them through a magnetic field to cause them to manifest current within themselves when, in fact, their only abnormality is a precondition of the reversal of their current relative to their voltage by one-half cycle of alternations amounting to a separation of the phase of current from the phase of voltage by 180 degrees. This is oftentimes called, a negative unity, power factor; or, the generation of power.

Some of these anomalous conditions are not very interesting (despite their unlimited gain over sufficient duration) due their fragility of collapsing under any load greater than a resistance of around 800 milli ohms or thereabouts.

But some of these occurrences are very interesting since they can withstand significant loads.

The simplest load is, of course, a resistive load, since reactive power has to be converted into real power before it can perform any useful work, such as: the boiling of water surrounding a resistive heating element in a steam locomotive from a bygone era; or, more recently, inside a nuclear power plant.

Upon applying a segregated analysis upon every significant component within these anomalous circuits yields some very appalling results, namely: that power tends to disappear at some components much faster than it is being generated at other components if the spark gap is not lit (not arcing). But whenever it is arcing, then power tends to appear at the spark gap only slightly faster than it is disappearing at the load which causes a consistent, and significant, gain over time.

This is my initial data to share with you before becoming more factual...

My question is more, or less, technical since I find it intriguing that this seemingly violates Michael Faraday's Induction Law unless we have narrow-mindedly interpreted his law to a very restrictive condition without including the reversal of current as being mathematically equivalent to the movement of a coil through a magnetic field.

Simulators don't know physics. They are dumb robots who only know the math which we program them to perform. They don't even know what time is. All they know are the functional relationships and variables of electrodynamics and time is one of these factors.

So, the damping of the power of an oscillating wave moving forwards in time becomes a raging surge moving backwards in time whenever current reverses itself, relative to voltage, by one-half cycle of alternating polarity of voltages.

Maybe this is the answer which I seek? Maybe this is not a violation of Michael Faraday so much as it is a reversal of time?

Postscript...

On second thought, and after a good night's rest, I will consent to provide some data... Here it is...

Joseph Newman has been ridiculed and for good measure...he deserves it. He lied to us about what, and how, he did whatever he was doing. What was he doing?

Disregarding his theories...since we're all ignorant on this topic. It's so new to all of us that books have yet to be written on this topic much less country bumpkins attempting to extemporaneously come up with Nobel Prize winning theories off the top of their heads! I should know... I'm one of those country bumpkins!... [throat-clearing sound]

The facts speak for themselves...

Dr. Hastings, a physicist and a bystander willing to cheer Newman onward, did an analysis of his "table model" and Newman inserted this into chapter 6 of his book, "The Energy Machine of Joseph Newman." The deciding factor was the good doctor's admission of a slight negative current traveling in reverse direction relative to the polarity of voltage coming out of his battery pack sufficiently strong enough to recharge his numerous, 9-volt batteries all hooked up in series.

It is this reversal of current traveling INTO his batteries and *against* the flow of current coming OUT of his batteries to which I am addressing the question of my original post.

He had to have a voltage in his large coil which was excessively higher than the voltage coming out of his batteries as a predicate, before any reversal of current could occur. Otherwise, his coil's voltage would have been overwhelmed by his batteries' voltage and no reversal of current would have been possible.

And he had to have a frequency of rotation at his rotor much faster than he admitted to...much faster than what is mechanically possible, to overcome the thermodynamic dissipation of current and succeed at reversing its direction in order to recharge his batteries!

I took the data from this chapter and wrote a simulation in LTSPICE, but it would not give me the reverse current that Dr. Hastings described. Instead, it gave me a thermodynamically commonplace dissipation of energy just as our conventional wisdom would want to expect of every Joe-blow schemer who has come along with false promises of overunity and free energy.

It was not until I raised the frequency of the rotor of his device, from my presumption of a hand-cranked 50 RPM inputting 5 volts, to a mind-boggling 100 thousand RPM (ergo, 6 million Hz) and reduced its input to 590 micro volts, and I also added a neon bulb in series with the coil's parallel capacitor to improve performance (this neon bulb was not specified in Newman's book), that produced a net result of a quarter of an ampere of reverse current sufficient to recharge his batteries (rather than drain them) and still provide over 1,000 volts of mechanical advantage, in the form of torque, sufficiently strong enough to drive a sump pump as he had demonstrated many, many times in public displays of overunity and free energy. This energy was for "free" in the sense that the only cost was the up-front cost of making a one-time, initial investment in a very large copper coil of magnetic winding wire, 30 gauge, of 149 pounds of copper in his table model analyzed by Dr. Hastings in chapter 6 of Newman's book.

This "quarter of an ampere of reverse current," within my second screenshot of a simulation of a modified (accelerated vibration, not rotation, of his rotor) version of the circuit which he specified in his book, is the result of my simulation achieving a reversal of current in the amount of 778.27mA at the coil minus the 530.73mA of negative (production of) current at the battery pack giving a net balance of negative 247.54mA. *{Berkeley SPICE and, thus, LTSPICE both render the battery's current as negative. Since I did not enjoy seeing this at*

*the time (I've gotten used to it since then), I multiplied these occurrences of the generation of power with a negative one to put a positive value of current on the simulator's virtual oscilloscope tracings. So, this meant my needing to also modify the current of the massive coil, represented by inductor: L1. L2 represents the inductance of the helium canister.}*

I initially did everything Newman described in his book except for this increase in rotor speed which I did after my first attempt at simulating his device. So, I did two simulations: one his way and the second simulation was done mostly his way with one modification of my own (the increased frequency of his rotor).

The National Bureau of Standards, who claimed to have analyzed his device on behalf of the U.S. Patent Office, modified his device (as they admit to on their website; and, as Newman claims that they did) by eliminating the build up of voltage in his massive coil by self-shorting that coil throughout the entire duty cycle of the commutator's rotations, using what they call: a "current shunt" (consisting of a pair of resistors, R-L and R-TS, within the right block diagram of figure 4, labeled: "Output Power Measurements"), rather than during the last 20% of each duty cycle as Newman specifies in his building plans for his device. This self-short was merely intended to lessen the sparking effect that was plaguing his device at the end of each duty cycle in addition to a parallel capacitor added to his massive coil which also helped to reduce sparking.

His massive coil was supposed to build up lots of voltage in excess of what the battery pack was sending it by resisting the flow of current coming from the batteries. At the very least, this was the first step in producing the overunity which he claimed to have achieved: a step-up of the batteries' voltage.

The second step was his lie about how to build the rotor since what he built for his public demonstrations was not the same design as what he describes in his book. And it may not be the same as what he delivered to the Patent Office. We'll never know, for certain, which version the Bureau of Standards had tested.

My guess, from the pictures on their website, suggests that Newman gave the National Bureau of Standards his conventional model (containing a permanent magnet rotor) which was incapable of achieving overunity. So, it is partly irrelevant that the testings were performed in such a way that invalidated their results since no overunity could be achieved by that model, anyway. Yet, it should have at least achieved an elevated accumulation of voltage had its coil not been so extensively shorted out with a "current shunt."

I know of Newman's lie since an electrical engineer, from Wabash, Indiana, a Byron Brubaker (MX6Maximus on Facebook and formerly on YouTube), contacted me after I had published my simulation data and told me how Newman built his demonstration model differently than he admitted to and never gave Byron any credit claiming, instead, that God had given Newman this information. These lies soured their relationship (since it was Byron's

suggestion forty years ago to improve Newman's device by replacing the permanent magnet rotor with a canister of helium wrapped with an open coil) and Newman took this secret to his grave.

Newman's public admission (in his book) was of a model which Newman *used to* design and test which never gave him overunity. It had a permanent magnet rotor. This was not what he rotated during his public demonstrations.

What he publicly rotated, and never allowed anyone else to touch, was a PVC canister made from sewage pipe and with two end caps to seal it filled with helium and the pipe was wrapped with an open coil, and painted orange to hide the fact that it was responding to the electrostatic field surrounding his massive coil of numerous windings. This response was the fact that helium is capable of emitting an electromagnetic vibration as a consequence of absorbing an electrostatic input. Thus, the open coil was acting as an antenna which was receiving the electrostatic rotation of the massive coil surrounding his rotor, and the helium was converting that high voltage, low frequency, electrostatic reception into a stepped up frequency of reduced voltage and elevated current. This constitutes a step-down transformation producing sine waves of elevated current blended with the massive coil's square waves of elevated voltage to affect a slight reversal of current, plus maintain a mechanical gain resulting from his elevated voltage.

So, as an electrical device, it sucked. But as a mechanical device, it soared. And the electrical evidence of its effectiveness is its reversal of current no matter how small and insignificant this may seem, it is enough evidence to validate having converted his appliance into a *mechanical* generator (for the most part and by definition) - not an electrical generator (for the most part) as we might expect. And the mechanical evidence is its ability to rotate a sump pump and pump lots of gallons of water per minute.

Here is *my* evidence...two screenshots of the LTSPICE simulation I spoke of earlier.

The first simulation uses a slow rotation of a hand-cranked rotor (LTSPICE ASC file). The second simulation uses the presumption of an elevated excitation of helium (LTSPICE ASC file).

It's not my fault that this smacks of pseudoscience since one of the implications of new information, not covered by pre-existing knowledge, is its pseudo- appearance. Only established beliefs smack of science and mine are not well-established. There's not enough of me to go around to make its newness more commonplace. Unless Byron lied to me, I believe in his sincerity since my simulations disproved Newman's motor design as outlined in his book predating Byron's admission over the telephone with me. And my second simulation (of accelerated vibrations coming from the rotor) confirms Byron's admission. So, nothing from my experience is self-contradictory. It merely contradicts everyone else's perspective.

**I am not a spam bot.**

Sorry to disappoint you, but I got over the oddity rather quickly 'cuz there's nothing odd about it. It may be shocking at first glance, but it is not odd by any means.

Batteries, although they're treated as if they are voltage sources, are truly nothing of the sort. They are mere converters of chemical storehouses of energy. Thus, conservation applies to all converters, ie. consumers, of power (including incandescent light bulbs and other resistive elements). Only a reactive composition of capacitors and coils is required to produce more reactive power coming "out" than the real power which enters "in" if it conforms to Mho's Law in which Ohms Law is multiplicatively inverted putting resistance in its numerator and the square of voltage in its denominator and negate that ratio to yield conductivity (admittance). Now, resistance is our friend and our circuits must be fed a marginal quantity of voltage and the current has to be maintained out of phase with the voltage by one-half cycle. If these criteria are met, then the largest hurdle against the magnification of power has been overcome.

edited 2 mins ago

asked Jul 23 at 20:43



Chet


133 bronze badges

 New contributor

- 5
- 5

Makes little sense to me, please add a schematic and some waveforms, and/or clarify your question. As it stands I don't think you'll get a useful response. – John D Jul 23 at 21:04

- 5

Sorry, but your text is non-understandable for those of us who have built our knowledge on the works of Faraday, Ampere, Ohm, Kirchoff and Maxwell. We have never heard of saturated capacitors. Materials disintegrate if the electric field grows strong enough but they do not saturate like ferromagnetic materials under magnetization. You may know something more than the rest of us. Reveal where you have got that information or what research of your own proves it. – user287001 Jul 23 at 21:12 

- 1
- 4