


Does Conservation of Energy pertain to the electrical energy within all wave patterns regardless of their form or function, but not to the pattern? [closed]

 electronics.stackexchange.com/questions/577307/does-conservation-of-energy-pertain-to-the-electrical-energy-within-all-wave-pat



-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 26 mins ago.

(Private feedback for you)

[Edit question](#)

Does the Conservation of Energy pertain to the electrical energy within all wave patterns (regardless of their form or function), but does not pertain to the wave pattern, itself?

In other words...

Does the Conservation of Energy restrict its domain to electrical wave patterns which merely convert one form of energy into another form of energy, such as: batteries and incandescent light bulbs?

And does the Conservation of Energy not apply to electrical wave patterns, such as: standing electrical waves whose phase of current is inverted relative to their phase of voltage by 180 degrees of separation?

For, I see a distinct pattern emerging in which electronic components, such as: batteries and resistive loads (such as: light bulbs) exhibit wave form patterns which are indicative of the consumption of energy due to the property that their wave forms move. This is indicative of energy moving (which is undergoing conversion) from one domain into another domain. Yet, is this contrary to the behavior of standing wave patterns, whose patterns do not move, despite the energy which is inside of standing wave patterns does allow for the movement of energy inside of their rigid wave pattern?

Hence, light bulbs exhibit their beneficial outcome of making electrical energy useful by converting it into light and radiate this outwardly, or else batteries make the chemical energy stored within themselves useful by converting this energy into electrical energy to power a light bulb. So, it makes sense that this conversion process must conform to a sensibility of conservation since no new energy is being produced.

But, does this explain the behavior of all electrical wave patterns? What about standing waves? Their energy is conserved, but is their wave pattern capable of cloning itself?

And what is the consequence of this ability to clone itself?

Must these wave-types steal energy from their environment in order to fulfill their function of endlessly making carbon copies of their wave forms? Is this what, so-called, "free energy" amounts to...is to find a source of energy exterior to a circuit from which to steal in order to succeed at cloning its standing wave form?

Or, is there another source from which to "steal" so-called "free energy," namely: the future of the energy which resides inside of a standing wave? In other words, is electrical energy capable of reversing its own time-domain whenever this type of standing electrical wave encases electrical energy? And, is "time" a conserved quantity?

This question pertains merely to those types of standing waves which possess a phase separation of one-half cycle of oscillations between the current phase and the voltage phase components of an electrical wave of energy (to distinguish this usage of the term, "standing wave," from other types of standing waves).

Yes, a wave pattern existing as a calculated quantity. That's what I intend to imply. And two different types of waves categorizing (organizing) wave behavior into two broad groups of the consumption and conversion and, thus, the diminishment of their electrically, energetic

waveform (which moves its position in space) versus their amplification of power due to their electrical, standing wave pattern which does not move around in space, yet may be moving around in time resulting in their amplification instead of dissipation? And from where does this extra energy come from: their future position in space (should their two phases of current and voltage be brought back together)?

"Amplification instead of dissipation" reflects the reversal of current as a property which is oriented by pointing itself away from areas of higher voltage and points its orientation towards areas of lower voltage accentuating their voltage differences rather than equalizing them (negentropy).

Please replace all instances of the word, "pseudoscience", with the phrase of "the virtual reality of electronic simulators derived from the Berkeley SPICE model," specifically: Micro-Cap by Spectrum-Soft.

So, I must assume that the use of the term of, "pseudoscience," implies that there is no scientific answer to this question? Okay. I understand and appreciate your comments.

energy-harvesting
edited 3 mins ago

asked 1 hour ago



Chet

133 bronze badges

- 2

Conversation of energy applies to everything in the universe, except when mass is converted to energy (or viceversa) – Voltage Spike ♦ 1 hour ago

- Quite a mess. Standing wave is not a wave, it's a calculated quantity, a pattern that can be calculated for the resulted total field strength as a function of place if the same space contains several electromagnetic waves which have exactly the same frequency but different propagating directions. That's possible in resonators and standing waves are useful visualization aids for students who try to learn what happens in resonators.. The only existing waves are the actual propagating waves where the standing wave pattern is calculated from. – user287001 58 mins ago

- About energy and time: You seem to think energy as existing entity, not as a property of physical processes. Where that idea has come from? And time - Have you possibly a definition for concept "time" written with other concepts, but definitely NOT with common time measurement methods. Every discussion of the properties of time is useless without that definition. A good definition of time would give a possibility to logically derive that such thing as motion has a possibility to exist. – [user287001](#) [28 mins ago](#) ✎
- Chet, this is another post of the class "pseudoscience": Hearing physical concepts, not understanding them, but then guessing together a framework that raises questions that involve nonsense consequences has nothing to do with science or engineering. – [Marcus Müller](#) [15 mins ago](#)

[Add a comment](#)