THE GENERATION OF REACTIVE POWER FROM AN LRC CIRCUIT OF HEIGHTENED IMPEDANCE VIA THE MODIFICATIONS WHICH ARE POSSIBLE WITHIN, AND SURROUNDING, AN ELECTROSTATICALLY ENERGIZED GAP OF AIR OR NOBLE GAS

FIELD OF THE INVENTION

The present invention relates generally to electricity. More specifically, the present invention is an LRC "tank" circuit of heightened impedance made manifest in the form of an electrostatically energized gap of air or noble gas which is internally, or externally, modified to generate reactive power sufficient to power an appliance of large demand, such as: an electric motor within an electric vehicle, exclusively utilizing input derived from the ambient energy of the immediate environment surrounding this invention.

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

The TriMetal Generator of Nikola Tesla[1] is the Solution to the Mystery of the Ammann Brothers' Atmospheric Generator Demonstration of 1921 in Denver, Colorado

The Inherent Overunity of Copper, Aluminum & Iron Orchestrated by the Ionizing Influence of an Air Gap

This refutes Tesla's Electric Car Hoax of 1931 (Wikipedia)[2]

*We take **1)** two electrostatic gaps made of <u>copper</u> or <u>bronze</u> and fill them with air in the shape*

1 Reference to the use of the word "Tesla" within the context of this document refers to the native of modern-day Croatia and an immigrant to the United States, also known as: Nikola Tesla, born: 10 July 1856 and died: 7 January 1943, and is not to be confused with Tesla Motors,™ an American manufacturer of electric motor vehicles.

2 "Nikola Tesla Electric Car Hoax" → https://is.gd/yogofe = https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nikola_Tesla_electric_car_hoax

*of hollow copper spheres, and **2)** loosely fill the interior of each sphere with a dielectric material in the shape of a metallic wool, such as: our modern-day use of tantalum (or the use of aluminum from a bygone era), and **3)** connect both spheres with a bent, and/or crimped, hollow copper tubing, and **4)** pass the tubing through the center of a coil of insulated iron wire and **5)** magnetically couple this coil to an inductive load to electrically isolate this whole arrangement from the load to insure its abundant production of reactive power so that it won't matter whether these electrostatic gaps are ON or OFF by way of arcing into a plasma or merely preparing the potentiality for an arc to form by ionizing its gas. **10**) Instead, **it is best if this electrostatic gap is always OFF to insure a nice, smooth, hyperbolic rate of escalation of its output. If this electrostatic gap were to turn itself ON (by arcing, or firing up, into a plasma), then the overunity benefits of this invention would escalate at a vertical rate of explosive amplification rendering this invention non-manageable.** This is a very important set of conditions to keep in mind when operating this device.*

Verification for the overunity condition of this invention is by way of its segregated analysis.

THIS CONSTITUTES A REPLICATION OF NIKOLA TESLA'S, SOLID-STATE GENERATOR THAT WILL LAST FOR FIVE THOUSAND YEARS, REQUIRE NO MOVING PARTS, AND POSSESS NO PRIME MOVER OTHER THAN THE AMBIENT ENERGY OF ITS IMMEDIATE ENVIRONMENT!

The reason why nobody has ever figured out the equivalent connection between Tesla's TriMetal Generator, and Joseph Newman's device, and the Atmospheric Generator of the Ammann Brothers, is due to their use of air, rather than the use of a noble gas, as their ionizing medium inside of their copper spheres and copper tubing.

It's easy to take an ionized gas for granted (such as air, etc). Stanley Meyer never mentioned how dependent his invention was upon his ionization of air (specifically, the nitrogen inside of air).

And Joseph Newman never mentioned his use of ionized helium despite this is exactly how he built his demonstration models according to the specifications given to him by Bryon Brubaker (an electrical engineer from Wabash, Indiana), and *contrary* to what Newman specified in his book (to use permanent magnets instead of helium canisters wrapped with an open coil). And the Ammann brothers got away with overlooking this salient fact whose lack of disclosure only helps to spread our misunderstanding of Tesla's TriMetal Generator wherein its use of three metallic substances is merely *supportive* of its primary use of the electrostatic ionization of an air gap.

Nikola Tesla called a spark gap a “disruptive discharge.”

A disruption is a random series of events effectively creating change, over time, to what would otherwise be a continuous condition of non-change. To an electrically reactive component, such as: an inductor or a capacitor, this randomization of altering electrically reactive activity is as good as rotating an inductor or turning ON and then turning OFF a capacitant, mechanical switch whose two contacts are changing the distance between each other which effectively changes the threshold at which a spark gap (between these two contacts) will form an arc after preionizing this space between these two contacts.

Since power comes from a prime mover, and a prime mover injects change into an (di-)electric, or a magnetic, field, a spark gap – although seemingly stationary – injects the equivalence of motion, namely: change over time, into a neighboring reactive component (such as: an inductor, or a capacitor) and, thus, solves the riddle of what did Tesla mean when he said that he had invented a “solid-state generator (of no moving parts) which would last for five thousand years and possess no prime mover.”

This is Tesla's TriMetal Generator which the Ammann brothers have managed to replicate.

Cosmologically speaking, if we wanted to find a celestial analog for this invention, then we might draw an analogy as to how our Sun, and other stars, hypothetically operate...

What we see lighting up our sky is *not* the generation of power. The photosphere surrounding our Sun constitutes its load; its impedance; causing a plasma to form around its hollow sphere lighting up our sky and warming our body. At the center of this hollow planet is a "dark star" which is defined as being similar to its photosphere with the difference that this dark star is not a plasma. It is merely an ionic sphere of electrical reactance; a preplasma, or protoplasma, of what it could become if it were to become thoroughly ionized into the state of an arcing plasma similar to a lightning bolt. If this dark star were to become completely ionized into a state of plasma, then the photosphere of our Sun would explosively die! But with a central dark star, this central sphere of protoplasma manages to generate all of the power which our Sun requires to operate the photospheric electrical load at its surface.

This cosmological rendition of my invention is analogous to the Science of Creative Intelligence™,[3] espoused by its author: Maharishi Mahesh Yogi,[4] in as much as the quiet center of our Sun represents Intelligence while the outer photospheric plasma constitutes Energy and the calcium ferrite hollow shell of our Sun held in between the outer lit photosphere and the inner unlit dark star is functionally analogous to the iron winding surrounding the Ammann brothers' invention in that it Creates a conversion of reactive power, emanating from out of the center of our Sun, converted into real power radiating from its electrically loaded photosphere.

We made a mistake over a hundred years ago when we set out to search for an "absolute frame of reference" and then claim that we could not find any. So, hence, we concluded that such a frame of reference does not exist and replaced that concept with the concept of relativity.

We could have found what we were looking for if we had properly understood *what* we were looking for.

So, it's not that we did not find an absolute frame of reference, but that we failed to find our

3 "What is the Science of Creative Intelligence?" – Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, Maharishi International University, posted to YouTube on 13 April 2009 → https://is.gd/zireta = https://youtu.be/TAyZIJl2oSw

4 "What is the connection between the Science of Creative Intelligence and Transcendental Meditation?" – Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, Humboldt, 1972 → https://is.gd/gehafu = https://youtu.be/uRkLI0VX6ko

misunderstanding of an absolute frame of reference. Since misunderstandings don't exist except in our delusions, it makes sense that we never found our delusion to exist within the realm of cosmology.

So...

Let's correctly redefine what we mean by an absolute frame of reference. And then, let's go and locate it and *this time* find it!

But to do that, we must first redefine something else which we have mistakenly deluded ourselves into entertaining incorrect thinking regarding the concept of *inertia*. And ask ourselves the parallel question of, “from where does inertia arise from?”

Inertia is a property of space. It is not a property of matter. But we have to clear up a third misconception in order to see why this is so.

Space is the ultimate, a priori, source for inertia via the impedance which space offers all matter against the movement which matter wants to engage in. Motion is the inherent nature of matter while impedance to movement is the inherent nature of space.

By way of the density of matter, space gives up its impedance to motion by way of displacement based on how much of space is displaced by how dense is the matter attempting to occupy that space.

Space is not simply something to fill with matter as if space were empty. No.

Space is the ultimate frame of reference in as much as space is the ultimate source for impedance to motion among objects of matter.

And space is the ultimate source for matter since matter is derived from space as a variation of spatial properties.

In exchange for matter's occupation of space, space gives up its impedance to motion and imparts this property to matter. The degree to which how much of this impedance is sacrificed by space is determined by the density of matter. The more matter which exists per unit of space, the more dense is that matter which means there will be less space in between the molecules and atoms of that matter

to be empty. Instead, there will be more matter filling that space and less space which is empty if that matter is very dense. Hence, we may also say that all matter is made of space. Matter is not made from, nor made of, anything else other than space. Thus, we mistakenly conclude that it is matter which possesses the property of inertia when in fact it is space which is the ultimate, a priori, absolute, source for (frame of reference for) impedance to motion which we call: inertia.

Thus, it is this impedance to motion which is the absolute frame of reference which we had failed to search for and, thus, did not find. This property of space is the ultimate prime mover.

So, now, we have to redefine what is a prime mover.

A prime mover is ultimately derived from the impedance which space offers to the movement of material objects (which occupy space) and, thus, the ultimate prime mover is scientifically measured and appreciated as inertia.

It is this inertial prime mover which allows for free energy since only when we offer very little voltage to a circuit does this ultimate prime mover demonstrate itself capable of surpassing inertia by feeding off of inertia to accumulate a vast storehouse of voltage buildup resulting from the impedance which is inherent within all free energy circuits which take advantage of the benefit which the impedance to motion (namely, the electrical motion we know of as: current) imparts to these types of circuits.

In other words, unlike conventional circuits which fight inertia by utilizing vast voltages to overcome impedance within a circuit (which will result in the production of some limited quantity of current which reaffirms our belief in thermodynamics as a self-fulfilling belief), a free energy circuit never overwhelms a circuit with excessive voltage so that the reactance of a free energy circuit may foster the accumulation of voltage all on its own derived from the spatial property of inertial impedance.

When this voltage is transferred to a self-shorted coil, current arises within this shorted coil along with the quality of a massive momentum standing behind this current in the form of a massive

quantity of voltage which we have allowed to accumulate arising from our having fostered reactance by not suppressing it with a massive input of voltage.

So, for free energy to flourish, we should never supply a circuit with any noticeable quantity of voltage to speak of. Instead, we should supply a free energy circuit with as little voltage as we can get away with and foster the development of reactance using the techniques of electrical reactance, namely: frequency, phase relation, duration, capacitance and inductance. These five qualities will produce whatever quantity of reactive power which we desire to obtain from the free energy circuit, alone, and not from any exterior source of power. The only efficient use to apply exterior sources of power is to use them to serve as mere stimuli for the escalation of freely available, reactive power and not for their exclusive use – *unless we want to subscribe to our total dependency upon the purchase of power!*

We don't need energy, nor do we need to feed our circuits with energy, in order for our circuits to exhibit energy.

All we have to do is foster our circuits to develop and amass reactance and, then, use this reactance as if it were energy since there's not much difference between the two, anyway!

A counter-wound pair of coils (connected in parallel with each other) comes to mind, right off the top of my head, as an example of how to use reactive power to impart rotation to a motor since the amperage of one winding will be in-phase with the voltage of its complimentary winding, and the amperage of the second winding will be synchronous with the voltage of the first winding. Thus, both windings may be utilizable at full wattage of positive unity power factor.

And a simple resistor gives forth heat when reactive power activates said resistor. This is another way to utilize reactive power at full wattage of positive unity power factor.

And magnetic coupling between two inductors preserves a highly reactive voltage on one side of this magnetic coupling while allowing for the formation of real or reactive current within a self-shorted coil on the other side of this magnetic coupling which will allow for the transfer of a humungous quantity of volts/amperes, or wattage, to back up the power of the self-shorted coil.

See how easy it is to understand free energy?

If we have a proper understanding of inertia, and space, and absolute frames of reference impeding the motion of material objects displacing the inertia of space by way of the density of their matter (and, thus, exchanging {transferring} the inertia of space to matter), then we will have no problem – at all – understanding free energy as an outgrowth of the prime mover of space (which opposes the movement of material objects attempting to move through space).

So, prime movers don't move; they stand still! They are not filled with energy; they're filled with inertia.

And inertia is the ultimate source for free energy to materialize any quantity of energy for free.

The moral of this story is that, if we look in the right place for whatever we are looking for, then we'll find what we are looking for. Otherwise, looking in the wrong place will just waste our time, our patience, our perseverance, and our tolerance for thinking outside of the box (so-to-speak).

We can't afford to look in the wrong place and come up empty-handed. No.

Never again will we make this mistake...

As as aside...

Our Earth was imported from a star located in the Plieades to replace a planet (called: Maldek) which was orbiting between Mars and Jupiter and blew up, thus, depriving our Sun of an adequate electrical load to dissipate its generation of reactive power. For, without an adequate load to encourage dissipation and prevent accumulation of stagnant power, the continuation of the generation of reactive power would have exploded our Sun. Like a balloon which is continually blown up with air, it will eventually blow up, likewise would our Sun have done the same thing had the Earth not been provided to “balance the load” as electrical engineers in charge of managing the power grid like to call it. All of the cetaceans that we know of (dolphins, Orcas – killer whales, sperm whales, porpoises, etc) were on board at the time that this Earth was removed from the Plieades and brought here.

Our Sun was in danger of turning ON its inner neon bulb. Its outer neon bulb was already ON.

That's the photosphere which we see as being lit up in our daytime sky giving us warmth and light. But its inner neon bulb was OFF and remains OFF to prevent an escalation of the accumulation of reactive power which is a vertical slope when graphed against the passage of time. Otherwise, when this inner neon bulb of a star (our Sun) remains OFF, the slope of this escalating curve of accumulating amplitude of reactive power (which is generated by the inner neon bulb of all stars) is a nice, smoothly gradual incline of accumulating reactive power. And if there is an adequate electrical load of planetary masses to dissipate a star's energy, then that star will not turn its inner neon bulb ON, because the energy which that star is constantly creating will dissipate at an adequate rate to prevent its buildup within the interior of that star. Instead, its planetary electrical loads will grow in size and electrical activity instead of their star/s growing and expanding the accumulation of their electrical power. This transference of electrical growth and growth of (gravitational) mass from a star to its surrounding planets maintains stability of the operation of that star and helps to preserve that star's long life. Otherwise, that star would become a nova, or a supernova, and destroy itself.

The inner surface of our Earth has an atmospheric sky. But unlike our outer sky, the inner sky of the Earth is lit up throughout the entire volume of atmospheric material. It is self-luminous. This means that the inner sky is behaving not unlike the outer photosphere of the Sun in that an inner neon bulb (located at the center of our planetary Earth) is OFF and transferring its energy outwardly to become manifest as electrical loads.

I would imagine that some crazy scientist on the planet Maldek got the silly notion in his head, one day long ago, to turn ON the inner neon bulb of his planet as if to suggest that the self-luminous condition of his inner sky was not enough to light up and warm his world on the inner surface of his planet. That's incredibly stupid. Or else their orbital path was too far away from our Sun to get adequate heat and light to warm and light up the outer surface of their planet so he decided to increase the electrical activity of the inner neon bulb ob his planet which led to its explosive escalation resulting in its self-destruction using the same mechanism of excessive accumulation which a star will undergo

under similar conditions of instability brought on by both inner and outer neon bulbs of either a planet or a star being both ON rather than the inner neon bulb always remaining OFF and the outer neon bulb remaining always ON.

The reason why the atmosphere surrounding the outside of our Earth is not always ON (arcing into a state of a plasma) is because it is dissipating its energy out to space. But on the inside, it cannot dissipate any energy since any dissipation coming from one inner side of a planet or star will simply jump to the opposite inner side of that planet or star and never leave the inside of that planet or star. Consequently, the inner sky of a planet is always lit up while the outer is not lit up and must get its energy from elsewhere. In the case of our planet Earth, its outer surface gets its energy from the Sun. But in the case of the outer surface of our Sun, it manages to turn its outer neon bulb ON due to there being not enough planets to act as electrical loads to dissipate the Sun's energy so rapidly as to prevent the Sun's outer neon bulb from turning itself ON through the accumulation of its inadequate dissipation of energy.

This is what I glean from the segregated analysis of a spark gap which has modified per the instructions laid bare in this document.

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

Physics defines current as arising from the negative pole/terminal of a voltage source, such as: a D/C battery. In agreement with this convention of nomenclature, physics also defines current as consisting of negatively charged electrons. And batteries define their voltage in terms of the positive pole/terminal of their device. Thus, do batteries define their generation of current with an inverse polarity relative to their voltage. So, if current is positive, then voltage is negative; or, if current is negative, then voltage is positive. This is the behavioral characteristic of the generation of reactive

power coming from a battery, or a rotary generator, etc. This is not energy in the usual sense since this is not an electrical load where consumption is taking place.

Electrical engineering defines energy as an ideal condition exclusively pertaining to resistors in which the power factor is positive one (unity) indicating no loss of the efficiency of power whenever the phase angle between current and voltage is in mutual alignment with each other and zero degrees of separation is between them. Only under this circumstance does Ohm's Law exclusively apply defined by the mathematical relations of...

$$Current = Voltage \div Resistance \quad \text{AND} \quad Power = Voltage^2 \div Resistance$$

Anything other than watts, namely: other than real power, is purely informational in the form of a measurement of volts versus a measurement of amperes, called volts/amperes (VA), which is not considered to be energy, per se, but is considered to be reactive power: a fragmentation of power into its constituent ingredients.

Thus, what comes out of a battery is not energy since its current is polarized 180° in opposition to the polarity of its voltage. Instead, what comes out of a battery is information in the form of volts/amperes (VA) also known as: reactive power. The chemistry of the battery is reacting to the closure of a switch causing the chemicals inside of a dry-cell battery to interact which they would not have done had the switch of this type of simple circuit (which interconnects the two terminals of a battery) never have been closed.

This chemical reaction is potential power which we measure at the terminals of the battery as being a voltage difference between its two terminals. It becomes reactive power when we connect the two terminals of this battery to a circuit and close a switch to engage the chemicals inside of the battery to react against each other causing current to exit from out of the negative terminal which depletes the voltage difference between its two terminals unless it's a rotary generator in which the generator initiates an increased resistance to whatever is rotating its shaft.

But the orientation of nomenclature remains intact, namely: the negative terminal of a voltage

source is still emitting current of a negative polarity while its positive terminal has a positive polarity of voltage. By definition, this implies reactive power; not watts. This means that energy never exits the battery and energy never enters the circuit (connected) from this battery.

So, we cannot say, in all honesty, that: “ENERGY IN MUST EQUAL ENERGY OUT.” We must alter this misrepresentation of the reality of the situation to say, instead, that: “REACTIVE POWER (WHICH TRAVELS INTO A CIRCUIT) SHOULD EQUAL THE ENERGY (REAL POWER) WHICH COMES OUT OF A CIRCUIT UNDER IDEAL CONDITIONS.”

We will know this RULE OF THUMB is satisfied whenever an electrical load has its orientation of current versus its voltage in alignment with itself, namely: its voltage will be positive and its current will also be positive, or else its current will be negative and its voltage will also be negative.

But they cannot be opposed in polarity and still be considered to be real power (measured in watts).

“ENERGY IN MUST EQUAL ENERGY OUT” describes an electrical load. It does not describe a generator of reactive power, nor does it describe the entire situation which is a combination of reactive generation minus the consumption of real power.

The volts and amperes of every component within a circuit, and the polarity of their sign values, must be accounted for to satisfy a *segregated analysis* of a circuit's activity yielding volts/amperes (VA) or watts indicating the generation of reactive power or the consumption of real power at an electrical load.[5]

But a modified spark gap, such as this invention, does not need to have its energy inputs and outputs strictly accounted for, and cannot do so, since reactive power generation does not interact with the consumption of real power according to the strict accountability of thermodynamics. Instead, it is a loose association between reactive power generation and real power consumption engaging the

5 “The Meaning of Unity in Energy Conversion Systems,” by James F. Murray, III and Aaron Murakami → https://is.gd/zujaqu = https://www.amazon.com/dp/1650183658/

modified spark gap as the consumer of real power to motivate its reactive power generation located at the electrical load within a "free energy" circuit.

Thus, not only is there a mere loose association between cause (generation) and effect (consumption) in which consumption will surpass generation by a remarkable degree, but these roles become inverted in their location: the electrical load becomes the generator of reactive power and the modified spark gap (per the instructions for its modification contained herein) becomes the consumer of real power. And the ambient energy of the environment becomes the prime mover (scant as it is: less than one microvolt).

These modifications for a spark gap gets away with this type of loose accountability since voltage can be cloned (borrowed) without the imposition of a consequential drain of current if this variety of voltage can be completely separated (disassembled) from current. This is the case with a simple battery. Any amount of total current may arise from these multiple sources of cloned voltages without any cost imposed upon this process of borrowing a voltage source by cloning it. But, although batteries are potentially capable of serving as a lender of voltage, without this loan becoming an expense by way of current drain (via its blockage with a capacitor surrounding both terminals of a battery), yet batteries are not capable of accentuating their power level. But, spark gaps can do this when properly modified by the guidance of this invention.

Even a gyroscope must lose weight whenever it spins[6] [7] which implies that its gravitational constant must have become altered since we know its mass has not altered, nor has the mass of the Earth become altered. The fact that we can alter the gravitational constant of a mass by rotating it implies a parallelism with capacitive reactance.

Current, which begins its helical journey by traveling through a coiled mass of wire, is blocked

6 "Gyroscopic Precession" Veritasium → https://is.gd/upexoq = https://youtu.be/ty9QSiVC2g0

7 "8.01x – Lect 24 – Rolling Motion, Gyroscopes, VERY NON-INTUITIVE" lectures by Walter Lewin → https://is.gd/veluba = https://youtu.be/XPUuF_dECVI

by a dielectric wall sandwiched in the middle of two plates of a capacitor resulting in an equivalency to the gyration of a spinning mass by producing a torque at right angles to the gyration – and following the same right-hand rule utilized by magnetism following current, because current must translate its helical motion into rotary motion within each plate of a capacitor. This blockage of current by a dielectric barrier produces a torque-force analogous, and equivalent, to the capacitance of a dielectric medium. Likewise is the angular momentum of current formed by its passage through a coil of wire engaging inductive reactance. In both instances of a capacitor and a gyroscope, capacitive reactance of a rotating body is responsible for altering the presumed constancy of gravity (for all intents and purposes) given the exact mathematical equivalency of both examples. In both instances, the electrical dynamics of gravity is alterable by manmade artifice.

In other words, the so-called constancy of gravity is not always constant unless there is a constancy of geometrical forces of such long-standing duration that we take this presumed constancy of gravity for granted throughout all of our years of existing upon this planet Earth.

Reactive power changes all of this into a variable odyssey of manipulable factors.

We know that we can get energy out of falling water at a hydroelectric power plant. But if we can manipulate the constancy of gravity, then we can just as readily manipulate the potential energy of gravity and, hence, manipulate the actuality of energy in a circuit to the same degree of variation.

This is the power of leverage in which a small change, whenever properly situated, can produce a gigantic conclusion.

Electrical reactance gives us this leverage since electrical reactance is merely potential energy. It is not kinetic energy. That's why we do not measure opposing polarities of current and voltage in watts, but we measure them in terms of volts/amperes, because volts/amperes is not energy. Volts/amperes is merely a loose association of potential energies: the potential energy of volts and the potential energy of amperes lying outside of the domain of Ohm's Law. *{It's like two people in a room and they don't look at each other, nor acknowledge one another, much less talk to each other. Yet, we*

still have these two people occupying a room.} This potential form of energy will become actual energy should the orientation of its polarization become self-aligned in which its current and its voltage are either both positively oriented or else both of them are negatively oriented. Then, and only then, will we have true power, aka. energy. *{And the two people in our fictional room will stop ignoring each other!}*

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

The accompanying drawings, which are incorporated in and constitute a part of this disclosure, illustrate various embodiments of the present disclosure. The drawings contain representations of various trademarks and copyrights owned by the Applicants. In addition, the drawings may contain other marks owned by third parties and are being used for illustrative purposes only. All rights to various trademarks and copyrights represented herein, except those belonging to their respective owners, are vested in and the property of the applicants. The applicants retain and reserve all rights in their trademarks and copyrights included herein, and grant permission to reproduce the material only in connection with reproduction of the granted patent and for no other purpose.

Furthermore, the drawings may contain text or captions that may explain certain embodiments of the present disclosure. This text is included for illustrative, non-limiting, explanatory purposes of certain embodiments detailed in the present disclosure.

FIG. **1** is a schematic of a battery and a ten Ohm resistor in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **2** is a graphical and numeric tabulation of total reactive and real throughput of a battery and a ten Ohm resistor in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **3** is a graphical mapping and a numeric tabulation of a segregated analysis of a battery and a ten Ohm resistor in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **4** is a schematic of a battery and a one hundred milli Ohm resistor in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **5** is a graphical and numeric tabulation of total reactive and real throughput of a battery and a one hundred milli Ohm resistor in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **6** is a graphical mapping and a numeric tabulation of a segregated analysis of a battery and a one hundred milli Ohm resistor in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **7** is a schematic of a one micro Farad capacitor, precharged with one micro volt, and a resistor of ten Ohms, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **8** is a graphical and numeric tabulation of total reactive and real throughput of a one micro Farad capacitor, precharged with one micro volt, and a resistor of ten Ohms, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **9** is a graphical mapping and a numeric tabulation of a segregated analysis of a one micro Farad capacitor, precharged with one micro volt, and a resistor of ten Ohms, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **10** is a schematic of a one micro Farad capacitor, precharged with one micro volt, and a resistor of one hundred milli Ohms, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **11** is a graphical and numeric tabulation of total reactive and real throughput of a one micro Farad capacitor, precharged with one micro volt, and a resistor of one hundred milli Ohms, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **12** is a graphical mapping and a numeric tabulation of a segregated analysis of a one micro Farad capacitor, precharged with one micro volt, and a resistor of hundred milli Ohms, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **13** is a schematic of a software macro, from the Micro-Cap[8] electronic simulator, of one of several possible embodiments which is functionally equivalent to the observed behavior of a neon bulb,

8 Spectrum Software™ → http://www.spectrum-soft.com/

spark gap.

FIG. **14** is a schematic of an idealistic embodiment of a negative resistor and a capacitor with a battery intended to illustrate a runaway condition of the unlimited generation of reactive power which, although not-realistic, is nonetheless the fundamental property of a spark gap and, thus, a perfect example of "free energy" for its lack of complexity.

FIG. **15** are the nodal numbers for the schematic in FIG. **13**. according to the convention of electrical engineering for some embodiments.

FIG. **16** is a segregation of only those sections of the circuit in FIG. **13** and FIG. **15** which are pertinent to the performance of a segregated analysis made upon this macro for a spark gap in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. 17 assigns polarity labels to the terminals of each component within the circuit of FIG. **13** and FIG. **15** and FIG. **16** wherein it is vital to identify, and segregate, for the purpose of making a discrete analysis upon this circuit to thoroughly assess its dynamics in order to conclusively determine from where is its energy coming from and towards where is this energy going and assessing what is the nature of each path of energy traversing through each component of electronics asking this question: is this pathway reactive power, or is this pathway real power, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **18** is a simple circuit of nothing other than a single neon bulb, flanked by two resistors on either side, whose individual resistances are one milli Ohm, each, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **19** is a graphical and numeric tabulation of total reactive and real throughput of a neon bulb, flanked by a one milli Ohm resistor on either side, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **20** are the nodal voltages for the neon bulb, electronic macro used within the circuit for FIG. **18**, demonstrating an OFF condition (non-arcing; humming with minimalist, ionic activity) for the neon bulb in FIG. **18**, by virtue of node **#10** (labeled: **Switchchk**) is exactly 10 nano volts, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **21** is a segregated analysis of the circuit in FIG. **18**, in accordance with some embodiments.

Like FIG. **18**, FIG. **22** is a simple circuit of nothing other than a single neon bulb, flanked by two resistors on either side, whose individual resistances are one kilo Ohm, each, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **23** is a graphical and numeric tabulation of total reactive and real throughput of a neon bulb, flanked by a one kilo Ohm resistor on either side, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **24** are the nodal voltages for the neon bulb, electronic macro used within the circuit for FIG. **22**, demonstrating an OFF condition (non-arcing; humming with minimalist, ionic activity) for the neon bulb in FIG. **22**, by virtue of node **#10** (labeled: **Switchchk**) is exactly 10 nano volts, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **25** is a segregated analysis of the circuit in FIG. **22**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **26** is a simple circuit of a neon bulb and a 100 volt battery, terminated on either end by a grounded node, and separated by three resistors of one kilo Ohm, each, which is the first instance for which a segregated analysis will be conducted – over the course of the following five figures, that seeks to demonstrate – once and for all – the futility of pursuing any segregated analysis due to the intrinsic nature of "free" energy transcends accountability.

FIG. **27** are a few throughputs of the circuit in FIG. **26** illustrating how a neon bulb, spark gap may, under certain conditions, commandeer its associated electronic components into becoming an oscillator and generator of reactive power despite a substantial throughput from a D/C voltage source of 100 volts. Located at the 4th row from the top, a pair of waves (the top wave is of current and the bottom wave is of voltage) of inverse phase relation (half an alternating cycle apart from each other – shifted in time) indicates a negative unity power factor which is the inherent definition of a generator of reactive power, and is in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **28** is a graphical and numeric tabulation of total reactive and real throughput of the circuit in FIG. **26**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **29** are the nodal voltages for the neon bulb, electronic macro used within the circuit for FIG. **26**, demonstrating an OFF condition (non-arcing; humming with minimalist, ionic activity) for the neon bulb in FIG. **22**, by virtue of node **#10** (labeled: **Switchchk**) is exactly 10 nano volts, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **30** is a partial segregated analysis of the circuit in FIG. **26**, minus its neon bulb (for brevity), in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **31** is a complete segregated analysis of the circuit in FIG. **26**, plus the segregated analysis of its neon bulb carried over from FIG. **30**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **32** is the same as FIG. **26** except the 100V battery has been replaced with a one Farad capacitor, precharged with 100 volts, and all three resistors have been reduced from one kilo Ohm to one milli Ohm, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **33** are a few throughputs of the circuit in FIG. **32** illustrating how a neon bulb, spark gap may, under certain conditions, commandeer its associated electronic components into becoming an escalating generator of reactive power despite the limited charge of 100 volts stored, nearby, within the one Farad capacitor, **C1**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **34** is a graphical and numeric tabulation of the reactive and real throughputs of almost all of the components within Micro-Cap's macro for a neon bulb, included within the circuit in FIG. **32**, except for the throughput of the resistor, **R4**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **35** is a graphical and numeric tabulation of the reactive and real throughput for the resistor, **R4**, within Micro-Cap's macro for a neon bulb, included within the circuit of FIG. **32**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **36** is a graphical and numeric tabulation of the reactive and real throughput for all of the remaining components of the circuit within FIG. **32**, apart from the neon bulb, in accordance with some

embodiments.

FIG. **37** are the nodal voltages for the neon bulb, electronic macro used within the circuit of FIG. **32**, demonstrating an ON condition (arcing) for the neon bulb in FIG. **32**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **38** is a partial segregated analysis of the circuit in FIG. **32**, minus its neon bulb (for brevity), in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **39** is a complete segregated analysis of the circuit in FIG. **32**, plus the segregated analysis of its neon bulb carried over from FIG. **38**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **40** is the same as FIG. **32** except that all three resistors have been increased from one milli Ohm to ten milli Ohms, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **41** are a few throughputs of the circuit in FIG. **40** illustrating how a neon bulb, spark gap may, under certain conditions, commandeer its associated electronic components into becoming an escalating generator of reactive power despite the limited charge of 100 volts stored, nearby, within the one Farad capacitor, **C1**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **42** are the nodal voltages of the circuit in FIG. **40**, minus the nodal voltages for its neon bulb, and minus any segregated analysis (for brevity), in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **43** is the same as FIG. **32** and FIG. **40** except that all three resistors have been increased from ten milli Ohms to 100 milli Ohms, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **44** are a few throughputs of the circuit in FIG. **43** illustrating how a neon bulb, spark gap may, under certain conditions, commandeer its associated electronic components into becoming an escalating generator of reactive power despite the limited charge of 100 volts stored, nearby, within the one Farad capacitor, **C1**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **45** are the nodal voltages of the circuit in FIG. **43**, minus the nodal voltages for its neon bulb, and minus any segregated analysis (for brevity), in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **46** is the same as FIG. **32**, FIG. **40** and FIG. **43** except that all three resistors have been

increased from 100 milli Ohms to one Ohm, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **47** are a few throughputs of the circuit in FIG. **46** illustrating how a neon bulb, spark gap may, under certain conditions, *fail to commandeer* its associated electronic components into becoming an escalating generator of reactive power due to the increased resistances having exceeded an amount of resistance which is slightly less than one Ohm, and due to the limited storage of voltage charged within the one Farad capacitor, **C1**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **48** are the nodal voltages of the circuit in FIG. **46**, minus the nodal voltages for its neon bulb, and minus any segregated analysis (for brevity), in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **49** is a schematic of an hypothetical, electronic analog of the Ammann brothers' Atmospheric Generator, and of Nikola Tesla's TriMetal Generator, and the focus of this invention, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **50** is a graphical and numeric tabulation of the reactive and real throughput for all of the remaining components of the circuit within FIG. **49**, apart from most of the components of Micro-Cap's macro for a neon bulb, except for node **#10** for each of the four neon bulbs used in the circuit of FIG. **49**, which indicates that one of these four neon bulbs is ON and three neon bulbs are OFF (humming with minimalist, ionic activity), in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **51** is a graphical and numeric tabulation of the reactive and real throughput for all of the components of Micro-Cap's macro for a neon bulb, plus node **#10**, for one of the four neon bulbs used in the circuit of FIG. **49**. This neon bulb is labeled **X1**, within the schematic for the circuit in FIG. **49**, and its throughput, in column **#2** and **#3**, of 10 nano volts for its node **#10**, labeled: **V(X1.10) (V)** on line **#12** in column **#1**, indicates that this neon bulb is OFF (not arcing, yet humming with a minimum of ionic activity), in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **52** is a graphical and numeric tabulation of the reactive and real throughput for all of the components of Micro-Cap's macro for a neon bulb, plus node **#10**, for one of the four neon bulbs used in the circuit of FIG. **49**. This neon bulb is labeled **X2**, within the schematic for the circuit in FIG. **49**,

and its throughput, in column **#2** and **#3**, of 10 nano volts for its node **#10**, labeled: **V(X2.10) (V)** on line **#12** in column **#1**, indicates that this neon bulb is OFF (not arcing, yet humming with a minimum of ionic activity), in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **53** is a graphical and numeric tabulation of the reactive and real throughput for all of the components of Micro-Cap's macro for a neon bulb, plus node **#10**, for one of the four neon bulbs used in the circuit of FIG. **49**. This neon bulb is labeled **X3**, within the schematic for the circuit in FIG. **49**, and its throughput, in column **#2** and **#3**, of 10 nano volts for its node **#10**, labeled: **V(X3.10) (V)** on line **#12** in column **#1**, indicates that this neon bulb is OFF (not arcing, yet humming with a minimum of ionic activity), in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **54** is a graphical and numeric tabulation of the reactive and real throughput for all of the components of Micro-Cap's macro for a neon bulb, plus node **#10**, for one of the four neon bulbs used in the circuit of FIG. **49**. This neon bulb is labeled **X4**, within the schematic for the circuit in FIG. **49**, and its throughput, in column **#2** and **#3**, of 10 nano volts for its node **#10**, labeled: **V(X4.10) (V)** on line **#12** in column **#1**, indicates that this neon bulb is OFF (not arcing, yet humming with a minimum of ionic activity), in accordance with some embodiments.

In FIG. **55**, I asked the software to calculate a segregated analysis for all of the electronic components minus the four neon bulbs, rather than doing this by hand, plus display the raw data for node **#10**, for all four neon bulbs used within the circuit for FIG. **49**, to indicate whether or not any single neon bulb is ON or OFF. Taking this approach altered the outcome by turning ON one of the four neon bulbs, **X3**, which is associated with (and connected in parallel to) the two inductors, **L1** and **L2**, of the circuit in FIG. **49**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **56**, is a segregated analysis for one of the four neon bulbs, labeled: **X1** within FIG. **49** and calculated by the Micro-Cap software. Also displayed is the raw data for node **#10**, for all four neon bulbs used within the circuit for FIG. **49**, to indicate whether or not any single neon bulb is ON or OFF. Taking this approach turned OFF all four neon bulbs in FIG. **49**, in accordance with some

embodiments.

FIG. **57**, is a segregated analysis for one of the four neon bulbs, labeled: **X2** within FIG. **49** and calculated by the Micro-Cap software. Also displayed is the raw data for node **#10**, for all four neon bulbs used within the circuit for FIG. **49**, to indicate whether or not any single neon bulb is ON or OFF. Taking this approach turned OFF all four neon bulbs in FIG. **49**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **58**, is a segregated analysis for one of the four neon bulbs, labeled: **X3** within FIG. **49** and calculated by the Micro-Cap software. Also displayed is the raw data for node **#10**, for all four neon bulbs used within the circuit for FIG. **49**, to indicate whether or not any single neon bulb is ON or OFF. Taking this approach turned OFF all four neon bulbs in FIG. **49**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **59**, is a segregated analysis for one of the four neon bulbs, labeled: **X4** within FIG. **49** and calculated by the Micro-Cap software. Also displayed is the raw data for node **#10**, for all four neon bulbs used within the circuit for FIG. **49**, to indicate whether or not any single neon bulb is ON or OFF. Taking this approach turned OFF all four neon bulbs in FIG. **49**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **60** is the grand total of the segregated analysis for the entire circuit in FIG. **49** indicating a slight excess of the reactive generation of power in the amount of approximately one-third of a volt/ampere, in accordance with some embodiments, which is probably the source for the amplification of total power for the circuit in FIG. **49**, but does not explain from where does this extra power come? *{In other words, I'm more interested in raising questions than in providing their answers and in documenting and verifying the authenticity of these questions lest anyone care to blatantly disregard these questions of conventional wisdom.}*

FIG. **61** is an improved version of FIG. **49** (of an hypothetical, electronic analog of the Ammann brothers' Atmospheric Generator, and of Nikola Tesla's TriMetal Generator, and the focus of

this invention), in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **62** is a graphical display of the throughput for some of the components of the circuit within FIG. **61**, apart from the throughputs for the four neon bulbs, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **63** is a numeric tabulation and a graphical display of the throughput for some of the components of the circuit within FIG. **61**, apart from the throughputs for the four neon bulbs, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **64** are the nodal voltages of the circuit in FIG. **61**, minus the nodal voltages for its four neon bulbs, and minus any segregated analysis (for brevity), in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **65** is a schematic for a contrived fantasy of a non-realistic, non-buildable circuit intended to illustrate the most advantageous position from which to ground a neon bulb is located at node **#5** in FIG. **15** and FIG. **69** so long as resistance is added to this grounded branch of Micro-Cap's macro, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **66** are a few of the throughputs of FIG. **65** indicating a gradual escalating tendency of increased amplitude to its oscillations, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **67** are the nodal voltages of the circuit in FIG. **65**, minus the nodal voltages for its neon bulb, and minus any segregated analysis (for brevity), in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **68** is a modification of Micro-Cap's macro for a neon bulb with the addition of a grounded node at position **#5** to take advantage of the buildup of voltage at this location by encouraging the drainage of current to ground, in accordance with some embodiments. Sometimes, it is advantageous to encourage the drainage of current (to ground) to make room for more buildup of voltage. Congestion of voltage buildup can sometimes inhibit the buildup of more voltage. So, current drainage is *sometimes* a solution. As it turns out, any resistance placed upon *this* branch, especially of higher resistance than a mere singular Ohm, actually *increases* the rate of voltage buildup at node **#5**. Voila!

FIG. **69** are the nodal numbers for FIG. **68**, in accordance with some embodiments.

Another node to encourage the buildup of voltage is at node **#6** of FIG. **69**, in accordance with some embodiments. So...

FIG. **70** provides for the buildup of voltage by two routes: capacitive and inductive, and also provide for a location for magnetically coupling another coil outside of this macro to a hot spot of voltage buildup more advantageous than is the electrodes of this macro represented by its singularly, simulated inductor at **L1**, in accordance with some embodiments. This is the most compact, theoretical, fantasy macro for a neon bulb making it a stand-alone power supply all unto itself – if someone (more knowledgeable than myself) could figure out a way to build it!

FIG. **71** are the nodal numbers for FIG. **70**, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **72** is an assortment of various symbols used to represent spark gaps, in accordance with some embodiments.

FIG. **73** is a spark gap acting as a power supply for a single-phase induction motor suitably powerful enough for use in a conventional automobile dependent upon the use of the modified spark gap in FIG. **70** which is purely fictional, yet very illustrative of how spark gaps could be enhanced, in accordance with some embodiments.

##########

DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS OF THE INVENTION

As a preliminary matter, it will readily be understood by one having ordinary skill in the relevant art that the present disclosure has broad utility and application. As should be understood, any embodiment may incorporate only one or a plurality of the above-disclosed aspects of the disclosure and may further incorporate only one or a plurality of the above-disclosed features. Furthermore, any embodiment discussed and identified as being “preferred” is considered to be part of a best mode contemplated for carrying out the embodiments of the present disclosure. Other embodiments also may

be discussed for additional illustrative purposes in providing a full and enabling disclosure. Moreover, many embodiments, such as adaptations, variations, modifications, and equivalent arrangements, will be implicitly disclosed by the embodiments described herein and fall within the scope of the present disclosure.

Accordingly, while embodiments are described herein in detail in relation to one or more embodiments, it is to be understood that this disclosure is illustrative and exemplary of the present disclosure, and are made merely for the purposes of providing a full and enabling disclosure. The detailed disclosure herein of one or more embodiments is not intended, nor is to be construed, to limit the scope of patent protection afforded in any claim of a patent issuing here from, which scope is to be defined by the claims and the equivalents thereof. It is not intended that the scope of patent protection be defined by reading into any claim a limitation found herein that does not explicitly appear in the claim itself.

Thus, for example, any sequence(s) and/or temporal order of steps of various processes or methods that are described herein are illustrative and not restrictive. Accordingly, it should be understood that, although steps of various processes or methods may be shown and described as being in a sequence or temporal order, the steps of any such processes or methods are not limited to being carried out in any particular sequence or order, absent an indication otherwise. Indeed, the steps in such processes or methods generally may be carried out in various different sequences and orders while still falling within the scope of the present invention. Accordingly, it is intended that the scope of patent protection is to be defined by the issued claim(s) rather than the description set forth herein.

Additionally, it is important to note that each term used herein refers to that which an ordinary artisan would understand such term to mean based on the contextual use of such term herein. To the extent that the meaning of a term used herein—as understood by the ordinary artisan based on the contextual use of such term—differs in any way from any particular dictionary definition of such term, it is intended that the meaning of the term as understood by the ordinary artisan should prevail.

Furthermore, it is important to note that, as used herein, “a” and “an” each generally denotes “at least one,” but does not exclude a plurality unless the contextual use dictates otherwise. When used herein to join a list of items, “or” denotes “at least one of the items,” but does not exclude a plurality of items of the list. Finally, when used herein to join a list of items, “and” denotes “all of the items of the list.”

The following detailed description refers to the accompanying drawings. Wherever possible, the same reference numbers are used in the drawings and the following description to refer to the same or similar elements. While many embodiments of the disclosure may be described, modifications, adaptations, and other implementations are possible. For example, substitutions, additions, or modifications may be made to the elements illustrated in the drawings, and the methods described herein may be modified by substituting, reordering, or adding stages to the disclosed methods. Accordingly, the following detailed description does not limit the disclosure. Instead, the proper scope of the disclosure is defined by the appended claims. The present disclosure contains headers. It should be understood that these headers are used as references and are not to be construed as limiting upon the subjected matter disclosed under the header.

The present disclosure includes many aspects and features. Moreover, while many aspects and features relate to, and are described in the context of the arrangement of electrical components surrounding, or immediately adjacent to, a spark gap, or to the restructuring of the internals of spark gaps, embodiments of the present disclosure are not limited to use only in this context.

Overview:

FIG. **1** is a schematic for reviewing the dynamics of a simple D/C battery, voltage source in which the resistance flanking the right side of the battery is *greater than* 1Ω. This distinction, between greater than or less than a significant turning point of resistance (slightly less than 1Ω for this figure), will become more obvious when a spark gap is added in subsequent figures.

FIG. 2 is the output of the dielectric potential, current and power of FIG. **1**. All of its output data

conforms to a steady-state.

FIG. **3** is the nodal voltage of FIG. **1**. The voltage of the grounded node is not displayed since it is assumed that anyone skilled in this art will recognize its value is always zero by convention. Also included is the status of the D/C battery, voltage source, and the status of its right-flanking resistor using the data from FIG. **2** with regards to whether or not each is a "generator of reactance" or else is an "electrical load" based on the polarization of sign values of the current and voltage of each component. This is in keeping with the polarity of sign convention of Berkeley SPICE electronic simulators, and the conventional nomenclature of polarity of sign for electrons versus the polarity of sign for the dielectric potential from the perspective of physics, and constitutes a segregated analysis for the purposes of reviewing the total power of each component, in combination with its status as a generator of reactance or its status as an electrical load, to perform an exhaustive survey of the sources of power versus the locations of the consumption of power and map these locations throughout the circuit for the purpose of summarizing the net (total) volts/amperes, or the total wattage, of the circuit – whichever the case may be. In this case, the total gain or loss of power is zero as indicated within this figure. In other words, there is no overunity of coefficience of performance. Instead, its coefficience of performance is 0%.

FIG. **3** also lays the foundation for our blind acceptance of causality, and its analog of thermodynamics, in which the current of a reactive voltage source, ie. a battery, is flowing *away* from a greater voltage (located at the positive terminal of the battery since this terminal is greater in voltage than its negative terminal), while (in contrast) the current of a resistor is flowing *towards* its terminal of greater voltage indicating that this flow of current is consequential to the flow of current at the battery. So, the voltage difference of the resistor initially increases until it reaches a steady-state while the voltage difference of the battery initially decreases until its steady-state of zero difference of voltage between its two terminals is achieved.

Thus, thermodynamics always assumes a depletion of voltage at the source over time which

further implies a non-“a priori” causality for all voltage sources. In other words, voltage sources are like bucket brigades in which nobody is the ultimate source for voltage. Yet, differences of voltage keep getting transferred from one “source” to the next in an endless chain of transference (the sun transfers moisture from the oceans to the mountains where it keeps flowing towards the sea, and the power grid recharges batteries using that hydroelectric power, and the consumer discharges batteries).

But as we will see further along in this discussion, spark gaps change all of this by confusingly redefining electrical loads as generators of reactive power and spark gaps become sinkholes of energy greater than the reactive power produced at the load.

FIG. **4** is another schematic for reviewing the dynamics of a simple D/C battery, voltage source in which the resistance flanking the right side of its battery is significantly *less than* 1Ω.

FIG. **5** is the output of the dielectric potential, current and power of FIG. **4**. All of its output data conforms to a steady-state defined by Ohm's Law.

FIG. **6** is the nodal voltage and segregated analysis of FIG. **4** using the data from FIG. **5**. Its coefficience of performance is 0% as indicated within this figure.

FIG. **7** has the same resistance as with FIG. **1** (namely, greater than 1Ω), but the battery is replaced by a capacitor of 1μF and 3Ω of equivalent series resistance to simulate a dielectric medium of tantalum or aluminum for usage in high voltage conditions (which I expect my invention will be subjected to). This capacitor is also precharged with a voltage of 1μV.

It will become more obvious, further along in this presentation, why it is advantageous to replace a constant source of voltage (such as a battery) with a source of voltage in which its amp-hours are extremely limited (such as a precharged capacitor, or a gas discharge tube not powered from any manmade source of voltage, such as: a battery) if we refrain from suppressing its tendency to surge (with a transient spike) by not supplying it with a constant source of voltage rated at the full volts needed to power our load.

The clue resides within the inherent nature of a voltage *source* in which its equivalent function

is as a *regulator* of voltage.

A precharged capacitor is used as an example of an electronic component which cannot regulate voltage (similar to spark gaps). Quite the contrary, being that capacitors are (by their very nature) reactive, regulation is the last thing they can accomplish and, thus, overunity is the last thing they might suppress if their precharged voltage is small enough to not get in the way of the initial onset of meager reactivity which must be fostered (ie. protected) against competitive sources of voltage which might prohibit reactivity.

FIG. **8** is the output of the dielectric potential, current and power of FIG. **7**. All of its output data conforms to the losses inherent within thermodynamics. This is not steady-state, because its parameters of power drop off at a hyperbolic rate using zero as its asymptotic limit.

FIG. **9** is the nodal voltage and segregated analysis of FIG. **7** using the data from FIG. **8**. Its coefficience of performance is 0% as indicated within this figure.

FIG. **10** has the same resistance as FIG. **4** possesses (less than 1Ω), but the battery is replaced by a capacitor of 1μF, with 3Ω of equivalent series resistance, and it is precharged with a voltage of 1μV to conform with the schematic of FIG. **7**.

FIG. **11** is the output data of FIG. **10**. Like FIG. **8**, all of its output data conforms to the losses inherent within thermodynamics. This is not steady-state, because its parameters of power drop off at a hyperbolic rate using zero as its asymptotic limit.

FIG. **12** is the nodal voltage and segregated analysis of FIG. **10** using the data from FIG. **11**. Its coefficience of performance is 0% as indicated within this figure.

Berkeley SPICE is an electronic simulator considered to be the standard of the engineering industry and a progenitor of a few examples of its commercial products, known as: LTSPICE and Micro-Cap (to name a few).

These electronic simulators define a “generator of reactance” as having an inverse polarity of sign ascribed to its current as compared to its voltage and, thus, agrees with the view of physics cited at

the beginning of this presentation.

Likewise, an “electrical load” is defined (by these simulators) as having a similar polarity of sign ascribed to both current and voltage arising from out of, or passing through, whichever electronic component possesses this characteristic.

Thus, a voltage source – such as a D/C battery possessing a substantial difference of voltage between its two terminals – will have a positive voltage measured by an electronic simulator's virtual oscilloscope, and will also have a negative sign associated with its current to conform to an inverse polarization of sign value with respect to voltage versus current.

A non-reactive load, such as a resistor, will have both a positive current as well as a positive voltage, or else it will have a negative current and a negative voltage. But a reactive load, such as: a coil of wire, or a capacitor, or the capacitance between two coils which are magnetically coupled (as lumped inductors), are all three subject to electrical reactance which alters the character of this type of load to become a generator of entropy or a generator of negentropy. This latter condition of negentropy possesses a negative unity, power factor defined by its inversion of the polarity of signs associated with its current versus its voltage along with a separation of phase between current and voltage by one-half cycle of alternating polarity.

Such is the case with Micro-Cap's macro for a spark gap in FIG. **13**. It contains a negative resistor of one Ohm of negative resistance at **R3**. This makes a spark gap a generator of reactance analogous to conventional generators, such as: rotary inductive generators at hydroelectric power plants, and solar panels on the rooftops above our homes, since a spark gap may generate reactive power when its resistance is overcome by an elevated voltage above its threshold.

Negative resistance will generate reactance under ideal conditions if: A) it is located alongside a reactive component, such as: an ideal capacitor[9] in FIG. **14,** or B) it is located alongside an ideal inductor (replacing the ideal capacitor in FIG. **14**). No generation of reactance will result if a negative

9 Negative Resistance → http://is.gd/negres

resistor is placed alongside another resistive load, such as: a resistance of positive value (replacing the capacitor in FIG. **14** with a positively signed resistor). *{FIG. **14** uses Paul Falstad's idealistic simulator[10] and is merely intended for the purpose of illustrating this hypothetical discussion of negative resistance in general. I prefer to craft my overunity circuits using a more realistic simulator, such as: Micro-Cap, since it is more challenging and more practical. But, sometimes, an idealistic simulator is more suitable to illustrate a generalization of theory.}*

Micro-Cap's macro for a neon bulb, spark gap satisfies this criteria since it contains an inductor, **L1**, and two capacitors, **C1** and **C2**, alongside negative resistor, **R3**, in FIG. **13**.

By the way, Ohm's Law also applies to reactance as well as to non-reactive power in as much as electrical reactance is not immune to Ohm's Law. Notice how the absolute value of whatever amplitude of voltage has amassed at the 10μF capacitor (52.02kV in FIG. **14**) divided by the absolute value of the negative resistor (of 4Ω positioned alongside this capacitor) will equal the absolute value of the current of this capacitor (approximately 13.01kV at this point {in time} of its escalating energy).

All generators of electrical reactance carry a cost to the production of their reactive power. Reactive components are no exception to this rule of thumb born of years of experience garnered among technicians skilled in this art.

The cost for activating a spark gap to generate reactive power is the voltage difference applied against its two terminals. This cost is reduced upon reaching its breakdown of resistance. Among neon bulbs, this breakdown occurs at between 60 volts to 90 volts.

But these distinctions are irrelevant when a spark gap is modified per the instructions of this invention. For, these modifications to a spark gap will not derive any beneficial rise of output dependent upon the formation of an arc. Instead, this modified spark gap will orchestrate a restructuring of the causal relationship we have grown accustomed to regarding generators and consumers regardless of arc formation.

10 Electronic Simulator → http://falstad.com/circuit/

This is why I electrically isolate the spark gap from the inductive load – to which its power will be magnetically transferred – so as to insure its success of achieving the goal of overunity of the coefficience of performance as stated at the opening of this discussion. *{But I'm getting ahead of myself since this is not depicted in any of these figures, yet.}*

Power is not a *required* cost for sustaining the overunity of this modified spark gap since merely a minimum *voltage difference* will sustain it. The concurrence of current arising from out of a voltage source intended to power a spark gap is merely intended to support Ohm's Law and has nothing to do with sustaining the benefits of a modified spark gap.

In other words, why waste any more current (and its consequential expenditure of power) than is needed to benefit from this invention if all that is *really* needed are the modifications to a spark gap delineated, herein?

Hence, it is possible to do away with a voltage source, such as: a battery, and use the ambient energy of the environment immediately surrounding a spark gap. This is what my invention will demonstrate: that the jurisdiction of the Conservation of Energy can be transcended (not violated) by a modified spark gap.

FIG. **15** is the same schematic as FIG. **13** with the addition of nodal numbers for ease of discussion.

FIG. **13** and FIG. **15** is a software, macro circuit designed to emulate the behavior of a spark gap. Since a spark gap has no internal circuitry of its own, any electronic emulation of the internal dynamics of a spark gap is purely mathematical predicated upon a century of technical expertise acquired by those who are skilled in this art.

Yet, it could be said of spark gaps, that this emulation *does occur as electrically mapped out* within the dynamics of the atomic composition inside of a spark gap.

Thus, it becomes possible to speculate (from these simulations of a neon bulb) on what might happen if certain modifications were to be made to the construction of neon bulbs in particular, and

spark gaps in general, to augment their ability to restructure the behavior of our circuits.

C. Earl Ammann claimed one hundred years ago that his device was scalable without limitation.

This is the intention of this application for provisional patent: how to upgrade our conventional spark gaps and how to connect them to our appliances for the improved performance of our appliances.

The software engineers who designed Micro-Cap's macro for a neon bulb, spark gap have figured out how to disassemble electricity into its component elements: of magnetism, dielectricity and time, and then reassemble them into a format which closely resembles the behavior of a spark gap.

Micro-Cap's macro for a spark gap has only one inductor, **L1**, simulating both electrodes of a neon bulb.

How can this be? Is this realistic? Yes!

If we assume that what is being simulated is not a single electrode, but the surface of both electrodes, and the single inductor, **L1**, simulates the junction between the metallic electrode material of both electrodes and the gaseous gap between them within a real world spark gap, then this singular function is a buffer between the conductivity of an electrode versus the reactivity of the neon gas, making this functionally equivalent to a neon bulb.

Also significant is the fact that the negative resistance of **R3** is placed immediately adjacent to this singular inductor, of **L1**, and in parallel with a single resistor, at **R1**, and it is this threesome that defines the functionality of this junction on the surface of all spark gap electrodes.

This location is where the magic of electrical synthesis occurs at the surface of an electrode, adjacent to a potentially arcing plasma. This is also where the magic of our Solar furnace transduces the reactive power, generated at its central “dark star” deep within the interior of its hollow surface, into the heat and light which enlivens our planetary biosphere. This junction is between *TheSurfaceOfTheSun.com* and its atmospheric plasma of silicon and neon immediately above a solid, planetary surface of calcium ferrite. This calcium ferrite acts as a magnetic coupling between the inner dark star (unlit neon bulb) and the lit neon/silicon bulb at the outer photosphere of our Sun which

serves to electrically isolate the inner from the outer.

FIG. **16** is a schematic of Micro-Cap's spark gap macro in which I have drawn a square boundary around the area of this macro that disassembles electricity and reassembles it and amplifies it at the same time. Everything else outside of this bounded square, such as: Micro-Cap's use of behavioral voltage sources, merely determines when to turn ON the sparking function of this neon bulb and when to turn it OFF and also determines how much current to manifest relative to various voltage differences. So, if somewhere within this circuit macro is to be sought some area for making modifications and improvements of net output, then it is within the bounded domain (so inclosed) wherein we will discover our goal of the buildup of dielectric potential despite no overunity, but an underunity, of the total coeffience of performance for this device to *appear to exceed* conventional standards of excellence if we refuse to perform a thorough segregated analysis of whatever is transpiring inside of this modified spark gap.

HINT... Energy is disappearing at a rate which is far greater than it is appearing, *apparently* debasing thermodynamics (until someone smarter than I can explain this anomaly) and, yet, create an abundance of energy at the load (for our appliances) far greater than the energy it takes to empower this modified spark gap to perform this benefit.

FIG. **17** is a sectional slice of this bounded domain of FIG. **16** exhibiting the labels which Micro-Cap uses which will help us analyze the output of any circuit which uses this spark gap. Thus, whenever an output gives us a current and a voltage of either a positive or a negative polarity of sign, we'll be able to make a determination as to whether or not any specific component is behaving as a generator or as a load by comparing the sign of the voltage versus the sign of the current for that component's output. *{This has already been pursued in FIG. **3, 6, 9** and **12**.}* Furthermore, we'll be able to map out the flow of current and the orientation of voltages to make a determination as to how this macro is disassembling and reassembling electricity as a reactant method of manipulating the amplitude of electricity. It's a very fruitful area ripe for learning about the internal dynamics of spark

gaps.

FIG. **18** is a schematic of a normal spark gap, in the format of a neon bulb, in which the resistances flanking both sides of the spark gap are 1mΩ.

FIG. **19** is the output of the dielectric potential, current and power of FIG. **18**. All of its output data conforms to a non-steady-state of thermodynamic dissipation.

FIG. **20** displays the nodal voltages generated by Micro-Cap of the spark gap inside of FIG. **18**.

FIG. **21** displays the nodal voltages of FIG. **18** generated by Micro-Cap and a segregated analysis of FIG. **18** and the spark gap inside of it using the data from FIG. **19** to derive this analysis. It includes a mapping of current flow and voltage orientation determined by the output of this simple circuit. It demonstrates the dissipation of real power and, thus, favors the resistive force of thermodynamics over the impedance of electrical reactance. This mapping demonstrates the variety of responses available to each component, within the context of this type of analysis, in which each component may either generate reactance or consume electricity. But it doesn't stop here...

The generation of reactance is an endothermic behavior if there are no extenuating circumstances to complicate matters any further than this, such as: the back EMF of coils inside of a rotary generator. And the consumption of electricity is an exothermic behavior. These facts are commonsense to every physicist.

But these thermal distinctions are trivial since they are merely the consequential behaviors of electronic components in particular and electrical behavior in general. These thermal factors are not causative; they do not define the distinctions between the generation versus the consumption of power. Only polarization of sign value of voltage and amperage and wattage or volts/amperes defines the distinction between reactive generators and electrical consumers.

Thus, thermodynamics is a trivial affair which should be relegated to the electrical technician who has to take environmental effects into account when crafting a real-world build of a theoretical device. Thermodynamics should not be a serious concern of determining whether or not an electronic

device will support a load versus drain a source. Only polarity of sign value of voltage, amperage and wattage or volts/amperes should be anyone's concern for making a determination as to whether or not an electronic device will support a load versus drain a source.

The generation of reactive power versus the consumption of real power is a myth. If truth be told, the reality of the situation is that generation versus consumption are fictions born of a consumer-based society in which we are forced to work for the privilege of staying alive rather than live in the world of the visionary inventors who have come before us, such as: the Ammann brothers, who disconnected their home from the utility grid and drove their electric car without any batteries powering its electric motor.

The only reality, according to these segregated analyses, is the polarity of volts, amps, and watts or volts/amperes which guides how we are to connect coils, etc., so that a circuit can function properly.

It is a trivial matter whether or not an electronic component generates or consumes power unless we're concerning ourselves with its consumption of heat – if it is a generator of reactance, or its generation of heat – if it is a consumer of electricity. This obsession with thermodynamics is just that: an obsession with the movement of calories from, or towards, the environment surrounding an electronic device and has nothing to do with the strict mathematics which models the behavior of electrical theory operating in the real world.

As far as electronic simulators are concerned, their viewpoint pays strict attention to the details of mathematical modeling and simulators are oblivious to whatever interaction a circuit has with its environment as if the environment does not exist.

When analyzing a circuit's behavior to determine whether or not it is behaving as an overall generator of reactive power or behaving as an overall consumer of real power, the movement of calories is a side-effect and possesses no serious consequence to any endeavor to determine whether or not an electronic device has an overunity coefficience of performance.

There are a lot of trivial matters when concerning ourselves with complex phenomena. And this

endeavor of mine, to promote a greater awareness of so-called: “free energy,” is no exception to this rule of thumb.

Hence, we have our priorities backwards putting caloric movement as an “a priori” focus of our attention span which is already limited enough as it is in its lack of tolerance for dwelling on the topic of so-called: “free energy” to waste this limited attention span on this trivial concern of caloric movement as if this is what defines energy when, in fact, it is merely a side-effect and not a causative agent to energy's production or consumption at all.

What's worse, is that “a priori” truth arises from mathematics while “a posteriori” truth arises from experience by the Latin definition of these Roman terms. Caloric analyses of inventions and devices is, thus, “a posteriori” putting it into an inferior position relative to any segregated analysis of the mathematics behind the polarity of sign value occurring within each and every electronic component in the context of the behavior of that circuit. So, our language already tells us that we have the wrong priorities claiming physics is the correct authority for any discussion of this matter overriding our linguistic common sense! But do we pay attention to this linguistic fact – which is hidden in plain sight in front of our collective noses? No! We just go along with what we are told to believe and never question the authenticity of our beliefs.

This lack of ability for us to think in a logical manner belies our collective stupidity, or our propensity for sloth, or both. But most importantly, it belies our fear of change as if growth of intelligence is something to be afraid of!

Polarity of sign value is the only correct procedure for the segregated analysis of a circuit's production of reactance and/or consumption of real power and caloric analysis plays no significant role, whatsoever, in making this determination. Thus, thermodynamics can be ignored whenever studying this topic of “freely available reactive power” renamed into the colloquialism of: “free energy.”

One more aside...

The difference between a con artist and a salesman is that a con artist fails to deliver on his

promised sale while a salesman fulfills his promise to deliver a sale. So, a con artist advertises a potential sale while a salesman advertises an actual sale that may take place should the prospective customer decide to follow through on the proposition for a sale.

So...

Do I deliver anything, or do I merely deliver empty promises?

That will be for the electrical technician to decide if, and when, he/she builds this device. Neither you, nor I, can make this determination without assistance from an electrical technician to manifest these simulations and discover whether they are pipe dreams or opportunities that we have overlooked.

But at least, my promises are logical due to their mathematical rigor.

FIG. **22** is similar to FIG. **18** except that the two resistors on either side of the spark gap have been raised to 1kΩ of resistance.

FIG. **23** is the output of the dielectric potential, current and power of FIG. **21**. All of its output data conforms to a non-steady-state of thermodynamic dissipation.

FIG. **24** are the nodal voltages generated by Micro-Cap of the spark gap inside of FIG. **22**.

FIG. **25** are the nodal voltages of FIG. **22** generated by Micro-Cap and a segregated analysis of FIG. **22** and the spark gap inside of it using the data from FIG. **23** to derive the analysis. It includes a mapping of current flow and voltage orientation determined by the output of this simple circuit. It demonstrates the dissipation of real power and, thus, favors the resistive force of thermodynamics over the impedance of electrical reactance.

Referring to FIG. **18** and FIG. **22**, nothing interesting is happening, here, from the perspective of overunity, so we'll use these figures as a reference for the default condition of a neon bulb, spark gap, which is: that they represent the underunity of their coefficience of performance. Underunity, ie. the self-damping of a wave, is a common misconception in the belief that it is the *only* possible type of wave and is, thus by misguided inference, the only explanation for the behavior of all waves.

Yet, there is something peculiar occurring at FIG. **22**. The voltage at **V1** within the spark gap is zero voltage, yet its current is not zero. Under normal conditions, we'd interpret this as being zero watts as well as zero voltage. But this is not what is happening here.

What is happening, is that some unknown voltage is simultaneously bipolarized causing the net voltage difference to be zero. It doesn't mean that there is no voltage, here, at **V1**. It just means that an undetermined voltage is bidirectionally polarized making it impossible for us to make a determination as to its absolute value and impossible to determine its orientation due to a conflicting possibility of simultaneous oppositional value of sign. It could be an infinite absolute value of voltage for all we know, or an infinitesimally small absolute value of voltage. We'll never know. But that doesn't mean that it does not exist. We merely can't make a determination one way or another.

The impact is that we don't know whether this is a generator of reactance, or an electrical load, even though it generates zero watts, because its current and its voltage are not in *definitive* alignment. Had they been aligned, that would have qualified this component as an electrical load. Anything else, by extended definition, is a generator of volts/amperes.

Notice how I said, a “generator of volts/amperes” rather than saying, a “generator of electricity”? This is to distinguish the fact that this cannot be a generator of watts, nor of power, owing to the premise of physics stated at the beginning of this presentation regarding sign convention of an electron.

Effectively speaking, this component is manifesting magnetism without any dielectricity being simultaneously manifested. So, this is a mere fragment of electricity arising here.

It would be hard to call this reactive power. Yet, it would be just as foolish to call this real power so long as its voltage remains zero. Yet, it has more in common with reactive power than it has in common with real power due to this fragmentation of exclusively manifesting magnetism in the format of current devoid of dielectric potential.

So, reactive power is the closest analogy (even though it has a 50/50 chance of being an

electrical load) and will have to suffice until we upgrade our physics to accommodate this anomaly.

FIG. **26** through FIG. **31** is a circuit schematic, its nodal voltages, and RMS outputs used as raw data for calculating the segregated analysis (included, herein) which exhibits all of the characteristics of a constant voltage source, ie. the 100V battery, supplying voltage regulation to the output keeping it rock-steady, on average, as an oscillating set of waves.

The circuit of FIG. **26** begins to exhibit a transcendence of the Conservation of Energy in as much as far more real power is consumed than the reactive power which it produces. All of the prior circuit examples leading up to this one exhibited an exact mathematical equivalency between production and consumption which ultimately zeroed out. Herein is where Conservation no longer applies. Instead, we'll begin to see examples of the consumption exceeding production. This suggests a loose association between the two in which the excessive consumption motivates a comparatively meager production, but does not neutralize it as an oppositely signed counter-magnitude which the Conservation of Energy requires of circuits to comply with thermodynamics.

This is a nightmare for physicists who, like bankers and certified public accountants, prefer all of their assets (production) to be the exact duplicate (in absolute value) of their liabilities (consumption) but of opposite polarity of sign value such that all positively signed denominations cancel all negatively signed denominations resulting in a total of zero net gain or zero net loss. That way, bankers and accountants can sleep peacefully at night without any nightmares. This is why free energy is against public policy which seeks to control everything: money, energy, etc.

According to the segregated analysis of FIG. **31**, the coefficience of performance for this circuit is slightly more than ¾ of $1/10^{th}$ of 1%, or more precisely: $1-0.9992235=0.0007765$ making this an *extremely* inefficient circuit. Nor does this analysis explain where did nearly three and a half kilowatts, over 99.9% of its energy, come from which disappeared at diode, **D1**, inside of the spark gap macro?

In other words, Conservation of Energy does not explain this failure of accountability which is inherent in this peculiar example of a non-overunity circuit simulation failing to make any

thermodynamic sense to the commonplace engineering perspective which is schooled in thinking in a normal manner.

This is why I don't think we should be calling anything a producer of reactance or a consumer of energy. It may work in *some* examples of conventional circuitry, it may work in *most* examples of acceptable circuitry, but does not explain *all* circuitry.

In fact, we have taken figures of speech and converted them into venerable laws of physics by simply repeating these figures of speech so often that we have forgotten their idiomatic roots of conventional speech patterns.

But, as has often been quoted by various sources as saying something similar to the effect of: "Repeat a lie often enough by enough people and make it a big enough lie, and it will (eventually) be accepted as the truth."[11]

My segregated analysis of non-thermodynamically compliant circuits (in which energy IN does *not* equal energy OUT) undermines this conventional wisdom and puts it in its proper place which is a limited domain of relevancy.

It is interesting to note that this quote is an abusive perversion of a well-known fact of yoga practice in which: "if the mantra is repeated often enough, it becomes the truth (enlightenment becomes an all-time reality for the yoga practitioner) despite all odds set against the yogi to achieve this goal. It is not necessary for the aspiring yogi, nor is it relevant, to dwell on any meaning attributed to the mantra since meaning is not relevant to the practice of yoga and will get in the way of achieving the goal of yoga which is to transcend all meaning and transcend all thought to get to the source of thought which is beyond the realm of the thinking mind and without becoming a mindless idiot in the pursuit of this lofty goal called: "samadhi" in the Sanskrit.

Also, if enough people practice meditation on a regular basis, then world peace is the result as

11 Famous Sayings: #56 – 'Repeat a Lie Often Enough...' → https://is.gd/vuvezo = https://shmaltzandmenudo.wordpress.com/2017/04/07/famous-sayings-56-repeat-a-lie-often-enough/

has already been thoroughly documented by the Transcendental Meditation movement operating under the auspices of its founder, Maharishi Mahesh Yogi.[12]

The import of this, that the silent repetition of a meaningless string of phonemes can produce world peace by enlightening its practitioners, is a very large aspiration.

Thus, all of the criteria of the quote, first cited up-above regarding lies (lots of people frequently repeating a big idea which has yet to become the truth), also holds true for yoga as much as it holds for achieving world peace.

And this also holds true for physics and electrical engineering as well.... **;-)**

All energy does not equal all mass times the speed of light squared probably due to the energy in question is not totally related (nor relevant) to electrical energy, but is only relevant to nuclear energy.

The only energy relevant to electrical energy are the valence electron volts of the atoms of the materials of construction in a circuit, because various electrons can choose to participate, or not participate, in the electrodynamics of a circuit's behavior at any point in time making it impossible, sometimes, to account for everything.

All we look at is the energy entering and exiting a circuit while ignoring the potential energy congregating inside of every circuit in the form of whatever valence electrons are not participating in its electrodynamic behavior. At any, and every, point in time, various valence electrons may choose to "sit it out" versus "engage in the game" (so-to-speak) which can, and does, skew the results giving the false impression (to us witnessing all of this from our macroscopically blurry {distant} vantage point) that either our accounting is wrong or (else) that physics has been violated.

It's our own fault for misinterpreting the data and drawing false conclusions, thereby.

You want to know what I think?

---

12 The TM Technique → http://tm.org/

I think that electrical reactance engages in a sloppy form of communication among the various components of a circuit in which, like the childhood game of “telephone,” not all of the information gets safely transferred from one component to another. Instead, some of the information gets “lost in translation” (so-to-speak) causing these anomalies which cannot be accounted for.

But you'll notice that in all of these instances of sloppy communication, the demand for energy is remarkably greater than is the supply.

It's as if two or more gears in a transmission system have a considerable amount of “slippage” causing a loss of energy and an inability to account for all of the energy in the system if we are blind to this slippage (occurring in front of our eyes) and also blind to how many gears we may be overlooking and what are the size of these “invisible” gears?

These invisible gears are the valence electrons which we are not accounting for since they “sit out” any participation in a physical circuit's dynamics most of the time causing us to take them for granted most of the time. Then, when they *do* choose to participate, we're shocked and confused assuming that some law which governs our stable life has been violated when, in fact, nothing has been violated. In short, we act as if we are sleep-walking and confident that we are keeping track of everything when, in fact, we are asleep at the “wheel of our life” and don't know it.

Worst of all.... We refuse to wake up! Instead, we claim to (already) be awake while simultaneously denying these anomalies which serve as our wake-up call to total reality – not merely the reality we wish to give credit for, but *all* of reality.

Tesla performed tolerance tests of the materials of construction, such as: copper wires, the dielectric plates of capacitors, etc, to see if and when would these materials break down. He exploded copper wires into nano-fine particles of copper dust, he punctured holes through the dielectric plates of capacitors, and other sundry experiments to see what are the physical limits of valence charges which are less than the non-limit of infinity which exists as the theoretical boundary condition for the absolute magnitude of free energy. This physical limit is the only limit we should be worrying about. This limit

is governed by the valence charge which binds matter together into a conglomeration of solidity which we take for granted on the one hand, and also hold the continuity of this solidity to be (somehow) sacred as well. Yet, it is this valence charge of the materials of construction of our circuits which is the *only* source for all of our energy unless someone should prove the existence of an Aether.

Tesla assumed nothing. He tested everything. He was obsessed with efficiency.

That's why he's a genius. Because he's willing to do his *own* homework and not take anyone's description of reality on blind-faith for whatever we've been taught to believe in.

Again...to repeat myself...

Where is the justice in Christ performing a miracle of multiplying a few loaves of bread and a few pieces of fish into enough food to feed a multitude of people?

Where is the American Way of Commerce when He turned worthless water into valuable wine and refused to charge a fee for His kind and brotherly service?

This is what I mean by “slippage” among gears which are loosely enmeshed. There is no direct causal relationship that would make any commercial sense, nor any moral sense, to justify giving away a substantial quantity of valuable merchandise for free!

Yet, that's what “free energy” implies! All the customer has to supply is the *need* for a product or service and the end result is guaranteed provided the customer no longer allows himself, or herself, to waste these gifts in senseless pursuits, as Christ admonishes the beneficiary to... “Go and sin no more.” This is a normal life. Anything else less than this is subnormal, substandard and subhuman.

The whole point behind physics is the presumption that accountability is all-encompassing and this obsession of physics is a misrepresentation under certain circumstances as the preceding analysis of a simple, non-modified spark gap has demonstrated.

So, why do a segregated analysis of any other variation of a spark gap, or a modified spark gap (such as this invention entails) if all inputs and outputs cannot be verified? Why go to any trouble to convince conventional perspectives when conventional perspectives will be superseded by a spark

gap's behavior which transcends the strict logic of accountability?

I guess, it would be to point out the flaw of assuming that we can, or should, account for everything?

I set out pursuing this discussion with the belief that a segregated analysis would defy irrational non-acceptance of overunity circuits in general and my invention in particular. To my dismay, the circuit of FIG. **26** and its segregated analysis in FIG. **31** defies Sir Isaac Newton's Second Law of Motion which states that, "the rate of change of momentum of a body over time is directly proportional to the force applied, and occurs in the same direction as the applied force."[13] The circuit of FIG. **26** *defies* Newton's second law of motion, because FIG. **31** exhibits no causal link between the source of voltage at the 100V battery of that circuit and the resultant wattages and volts/amperes occurring within the spark gap analyzed in FIG. **31**.

Despite this caveat undermining the conventional wisdom of physics, we get some hints as to what is going on within the spark gap (courtesy of FIG. **31**) which spiritualize an otherwise entrenched materialism engulfing physics by converting materialism into immaterialism.

Diode, **D1**, within Micro-Cap's spark gap macro is consuming a tremendous amount of energy (nearly 3½ kilowatts) in contrast to the battery, **V1**, which is producing reactance at a far smaller rate of nearly 3 volts/amperes. These are the only components worth focusing our attention on since these are the only components with the largest consumption of energy and production of reactance occurring anywhere throughout this circuit. Yet, their absolute magnitudes do not equal each other. Energy simply disappears without ever having appeared in the first place (as reactance). The ratio of this disappearance is vastly greater than its appearance by a factor of one thousand to one (1.28783k to 1) which is the mathematical reciprocal of ¾ of one-tenth of one percent ($1 \div 0.0007765$).

This anomaly will shortly repeat itself (at FIG. **95** to FIG. **105**, below) when I present a

13 "Newton's laws of motion; Newton's second law" → https://is.gd/beganu = https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Newton's_laws_of_motion#Newton's_second_law

segregated analysis of a circuit which is analogous to Micro-Cap's macro of a neon bulb, spark gap without being a spark gap. Instead it is a simple, LRC tank circuit of hypothetically high resistances in between its components and a pair of diodes whose cathodes are facing each other. I consider this diode / LRC tank circuit to be a far simpler equivalency to Micro-Cap's spark gap macro and is, thus, indicative of the macro's inherent qualities minus its need to turn itself ON whenever a point of breakdown of resistance occurs at a specific voltage (such as 90V for neon bulbs). Thus, this hypothetical LRC circuit is always ON, ie. it is always engaging in the analogous creation of a plasma arc inside of itself along with all of the consequences, thereof, similar to Micro-Cap's spark gap macro.

This defiance of Newton's second law suggests an intriguing cosmology in that all of creation is the manifestation of “cycles of repetition” wherein the cycles do not possess an “a priori” first cause, nor do they possess an ultimate conclusion. Instead, each cycle is part of an endless progression of repetitions whose causal linkages only exist in between any two cycles of repetition. This relationship between any two adjacent temporal cycles is the source for our scientific laws and mathematical relationships, but is restricted to this limited domain of temporal jurisdiction and does not (cannot) supersede it.

Causality and its resultants only applies to the interconnecting relationship between two successive cycles of repetitious activity. This limited domain cannot transcend this limited jurisdiction and become applicable to all of time. Any scientific attempt on our part to transcend this limited domain is overtaken by amorphous bliss. And if we can become so familiar with this bliss such that it is always in the background of our awareness, even upon the event we know of as our own mortal death, than we have achieved enlightenment.

A circuit can get a momentary glimpse of bliss whenever it transcends causality, such as: whenever the cathodes of a pair of diodes face each other within the context of an LRC circuit of high resistance, or within the context of a spark gap, because it is during this transcendence of causality in which bliss is no longer overshadowed by the rigors of causality which we know to be scientifically

and karmically validated by our vast history of expertise on this subject of both material and spiritual causalities.

It is this transcendence of causality which accounts for "free energy" by *not* accounting for its segregated analysis, but by *preventing* any possibility for a segregated analysis to make any logical sense as demonstrated at FIG. **31** and FIG. **60** and FIG. **80** (mirrored at FIG. **84**) and incompletely analyzed at FIG. **105** without adequate data to draw any conclusions.

FIG. **32** is a schematic of a simple circuit involving an unmodified, neon bulb, spark gap, three resistors of 1mΩ, each – resistors: **R1**, **R2** and **R3**, plus a one Farad capacitor precharged with 100 volts.

FIG. **33** is a graphical display of a few of the output values, namely: the voltage and current for the 1F capacitor, and the values of current for three components within Micro-Cap's macro for this non-modified spark gap, namely: its current source – **G1**, its zero voltage source – **V1**, and its negative resistor – **R3**.

FIG. **34** are almost all of the output values for the non-modified spark gap within the circuit of FIG. **32**. The only value missing is for resistor, **R4**.

FIG. **35** is the output value for resistor, **R4**, within the non-modified spark gap within the circuit of FIG. **32**.

FIG. **36** are the output values for the circuit in FIG. **32** minus the output values for its spark gap.

FIG. **37** are the nodal voltages of the non-modified spark gap within the circuit of FIG. **32**.

FIG. **38** are the nodal voltages and a segregated analysis for the circuit of FIG. **32** minus the nodal voltages or segregated analysis of FIG. **37**.

FIG. **39** is a segregated analysis of the non-modified spark gap for the circuit of FIG. **32**. Although it is not a steady-state condition, because power (both reactive power and real power) is escalating due to the low resistances of 1mΩ for each resistor, and due to the precharged condition of the 1F capacitor, and also due to the low equivalent series resistance of this capacitor at 10mΩ. Yet, it

possesses a net gain, or loss, of zero watts, or volts/amperes, indicating a normal thermodynamic condition supporting the rule of thumb in which "energy IN [sometimes, under specific conditions] equals energy OUT."

Fifty years after the "discovery" of the electron and its present convention of naming its sign negative, it was discovered that the electron is actually positively signed.

When you look at the tabulational values of FIG. **39**, you will notice a very interesting thing in which all of the watts are signed positive while the volts/amperes are signed negative. This is backwards to logic since the generation of anything (volts/amperes in this case) should also be *adding* power to a circuit while the consumption of anything (watts in this case) should always be *subtracting* power from a circuit. Yet, this is not the case. Hence, it is very *confusing!*

The reason given (by historians) why physicists did not bother to change their sign conventions when they discovered their error is that they were afraid that fifty years was too long to upset conventions by correcting their mistake by going public with it and requiring that everyone switch over to the new naming convention.

Yet, look what a hazard this has become in logically deducing what is happening in a circuit which is undergoing a segregated analysis....? It's obviously self-contradictory to say that watts are consuming the power of a circuit while labeling it with a positive sign, or to claim that reactive power is being generated labeled with a negative sign. But this is what fear and sloth has accomplished for the study of physics which we have inherited to this day – *over a century after* this mistaken labeling was first discovered!

FIG. **40** through FIG. **45** are a few more examples of this type of low resistance circuit. Included are their schematics and their outputs, nodal voltages, but without any segregated analysis. These figures also exhibit the property of an escalating output due to their low external resistances of less than one Ohm and the low equivalent series resistance (ESR) of 10mΩ within their precharged capacitor. 3Ω would have been more realistic since this circuit must suffer very high voltages. But that

high ESR would have dampened their output into a mediocre state of conventional thermodynamic loss. Although these circuits of low resistances are overunity, and escalate to their own self-destruction, they are not practical since any connection to a load of considerable resistance will suppress their overunity. Hence, these conditions and their resultants are usually never paid any attention to by anyone for these obvious reasons.

The other interesting thing about these three runaway examples of overunity (FIG. **32** and FIG. **40** and FIG. **43**) is the fact that their outputs escalate the fastest when their resistors are enlarged to approach as close as possible to the turning point, but still remain less than whatever it happens to be, in which any greater resistance above this turning point (of slightly less than one Ohm) will create the opposite (damping) effect depicted in the following figures.

FIG. **46** through FIG. **48** is a circuit schematic and its outputs, nodal voltages, but no segregated analysis which displays a distinct self-damping of its output probably due to its raised resistances having been elevated to one Ohm – which is above the turning point which contrasts the opposing behavior between overunity and underunity of its output performance.

FIG. **49** is the schematic for one embodiment of this invention. This may be how the Ammann brothers built their device. And it may also be what pop culture refers to Tesla's TriMetal Generator.

The reason why **L2** of FIG. **49** is magnetically coupled to **L3** & **L1** of FIG. **49** and **L2** is not magnetically coupled to **L3** is because **L1** is aluminum wool stuffed inside of the copper spheres and the copper tubing which connects the spheres with each other reflecting the inductance of **L2** with reversed polarity (just like a mirror) from inside the copper tubing. The paramagnetism of aluminum severely reduces the direct coupling of **L1** to **L3** towards negligible values. **L2** has 60k Ohms of series resistance and is wrapped around the copper tubing. **L1** has a series resistance of 2k Ohms inside of the copper tubing serving as its electrode. The aluminum is also acting as a self-referencing (parallel) capacitance internalized inside of the copper tubing. *{Tantalum may substitute for aluminum?}* This capacitance (inside of the copper tubing) is simulated with the help of 1 Farad, each, of parallel

capacitance placed inside of the simulated inductors, **L1** & **L2**. **L3** is a motor load of 25 AWG copper winding possessing 10 Ohms of series resistance and no parallel capacitance. All capacitors possess 3 Ohms of equivalent series resistance. **C2** prohibits the escalation of impedance at **L3**. The magnetic coupling of **L3** is to its armature, not to itself, since the copper winding of **L3** contributes a much smaller coupling coefficience than the contribution of its ferromagnetic armature. **X1**, **X2**, **X3** & **X4** are spark gaps filled with air possessing a voltage threshold of one kilo volt. Gear Approximation Method is simulated with RELTOL (relative tolerance) equaling 1.

The frequency of the sine wave generator, **V2**, is slightly faster than the frequency of the sine wave generator, **V1**, by 10% to create a beat frequency between them. This helps, or insures (I forget which!) the overunity gain.

The voltage precharged onto capacitor, **C1**, also regulates the overunity rate of gainful output.

FIG. **50** is a numeric output of the circuit minus the output from the four electrostatic gaps of air.

FIG. **51** is a chart of the numeric outputs of electrostatic gap, **X1**.

FIG. **52** is a chart of the numeric outputs of electrostatic gap, **X2**.

FIG. **53** is a chart of the numeric outputs of electrostatic gap, **X3**.

FIG. **54** is a chart of the numeric outputs of electrostatic gap, **X4**.

V(X1.10) through **V(X4.10)** are the ON/OFF conditions of the four electrostatic gaps of air. If their voltages are 10 volts, then they are ON. If they are approximately 10 nano volts, then they are OFF.

ON versus OFF conditions don't seem to severely impact anything most of the time except for an enhancement causing the surge to escalate at a vertical rate of departure (up or down; enlargement of amplitude versus its diminishment) from the virtual oscilloscope's midline (of zero amplitude) when the spark gap is ON versus a gradual hyperbolic escalation when the spark gap is OFF.

FIG. **55** is a subtotal of the entire output of the circuit in FIG. **49** and a grand total of its load. Its

output may be inconclusively inaccurate due to computational discrepancies. But it exhibits a nearly zero condition by comparison to the largest outputs of this section of this circuit since its subtotal is slightly greater than one-third of a volt/ampere and the absolute value of its two largest outputs are both exactly 69.33 kilowatts. That's a discrepancy of about 140k to 1 which is probably Micro-Cap's margin for error?

It's not easy to conclusively compute the outputs of the behavior of a spark gap. In fact, very often I'll get different results. So, I look for a trend. If I can see a trend occurring, then I can extrapolate what might be happening.

FIG. **56** through FIG. **59** are the subtotaled outputs of the four spark gaps within FIG. **49**. They demonstrate a spike of wattage occurring around 200 seconds into the simulation amounting to approximately 6 watts of real power. This is far greater than the one-third of a volt/ampere of reactive power being generated at the load (as depicted in FIG. **55**) as if to suggest that the spark gaps are attempting to periodically “soak up” (consume) the reactive power coming from the load in order to maintain thermodynamic equilibrium averaged out over time?

FIG. **60** is a tabulation of the entire circuit, plus its four electrostatic gaps of air. Its conclusion is that less real power (1 & ¾ milliwatts) disappears into its four sparkable gaps of air (although they are not sparking yet; they're merely ionizing/preparing to spark) by comparison to the 348.573 milli-volts/amperes of reactive power which appears at this circuit's inductive loads. These loads have become generators of reactive power due to this circuit's use of electrostatically energized gaps of air. Also, more power continually amplifies over time from the scant seed power which initiated, and continually runs, this circuit.

FIG. **61** is the schematic for the construction of a preferred embodiment for this invention. Here are its construction details...

L1 is the “inner,” primary, coil of the Ammann brothers' Atmospheric Generator's transformer. To represent its parallel capacitance (of one Farad), it is filled with aluminum wool which has been

“conditioned” by first using this wool as the terminus of one electrode while another electrode of some other material are both immersed into an electrolyte of borax (or, baking soda) and both electrodes are energized with an A/C current to cause a layer of alumina (aluminum oxide) to form on top of the surface of the aluminum wool, and then stuffing a copper pipe with this conditioned aluminum wool, and then holding this copper pipe in a vertical orientation, and then positioning a Bunsen burner flame underneath one end of this copper pipe to cause a stream of hot air to rise upwards through the interior of this copper pipe to dry out any lingering moisture which may be adhering to the surface of the conditioned aluminum wool.

The Henrys of **L2** is defined by its diameter of bare iron, single layer winding (not by its mass as is the case with conventional windings {of today} predicated upon when winding copper – not iron – coils). **L2** is wound upon a wicker-style frame of iron rebar setting each turn of winding apart from its previous turn to create a capacitant spacing between each turn of winding.

The coupling coefficient of **L2** and **L3** is 99.9999999% due, not to proximity between its pair of coils, but -instead- due to their coupling is between their iron masses: the mass of iron armature upon which is wound the stator and starter coils associated with L3, and the iron wicker-winding of **L2**. In actuality, the distance of their separation is a radius of several miles determined by the radius of **L2** (simulated by the inductance of **L2**).

The inductance of **L1** is weak due to it being constructed of mere copper tubing. It's resistance is also low due to its shrunken mass.

The diodes, **D1** and **D2**, have their cathodes pointing towards the parallel capacitance of the aluminum oxidized wool of **L1** which, at first, may seem backwards since the oxide only forms if the aluminum is serving as the anode of a diode. But the cross-wired capacitors, **C5** and **C6**, are effectively reconnecting the anodes of these two diodes with their origin at the parallel capacitance possessed by inductor **L1** by the use of a cross-wired connection. This cross-winding lends stability to what would otherwise be considered an unstable circuit (which is what conventional wisdom calls overunity, free

energy circuits: unstable). This makes the task of Micro-Cap simulator a bit easier to compute the outcome with less error which tells me that this is also a good idea to use this feature in the actual, physical build.

The diodes, **D1** and **D2**, could be represented in their electrical analog as a pair of diodes possessing an aluminum anode and an iron cathode if, in your physical build of this device, you wished to avoid strict adherence to how the Ammann brothers built their device when building your own version.

The circular polarity of **L1** relative to **L2** is significant. They must possess a continuously, unbroken orientation of direction to their windings. Yet, this is automatically taken care of due to omnidirectionality of the polarity of a magnetized copper tube (**L1**).

The precharged condition of capacitor, **C1**, is one factor which regulates the rate of amplification of output. A greater voltage input, here, accelerates the growth of output.

Resistor, **R1**, in between the two ground nodes, registers a voltage difference of zero volts, because the Ammann brothers are using the chassis of their EV conversion as their ground nodes for both copper spheres and this resistor represents the resistance of their chassis between both headlight sockets. These spheres are attached to the headlight sockets of their car and replaces its headlamps. They are electrically connected to the car's chassis. The mass of iron within the car's chassis may be a significant contributor of amplification due to what Tesla has been quoted by a Mr. Dort (via William Lyne in his book, entitled: “Pentagon Aliens”):[14] “for every 200 pounds of iron added to Tesla's Special Generator, one horsepower is added to its output.” This is merely one reason why I believe that Tesla may have been replicating and improving upon the Ammann brothers' demonstration when Tesla performed his own demonstration ten years later with a Pierce-Arrow which weighs over 4k lb.

Aluminum must be at the core of this device's power transformer, simulated herein by inductor

14 “PENTAGON ALIENS; CHAPTER VIII: A TASTE OF OTHER ENERGY SECRETS” → https://is.gd/anavum = https://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/ciencia/pentagonaliens/pentagonaliens08.htm#CHAPTER%20VIII:%20A%20TASTE%20OF%20OTHER%20ENERGY%20SECRETS

L1 (being made of a copper tube filled with aluminum wool), but whose dormant coils are wound with iron and surrounded by an iron case – the more iron the better, but its active windings are of copper. All of these dormant windings of this transformer is simulated by **L2** and is exclusively of iron. And the chassis of the Ammann brothers' car contributes the iron of its construction to the iron of the motor's armature and conveys its iron influence into the copper windings of the car's motor to become actuated.

The copper tubing minimizes the use of copper needed to transfer the magnetism of the aluminum to the iron winding of **L2**, and vice versa, and not get in the way of focusing our objective on the near exclusive buildup of power without encouraging its dissipation. Its dissipation would have been encouraged had more copper been used surrounding the aluminum core. This should reduce the manifestation of heat at this transformer to indicate less manifestation of usable power at the transformer saving as much of it as is possible for its thermodynamic conversion/dissipation at the car's electric motor.

There's usually a core idea which initiates my development of an overunity circuit plus enhancements. The enhancements accelerate the amplification of “freely available” reactive power to help make that device more practical.

You'll notice that this improvement, in FIG. **61**, is no longer capable of adhering to an authentic style of build according to whatever the Ammann brothers managed to succeed at, because I lack the imagination required to envision how the two cross-wired capacitors, **C5** and **C6**, could be built according to the style of build utilized by the Ammann brothers. At this point in the development of this circuit, it becomes necessary to divorce one's self from adherence to authenticity of whatever the Ammann brothers managed to accomplish and strike out on our own – which may be what Tesla managed to succeed at accomplishing ten years after the Ammann brothers?

Anyway, the 8 micro second duration required to accelerate the growth of reactive power is so fast in FIG. **61**, that it far surpasses the 214 seconds required to amass a largess of power in FIG. **49** and also manages to make possible the elimination of the pair of frequency sine wave inputs, **V1** and

V2, and, thus, invalidate any requirement for remaining true to the Ammann brothers' claim of “energy from the air” – the description of their Atmospheric Generator.

Where is the energy coming from now that a mere microvolt precharged onto a one pico Farad capacitor, at **C1**, is all that is necessary to initiate an infinite growth of reactive power against considerable impedances and resistances?

This growth of reactive power is coming from the inductive loads, all of the coils, associated with this device. It's not coming from any prime mover unless we deem a spark gap can “authorize” inductors into becoming prime movers by “faking” their rotation, and movement, in an electrodynamic field?

Rapid switching can do this....that is, if we could invent mechanical switches that could withstand the rigors of high speed switching. But diodes do this with ease for one half of each alternating cycle. And spark gaps also provide negative resistance in addition to electrical behavior reminiscent of ultra-fast, mechanical switching.

Spark gaps incorporate diodes and negative resistance and inductive and capacitive reactance all into one innocent looking space between two pieces of metal!

It's as if the Federal Reserve were to make the announcement that we don't need banks anymore, nor do we need to work for money, when we can mint our own money all by ourselves out of practically nothing!

You may either assume that this is a ridiculous thought and dismiss it on that premise, alone. Or, you may dismiss it on the premise that we don't want that kind of world to live in for fear of how dangerous is a world without workers and without money. Either way, you'd be against this technology.

But that didn't stop the Ammann brothers. Nor did it stop C. Earl Ammann from evolving towards his fate of arrest at the hands of.....?

FIG. **62** and FIG. **63** are the graphic and numeric outputs for FIG. **61**, respectively.

FIG. **64** are the nodal voltages for FIG. **61**.

Thus, ends my presentation of realistic situations that are buildable.

What follows are imaginary examples illustrating: **1)** more overall reactive power plus real power appears over time by comparison to the input of energy continually used to run, or initially used to run, in the following examples. Also, **2)** more energy *disappears* in the following examples than the quantity of reactance which *appears*. And **3)** the inductive load becomes the generator of reactive power while the spark gap becomes the electrical load where lots of energy disappears.

The first contrast (**1**) illustrates the overunity of these imaginary flights of fancy. The second comparison (**2**) reaffirms the mystery of more overall energy disappearing, than what appears, and no accountability for where this energy (which is disappearing) came from. And the third bullet point (**3**) turns normalcy upside-down when consumers (inductors) become producers and spark gaps become consumers. Incredible!

FIG. **65** through FIG. **69** is a circuit schematic and their outputs and nodal voltages which displays a distinct escalation that oscillates rather than simply curving as a smoothly shaped hyperbola (in contrast to FIG. **32** through FIG. **45**). This is brought on by the use of a spark gap which has been slightly modified in FIG. **68** and its nodal numbers depicted in FIG. **69**. A ground connection has been added to this type of modified spark gap causing its reactance to exceed conventional standards for this type of component.

This grounded neon bulb does not qualify my invention. But it introduces one of several innovations which my invention could incorporate by showing what this single modification can do to its output. My invention includes this modification, without exclusively depending upon it, and also includes a few other modifications all of which are optional.

The conversion of a reactive load into a generator of reactance, from the viewpoint of these segregated analyses, is achieved by comparing the output of current versus the output of voltage of various components within these circuits and examining their differences or similarities of polarity of sign value. If the voltage and the current share the same polarization of sign value, then a status of

consumption of real power is the result. If, on the other hand, the voltage and the current possess opposing values of signed polarization, then a status of the generation of reactive power is the result.

Only those simulations which agree with this definition of the generation of reactance versus the consumption of real power (acting as electrical loads) in terms of the orientation of the polarities of current versus the polarities of voltage agree with thermodynamics, because these simulations do not represent any anomalous creation, nor destruction, of net power and cannot be swept aside as "numerical approximation error" since we already are familiar with the signing convention of physics.

We are also familiar with super-conductivity at, or near, zero degrees Kelvin. So, we know how important a lack of resistance is to the conductivity of a thermodynamically oriented circuit.

Yet, spark gaps possess an extremely large, internal resistance and use that resistance to alter their voltage *and* their current to values which are either greater or less than whatever their voltage sources are feeding them!

This apparent "violation" of the Conservation of Energy is contingent upon several factors: the parameter of resistances between, and within, these various components and whether the breakdown voltage of the spark gap has been surpassed.

To clarify this point... The only thing violated is any preconceived notion of the universal jurisdiction of the Law of the Conservation of Energy. Its domain is limited to specific conditions. It is *not* universally applicable under all circumstances. Thus, it is best to call this a *transcendence* of the Law of the Conservation of Energy rather than a *violation* of it since the only thing violated is its limited jurisdiction which indicates an *example* of thermodynamics without universally *requiring* its applicability to all types of circuits.

Transients are well-known among electrical engineers as being momentary surges which can destroy equipment. They explode with tremendous force, yet die out just as quickly. The electrical reactance of a sparking gap encourages the formation of transients under certain conditions which are elaborated, herein, regarding any circuit so elaborated as having an escalating output.

My invention makes it possible for a transient to become invincible to any magnitude of impedance offered to it by any load. Only an impedance of infinite magnitude could quell an invincible surge provided by the modified spark gap elaborated, below, but only at a hyperbolic function in which the closer to infinity is the impedance of the load, the closer to zero is the output of this hypothetical load. Then, what we're doing is distributing the power of a surge across the impedance of a load which is what we normally do under conventional circumstances.

FIG. **70** is a schematic of a spark gap which has been modified to resemble the internal dynamics of one possibility for this invention.

V1 used to be a zero voltage battery in a normal simulation of a spark gap positioned, such as it was, in between nodal numbers **#1** and **#2** in FIG. **15**. But in FIG. **66**, it has become a sine wave generator of one femto volt representing an input from the spark gap's environment comprising whatever ambient frequencies are available to contribute to the enhanced output of this invention.

FIG. **67** has the nodal numbers for FIG. **66**.

Nodal number **#5** in FIG. **15** becomes a ground attachment in FIG. **67**. This ground attachment suppresses its connection to ground, and becomes a floating ground, by the impedance of the high resistance of **R7** and the two diodes, **D3** and **D4**, flanking this high resistance on either side of it by shepherding (directing) current towards this high resistance to concentrate current where it does not want to congregate, namely: in areas of high resistance. This is accomplished by pointing the cathodes of each of these pair of diodes towards each other. This is a technique I learned by studying how Micro-Cap software engineers used a contrary technique among diodes, **D2** and **D1** in *their original version* of a neon bulb spark gap (depicted in FIG. **15**), of pointing the cathodes of these two diodes *away from each other* to concentrate voltage between them (in contrast to *my endeavor* to concentrate current between diodes, **D3** and **D4**).

Normally, current wants to head towards areas of least resistance. But these two diodes, **D3** and **D4** of FIG. **67**, forces the current of this ground connection towards the elevated resistance of **R7** and

loiter there a while longer than it would have otherwise without these intentional encouragements, thus, thwarting the conventional purpose of a ground connection which is to enable current to transfer towards ground.

This ground connection serves to isolate the circuit from ground, yet provide the *potential* for a ground connection nonetheless. This encourages a dielectric potential to build up along this connecting line to ground and back up (accumulate) into node **#5** of FIG. **67.**

Since diodes shift current towards their cathode and voltage is shifted towards their anode, some voltage does manage to get shifted towards ground on the grounded side of diode, **D3**, while an equal amount of voltage shifts over to node **#5**. This loss of voltage, by the passage (leakage) of current through diode, **D3**, is a cost of inefficiency. But since we're dealing, here, with freely available electrical reactance, I'm not going to cry over this loss!

And since node **#5** is directly in front of diode, **D1**, any voltage which deposits there immediately gets shifted behind diode, **D1**, and accumulates behind **D1** in the space between **D1** and **D2** which is where I want lots of voltage to accumulate and amplify, by virtue of the fact that this location, between **D1** and **D2**, is also outside of this spark gap in as much as it is behind the anodes of **D1** and **D2**. But the difference, here from the ground attachment leading away from node **#5**, is that the ground attachment is a series connection to the environment surrounding this spark gap while this space between **D1** and **D2** is a parallel connection with the environment surrounding this spark gap.

By the way, the sine wave voltage source, at **V1**, is also a series connection with the environment surrounding this spark gap.

Anytime two diodes face in opposing directions, facing away from each other, suggests an area between their pair of anodes which is outside of, and *in parallel to*, the circuit to which these two diodes appear.

Anytime two diodes face in opposing directions, facing towards each other, suggests an area between their pair of cathodes which is also outside of, and *in series to*, the circuit to which these two

diodes appear.

In fact, four alternative schematic symbols for a spark gap – depicted on the right-hand side of FIG. **68**, by comparison to Micro-Cap's use of a capacitor symbol surrounded by a circle – depicted on the left-hand side of FIG. **68**, are a pair of diodes whose cathodes are facing each other across a small gap![15]

In Micro-Cap's normal simulation of a spark gap, neon bulb, this area between diodes **D1** and **D2** (and behind their anodes) fails to contain anything since it has been assumed, by convention, that a neon bulb will be encased in a dielectric enclosure, such as: a glass bulb. Joseph Newman used a PVC (plastic) sewer pipe to enclose his secret use of helium in his device telling everyone it was a set of permanent magnets since it was wrapped in black tape and he never allowed anyone to physically handle it, nor start its rotation.[16]

Helium cannot be encased within an enclosure made of glass since glass will pass helium while other materials of construction, such as: plastic or copper, will not allow helium to pass through their molecular lattice.

The Ammann Brothers replaced a dielectric enclosure with a copper or bronze enclosure which constitutes a parallel connection with the environment surrounding their undisclosed use of a spark gap.

Their use of a copper tubing unites the inductance within the spark gap's enclosure with the iron winding which surrounds this tubing.

The pair of inverted inductors, **L2** and **L3** in FIG. **67**, represents this iron winding and it also represents the copper tubing having been bent and crimped in its middle section with both bent legs wrapped with the iron winding causing the inductance of the tubing to become inverted with respect to

15 Spark gap schematic on Wikimedia Commons → https://is.gd/qufami = https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/2/29/Symbol_spark_gap.svg/2560px-Symbol_spark_gap.svg.png

16 “Has anyone tried to recreate Joseph Newman's perpetual motion machine?” → https://is.gd/kogina = https://qr.ae/TWyG6j

itself and, thus, requires an analogous inversion between among a pair of inductors, **L2** and **L3**.

L2 and **L3** offer a much more powerful (and a much more efficient) linkage to magnetically couple an outside load to this spark gap then do the electrodes of this spark gap simulation represented by inductor, **L1**.

Capacitor, **C5**, represents the accumulation of aluminum wool at the crimped location within the Ammann Brothers' copper tubing, or Nikola Tesla's replication and enhancements ten years later with his Pierce-Arrow conversion into an electric vehicle.

We might choose to use tungsten wool, instead of aluminum wool, since tungsten may be more paramagnetic than aluminum? But I'm not convinced this would be a good choice since whatever we choose to use must also exhibit the properties of a dielectric material as well as the properties of a paramagnetic material.

Aluminum may be an equivalent choice over tantalum? We want this material to first store dielectric potential within itself and, then, paramagnetically shift the magnetism, which will be congregating inside this invention, to become exported outside of this device towards the copper tubing, which surrounds the ionized air or arcing plasma, so that the copper tubing may further transfer this magnetism towards, and into, the iron winding surrounding this tubing. Thus, this aluminum will perform a function analogous to a magnetic diode. But if tantalum can do a better job, then so be it.

This is an appropriate analogy since diodes were constructed of two plates, one made of aluminum and the other plate usually made of lead (or else, any other material other than aluminum will suffice) with an electrolyte of baking soda or borax between these two plates a century ago when the Ammann brothers discovered these various properties of material substances. The aluminum will develop an oxide coating causing it to prevent the passage of current outwards through itself making this aluminum plate the anode and the opposing plate the cathode.

The fact that this iron winding is a spiral geometry induces a sine wave to enter into the copper tubing and, hence, into the molecules of air situated inside. Thus, the iron winding also serves the

purpose of acting as an antenna which transfers the ambient frequencies of the environment surrounding this spark gap into this device represented by the sine wave generator at **V1**.

L2 and **L3** possess no series resistance since they are entirely composed of iron which offers no resistance to magnetic flux. And any eddy currents which will develop is neutralized by pairing these windings in opposing directions of orientation.

Yet, capacitor **C5** is given an equivalent series resistance equal to the dielectric material of aluminum since **C5** represents a location inside of this device while **L2** and **L3** represent a location which is outside of this device.

Iron passes magnetic flux without any resistance whatsoever. This the basis for magnetic remanence utilized by computer core memory techniques of operation dating from the years of 1955 to 1975 in which two strands of copper wire were threaded through a cloth arrangement of ferrite rings. Each ring possessed one bit of information: either a one or a zero, depending on the direction of the magnetic flux. The flux stayed in perpetual motion until acted upon by contrary forces (Newton's Law of Motion: an object tends to stay in motion, or stay at rest, until acted upon to do otherwise) at which point the flux would release its charged state as a bit of information before storing the subsequent bit.

This lack of resistance of magnetic flux implies that magnetism cannot impede its own flow. Hence, if we can figure out a method to induce a flow of magnetic flux in simultaneously opposing directions, then we can broadcast this magnetism within a limited radius of scope to another mass of iron serving as a pickup aerial which is placed immediately adjacent to a copper coil acting as a load to induce an alternating flow of dielectric potential which is the conventional definition for our A/C power system.

The purpose of bending and crimping the copper tubing in the middle and wrapping an iron winding of very large inductance around this bent and crimped tubing (capped at both ends with copper spheres and filled with air and aluminum wool) is to transfer the ionic or plasmic electrical activity of the air molecules into eddy currents inside the copper tubing and then translate these eddy currents into

an inducement of simultaneously opposing magnetic fluxes occurring within the singular iron winding immediately surrounding this bent tubing.

The purpose of the crimp in the center of the tubing is to enhance the Venturi Effect which will accelerate the reciprocating motion of the plasma along the entire length of the tubing and, thus, intensify the eddy currents arising within the copper tubing.

The paramagnetic and dielectric material in the shape of metallic wool within the tubing and adjoining spheres serves a dual role of offering resistance along the interior of the tubing and spheres – to prevent arcing (shorting) across the diameter of the tubing and spheres, and also store dielectric charge potential which will accumulate and enhance the amplitude of the eddy currents arising in the copper tubing.

A copper stator winding, which is magnetically coupled to the iron core surrounding the middle the copper tubing, must translate the simultaneously opposing magnetic fluxes (received by the iron core) into an alternating polarity of dielectric potentials since copper cannot sustain alternations without cross-cancellation occurring. So, to satisfy "the Conservation of Energy," this translation automatically occurs.

This distinction between the lack of magnetic impedance within ferromagnetic materials, such as: iron, and the fact of electrical impedance within conductive metals, such as: copper, is a factoid of information ripe for harvesting its benefits!

C. Earl Ammann was falsely charged with "stealing energy from the grid" in 1921 when he entered Washington, D.C., to deliver his electric car conversion, serving as a working model, to the United States Patent Office. By the standards of today, plus my discovery of the methodology behind his device, leads me to conclude that he should not have been falsely charged with theft, but -instead- more accurately charged with acts of "domestic terrorism" since he gave energy to the grid within the scope of downtown Denver, Colorado and disrupted the frequency and phase relation of the entire grid located within the radius of his influence. He did not steal any energy at all.

He gave a disturbance of phase relation and frequency to the area within the dozen or so mile radius of influence wherein his device furnished power to the grid. But at the periphery of this circle of influence, no significant amount of power was able to reach the grid. Instead, a significant amount of disturbance reached this peripheral area, just as it also reached the interior of this radius of influence, which caused an electrical blackout since he caused a translation of real power into reactive power at this peripheral perimeter. And since this demonstration of his, and his brother's car, was not foreseen by the engineers who had installed the electric power grid of Denver, Colorado, no correction for reactive power had been installed to safeguard the grid from this type of disturbance. So, the real power of the grid at the foothills surrounding downtown Denver went down towards zero by becoming converted into reactive power of no practical benefit to the customers of the grid. From the perspective of the customers' appliances at this peripheral location, useful real power disappeared into the domain of invisibility for all intents and purposes since it translated into reactive power leaving no real power left remaining to power anything.

Returning to the analysis of electrodynamic behavior of my invention in FIG. **49**, the resistor, **R3**, of Micro-Cap's macro for a spark gap (in FIG. **15**) turns the direction of current around at nodes **#3** and **#5** due to its negative resistance of 1Ω (spark gap, macro parameter: **RNEG = –1**).

Diode, **D1**, of Micro-Cap's macro for a spark gap prevents current, at node **#5,** from returning to itself from resistor, **R3**, by converting it into voltage and accumulating this voltage behind itself, at node **#6,** during each half-cycle of alternating voltage polarities.

Despite whatever D/C input may, or may not, enter from outside this spark gap, oscillations are initiated by the switching action of the two diodes, **D1** and **D2**, imposed upon their flow of current, and the gap capacitance at **C1**, and the arcing capacitance at **C2**.

Current source, **G1**, clones a quantity of current ten times greater than whatever voltage is behind itself at node **#7**, labeled "**Switch**," if the voltage difference between **Pin #1** and **Pin #2** exceeds the breakdown setting for this type of spark gap (which is set to a default condition of 90 volts) and

divides this voltage between **Pin #2** and resistor, **R4**.

Resistor, **R4**, impedes the current of **G1** by converting it into voltage on its opposing side at **Switch**, node **#7**, due to the impedance of current at diode, **D2**. This creates a positive feedback which escalates until it reaches whatever thermodynamic inefficiencies limit this runaway condition from escalating any further.

FIG. **69** is a circuit schematic of an imaginary embodiment, ie. may not be buildable, for my invention.

The symbols, and their parameters, positioned to the left of the power supply, **X1**, of the circuit in FIG. **69** are as follows...

- 1E6 H = one million Henrys of induction for **L3** and **L4** within the macro for the spark gap for the power supply, **X1**.
- 1E30 F = 1 x 10^{30} Farads of capacitance for capacitor, **C3**, within the macro for the spark gap for the power supply, **X1**, which represents the aluminum wool contained inside of the hollow copper spheres and hollow copper tubing of this invention.
- 1E5 Ø = 100 thousand Ohms of resistance in between diodes, **D3** and **D4**, on the grounded branch of the circuit macro for the spark gap, power supply of **X1**.
- 1E4 *f* = 10,000 cycles per second of sine wave input entering through the spark gap macro's voltage source, **V1**, from the environment immediately surrounding the power supply, **X1**. In real life, the actual physical build would probably use the iron winding, represented by inductors, **L2** and **L3**, of power supply, **X1**, to receive this input from the immediate environment.
- 1E-15 V = one femto volt of sine wave input entering through the spark gap macro's voltage source, **V1**, from the environment immediately surrounding the power supply, **X1**., and entering through the iron winding, represented by inductors, **L2** and **L3**, of power supply, **X1**, to receive

this input from the immediate environment.

FIG. **74** through FIG. **79** are numeric displays of the raw data for all of the output parameters of FIG. **73** which are pertinent to conducting its segregated analysis.

FIG. **80** is the entire segregated analysis for the circuit in FIG. **73** whose image is broken up and repeated and enlarged in FIG. **81** through FIG. **83** for ease of viewing.

FIG. **81** is a segregated analysis for my modified spark gap invention acting as the power supply for the circuit in FIG. **73**.

FIG. **82** is a segregated analysis for the motor load within FIG. **73**.

FIG. **83** is a segregated analysis for the arcing space between the **ROTOR** coil and the **STATOR** coil within the motor load of the circuit in FIG. **73**.

FIG. **84** is the summation of all of the reactive power generation subtotals and the real power consumption subtotals and their grand total yielding a net loss of over 930% and a coefficience of performance of nearly 11% despite the total reactive power at the motor load of 600k at 17.46 milli seconds and quickly climbing (loosely calculated "on sight" from FIG. **82**).

This segregated analysis confirms what Eric Dollard has to say about Nikola Tesla's method for transmitting power. He didn't transmit. The power simultaneously appeared at both the transmitter and at the receiver of Tesla's Magnifying Transmitter – *under construction, but never implemented, at Wardenclyffe, near the village of Shoreham on Long Island, New York, and thoroughly tested for nine months at Colorado Springs, Colorado, in 1899* – by bringing both locations together with a mutual relationship between them which transcended their spatial disjunction making their divergent locations into one singular, conjunctive location requiring no speed of light to delay the response at the receiver from the transmission of the sender.[17]

In other words, in my segregated analysis it becomes obvious, to the trained eye of the skilled artisan, that the appearance of reactive power and the disappearance of real power are simultaneous

17 YouTube video → https://is.gd/conjunctionofspaceandtime

events without any causal relationship between them since they don't cancel each other – in other words, thermodynamics does not apply. They both occur at the same time preventing any accountability and making senseless any segregated analysis of their raw data as if to suggest that we are overlooking some other significant factor whose scope is, as yet, undetermined.

Yet, to appease those who are trained in traditional schools of thought, I perform these segregated analyses despite their futility in proving thermodynamics is relevant for defining circuits involving spark gaps.

FIG. **85** are the nodal numbers of FIG. **73**.

FIG. **86** are the nodal voltages of FIG. **73**.

FIG. **87** are the nodal voltages of the spark gap, **X1**, acting as the power supply for the circuit in FIG. **73**.

FIG. **83** are the nodal voltages of the spark gap, **Magnetodynamo**, acting as an arcing space between the **ROTOR** coil and the **STATOR** coil of the circuit in FIG. **73**.

FIG. **95** is a circuit schematic of an hypothetical analog of my invention.

What can be said of the circuit in FIG. **95**? It could be said that this simulation is functionally similar to my invention in as much it is an LRC "tank" circuit, and is essentially what my modification of a spark gap is equivalent to if the resistance of this LRC circuit (in the lower half of FIG. **95**) is very high....so high, that it cannot be built without resorting to its analog in FIG. **73** applied to a similar circuit (power supply, **X1**, depicted in FIG. **80**). The addition of two diodes, whose cathodes are facing each other, accelerates the accumulation of dielectric potential, but is not a requirement for dielectric potential to accumulate – a highly resistive LRC tank circuit is sufficient to illustrate, by way of analogy, how my modifications made to a spark gap can achieve what they set out to accomplish: overunity. This exercise of our imagination (using this hypothetical circuit) is a convincing display of how the resistance of a pair of diodes, and the general ambiance of very high resistance distributed throughout an LRC circuit, can orchestrate overunity without recourse to sleight-of-hand trickery or our

speculative imagination.

The study of Micro-Cap's macro for a spark gap is capable of guiding anyone with a discerning point of view towards making these claims.

FIG. **69** has the nodal numbers for discussing the grounded spark gap (depicted in FIG. **65**) used within this hypothetical circuit (depicted in FIG. **95**).

FIG. **96** is a graphical display for the output graph of the motor load in FIG. **95**.

FIG. **97** is a numeric chart for the output of the motor load in FIG. **95** and is used as the raw data for calculating the segregated analysis of FIG. **95**.

FIG. **98** is a graphical display for the output graph of the LRC power supply in FIG. **95**.

FIG. **99** is a numeric chart for the output of the LRC power supply in FIG. **95** and is used as the raw data for calculating the segregated analysis of FIG. **95**.

FIG. **100** is a graphical display for the output graph of the arcing space between the **ROTOR** coil and the **STATOR** coil of FIG. **95**.

FIG. **101** is a numeric chart for the output of the arcing space between the **ROTOR** coil and the **STATOR** coil of FIG. **95** and is used as the raw data for calculating the segregated analysis of FIG. **95**.

FIG. **102** are the nodal voltages of the arcing space between the **ROTOR** coil and the **STATOR** coil of FIG. **95**.

Nodal number **#10** in FIG. **69** is labeled "**Switchchk**" in FIG. **102**. The nodal voltage at this node is 10n volts indicating a double "false" condition of the IF/THEN test-statement of the **E2** behavioral voltage source of FIG. **68** and FIG. **69** and FIG. **102**:

`IF(ABS(V(PIN1,PIN2))>V(THRESH), THEN E2 = 10, ELSE IF(ABS(I(V1))>ISUS, THEN E2 = 10, ELSE E2 = 10N`. In plain English, this renders into the equivalent statement that: if the absolute value of the voltage difference between **Pin #1** and **Pin #2** of this spark gap macro is not greater than the voltage default setting for the threshold of the breakdown of resistance for this neon bulb macro (which is 90V), and if the absolute value of the current of V1 is not greater than the default

setting for the minimum current required for sustaining an arc in this macro (which is 500mA), then the nodal voltage for node **#8** will be set to the value of 10 nanovolts and will be transferred to the left-hand side of resistor, **R5**, to node **#10** labeled **Switchchk**. This value of 10nV will then become a multiplier for calculating the voltage of current source, **G1**, when multiplied against the voltage difference between node **#7** (labeled "**Switch**") and **Pin #2**. This will result in a new value for voltage erupting from out of current source, **G1**.

This double false condition is indicative of this spark gap being in the state of "OFF," namely: it is not arcing. Instead, an ionic channel is forming across its arc which is preliminary to the formation of an arc.

Despite the temptation to assume that this OFF condition renders this component useless for the purpose of encouraging the LRC circuit beneath it (in FIG. **91**) to accumulate dielectric potential, the presence of this arcing space (between the **ROTOR** coil and the **STATOR** coil of FIG. **95**) is required to get the LRC circuit to accumulate dielectric potential. Otherwise, without this arcing space, the LRC circuit is (for all intents and purposes) always OFF and incapable of providing overunity.

This condition of a spark gap which is OFF (not firing and not arcing), yet producing overunity by its mere presence inside a circuit, is a repetition of a similar situation depicted in FIG. **29** for the circuit in FIG. **26** whose segregated analysis is located in FIG. **30** and FIG. **31**.

So, don't expect that my invention (of a modified spark gap) will require its spark gap be in a condition of being ON (engaging in arcing/firing) in order for my invention to be successful. The low-scale, prefiring/prearcing warmup of its spark gaps are enough to render it useful. This is the unrecognized mystery of spark gaps which this invention benefits from.

This ionic channel (between the **ROTOR** coil and the **STATOR** coil of FIG. **95**) is a grounded spark gap whose resistance along its grounded branch subcircuit is displayed in the schematic as having the value of 1e7 Ohms. Its macro is depicted in FIG. **68** and its nodal numbers in FIG. **69** and its nodal voltages for FIG. **95** are depicted in FIG. **102**.

FIG. **103** are the nodal numbers for FIG. **95**.

FIG. **104** are the nodal voltages for FIG. **95**.

FIG. **105** is a segregated analysis of the Motor Load within the circuit of FIG. **95**. It exhibits a neutral, no-gain/no-loss, of the generation of reactive power versus the consumption of an electrical motor load due to all reactances are canceled by all loads resulting in a net gain/loss of zero. This fulfills thermodynamics for this motor load (minus the arcing spark gap between its ROTOR and its STATOR which will be analyzed in a subsequent figure) leading to a presumption that all generators of power may not be entropic as is claimed by our authority figures in the various sciences. Only our electrical loads are entropic.

Even our lead acid batteries are initially charged, during their manufacture, using high voltage and low amperage which encourages a different electrolytic chemistry than is found to occur within this type of battery during their recharge phase under the hood of our automobiles. Their recharge, by the consumer, is based on the use of low voltage combined with high amperage which encourages a type of electrolytic chemistry which ages the lead acid battery leading to its ultimate need for replacement. This recharge chemistry involves the generation of hydrogen gas during the discharge phase of our lead acid batteries while the manufacturing phase of our lead acid batteries forces oxygen into the lead plates under the administration of high voltage and low current.

If we perform a segregated analysis of how much power was utilized to charge our lead acid batteries under conditions of high voltage and low amperage, and calculate this against the power which discharges from our lead acid batteries, then there is no net loss. Instead, it turns out to be a slight gain of power making each alternating cycle of charge and discharge a slow process of topping off the charge of the lead acid battery rather than expending it.

This was discovered by John Bedini and Peter Lindemann[18] and replicated by numerous

18 "Bedini SG, The Complete Handbook Series," written by Peter Lindemann, D.Sc. and Aaron Murakami, BSNH → https://is.gd/awahoz = http://bedinisg.com/bedinisg.pdf

individuals, including Ritalie.com.[19]

It is important to remember the distinction between charging lead acid batteries with high voltage and low amperage versus charging them with low voltage and high currents involves a different electrolytic chemistry in which the conventional method of recharging these batteries emits hydrogen gas during their discharge while their manufacture, and initial charge, infuses oxygen into their lead plates – which is unconventional and unheard of among the common man-on-the-street who is proficient in standard methods of recharging lead acid batteries.

Thus, this unconventional approach not only gains a net charge over time to a slight degree, but it also regenerates (reconditions) these batteries so that they last longer (barring any structural damage which may occur which would make them unsalvageable) and defies the conventional belief that *entropy must always dominate the universe*.

Considerate thinkers might conclude from this that physicists have made slaves of us, all, tied to an ideology of commercially vested interests who limit our commercially available supplies versus the demands made upon these limited supplies which are forever growing with the increase of population and the economic and educational development of all people, everywhere?

FIG. **106** is the schematic of a dual power supply for a bifilar wound D/C motor.

FIG. **107** and FIG. **108** are a graphic and a numeric display of some of the output parameters of FIG. **106**.

FIG. **109** are the nodal voltages of FIG. **106**.

FIG. **110** are the nodal voltages of the spark gap, **X1**, acting as the power supply for the left-hand coil, **LOAD**, of FIG. **106**.

FIG. **111** are the nodal voltages of the spark gap, **X2**, acting as the power supply for the right-hand coil, **GENERATOR**, of FIG. **106**.

19 "How to Build a Radiant Battery Charger – eBook file" → https://is.gd/quxufa = https://ritalie.com/store/index.php?main_page=product_info&products_id=1

FIG. **106** could be the stator coil for a D/C motor and involves is a bifilar winding of opposing directions plus a “smoothing capacitor” of one Farad in parallel with these pair of coils to absorb the reactive power of both power supplies, **X1** and **X2**, and slow down their escalation to infinite oblivion.

FIG. **112** is a photograph of the Ammann brothers standing in front of, and on either side of, their EV conversion which incorporates the use of their novel invention to which I owe my gratitude. Two red arrows have been inserted onto this photograph directly above the two copper spheres seated within the headlight sockets where there used to be headlights before they were removed to make room for these spheres. I owe a debt of gratitude to “Tartaria Mud Flood” on FaceBook who posted this picture and has allowed me to use it within this application for provisional patent.

FIG. **113** is one of the two newspaper articles (that we know of), in which the photograph of FIG. **112** appears, scanned by a fellow who prefers to go by the EnergeticForum.com username of, Boguslaw, and who has kindly permitted me to use this newspaper clipping at my discretion.

Although the invention has been explained in relation to its preferred embodiment, it is to be understood that many other possible modifications and variations can be made without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention.