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![1]

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.[2]

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

1 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

2 “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.[3]

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

3 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[4] and replicated by numerous

4 "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.[5]

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**.

5 "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.