Criticisms of Overunity

In Defense of Free Energy

© May 4th 2022 by Vinyasi

Here's my chance to promote my soapbox of understanding so-called "free energy".

Many people believe that over unity is simply not possible.

They are right, you know, because it's not that simple. Certainly not as simple as a flashlight circuit… Ha ha ha!

My response…

The square root of negative one is the source from where free energy arises(aka, non-thermodynamic overunity: more apparent power exiting a circuit by comparison to the apparent power entering into it) and the sink for the disappearance of reactive power (aka, non-thermodynamic underunity: less apparent power exiting a circuit by comparison to more apparent power entering into it). This results in the non-accountability of all energy transfers and conversions which steps outside of the domain of thermodynamics as we know it, today.

And since reactive power can readily be converted into real power by three different methods that I know of, in a roundabout fashion, free energy is real and not a fiction. These three methods are…

1. Resistance.
2. Full rectification bridge of four diodes converting AC to DC.
3. Bifilar counter-wound coil.

When oscillating current cannot become saturated, it no longer exhibits a sine wave. Instead, it exhibits triangular waves brought about (in my circuits) by the separation of the phase of current from the phase of voltage by 1/2 cycle of oscillation, namely: 180° of angular separation.

This is the passive sign convention's definition of the generation of power but is not occurring inside of a generator. Instead, it is occurring inside a circuit powered by a feeble voltage input no different than the quantity of voltage available in our environment.

Conventional wisdom conveys the ideology that the electrical reactance of a circuit offers

impedance against the input voltage. But the opposite perspective is also true in which the input voltage offers impedance to the electrical reactance of the circuit, because the circuit would like to create its own energy in the form of reactive power but cannot if the input voltage fights it with sufficient strength.

It is necessary to keep this input voltage extremely low so as to prevent the throughput of voltage. Voltage throughput would cause current to maintain the same polarity as voltage outside of the source of input.

But when voltage throughput is broken, impedance overwhelms voltage input which can have two different results: either a comatose circuit by conventional standards or else an over unity circuit depending on how it is constructed.

An over unity circuit must take advantage of capacitance and inductance to create a condition of the non-saturation of current in order to maintain the growth of reactive power so that this growth can accumulate to a reasonable amount necessary to power our devices.

Since reactive power is lossless, a.k.a. does not interact with thermodynamic conversions or losses, it can only accumulate until converted into real power by one method or another.

I think a major contributing factor to our misunderstanding of free energy is our misunderstanding of the movement of energy across a conductor.

Electrical energy changes state within the valence shells of an atom, but does not exit the atom nor enter into it.

This is an illusion brought on by our pattern-oriented brain which sees a ripple and thinks it is the movement of something substantial when all it is is the movement of a pattern that our brain recognizes. And that pattern is the ridge (or peak of energy) that is moving - not the energy itself.

In order for energy to move, the matter which hosts that energy would have to move as well. But such is not the case within a conductive medium such as a strand of copper wire. {It is more likely to occur within a thundercloud of ionized particles for instance.} All the atoms of copper stay in one place along with the electrons within their valence shells.

But since all of the valence electrons are interconnected along the entire strand of a conductive medium, all of this electrical energy is shared among all of those atoms as a collective storehouse of potential energy.

All of the input energy is wasted on performing a non-energetic task of commanding the rise and

fall of energetic states of the valence electrons throughout the entire length of a conductive medium. Conversely, all of the energy required to power our devices is coming from the materials of construction within the devices, themselves.

Thus, the practical limit of free energy is the tolerance to which the materials of construction (within a circuit) limit how much energetic excitation can occur within those materials before those materials are destroyed.

If not for this practical limit imposed by the materials of construction within a circuit, free energy would be limitlessly infinite as all of my simulations exhibit.

Joseph Newman had at least this much right… That the size of a coil matters more so than the energy which is supplied to the coil. For, if the windings of the coil is increased, then it's inductance is increased along with its voltage resulting therefrom. And that excessive voltage can be put to good use.

Response from a critic…

Thank you for your response, Vinyasi. What you say is that you have an overunity device. Can you show it?

My answer…

President Eisenhower was pressured by Exxon to suppress and terminate the successful development of an over unity device in Canada that was producing around five to fifteen times more output than its input.

This is probably why President Eisenhower warned us (in his farewell address) to beware of the military-industrial-complex because he got to meet them face-to-face and see how ugly competition can be when you're president (a stuffed shirt who is not commander-in-chief of the mightiest nation on earth) and have to take dictation and commands from a global corporation and bend your knee and pay homage to them…

It doesn't stop there…

John Jacob Astor the third was murdered but in such a way as to hide the murder in the midst of a tragedy, namely: the sinking of the Titanic. He was scheduled to publicly announce his financial support of Nikola Tesla. Oops! Gone with the wind…

And how about President Garfield? He was making whistle stop tours across the New England states and he was going to stop in Buffalo to announce his support of Nikola Tesla. Did he make it to his destination? Nope! He was assassinated before he could give his speech!

What do you think my chances are of sharing anything with anyone?

Certainly not for lack of desire!

Stanley Meyer was murdered. Although it's much easier to sweep aside such people, publicly branding them as hooligans and charlatans, so as to not believe in them rather than go to the trouble of killing them off. But once in a while, they die of mysterious causes.

http://www.energyfromthevacuum.com/Disc43Izzard/index43Izzard.html

And…

http://www.energyfromthevacuum.com/Disc31ZeroFuelMotor/5DISCSILVERBUGCOLLECTION.html

Rather than let anyone go hungry, I will repeat what I have mentioned to somebody else on YouTube … Get a hold of a Kromrey converter and magnetically couple a humongous mass of ferromagnetizable iron to the ferromagnetizable iron contained in the two horseshoe cores of that device and see what happens.

The Kromrey converter is the reincarnation of Tesla's special generator mentioned by Thomas Commerford Martin in the last chapter, chapter 43 of his book, on the inventions and writings of Nikola Tesla. And it is also mentioned by William Lyne in his book (chapter 8) entitled "Pentagon Aliens" which you can buy on Amazon. Thomas's book you can download from archive.org.

But you want to start off by studying the perpetual motion holder which was popularized by Edward Leedskalnin (who also built coral castle outside of Miami Florida). The two devices are very similar because magnetic flux does not figure into them so much as magnetic remanence (which was utilized in computer core memory between the years of 1955 and 1975).

Here's another criticism from somebody else…

"It [reactive power] is not Power that can do any work."

Correct. That is why I advocate the conversion of reactive power into real power by way of any one of three different methods (there may be more), such as:

Resistance, or a full bridge rectification from AC to DC, or a cross wound bifilar coil in which the magnetic field of one coil will match up with the electric field of the other coil and vice versa if we managed to separate the phase of voltage from the phase of current by a full half cycle of angular displacement (180 degrees of separation).

It's kind of like the idea of teamwork in as much as free energy (as a singularity) does not exist. But it does exist as a quarterback end run (so to speak) which can result from the freely available reactive power of capacitive reactance and inductive reactance occurring simultaneously to create a condition of the non saturation of current. This condition eliminates back EMF and disallows sine waves (in an oscillating circuit) replacing them with triangular waves. See pages 16 and 18 of this book for an example of triangular waves of non-saturated current.

https://www.amazon.com/dp/B09Z97FRRT/

And since these two reactances can do no work, a.k.a. they are lossless, thermodynamics does not apply.

Consequently, reactive power can only do one thing and that is accumulate until there is so much there that when converted into real power we got ourselves some free energy because of the impedance of the circuit gave it to us if we don't suppress it by feeding it too much voltage or too much current from a prime mover. See any of the schematic screenshots from page 11, onward, of the Oops pdf file, above, and any of the output screenshots beginning on page 19.

It's good to look at things from both angles. In other words, what we call impedance (we say is located inside the circuit) and it is impeding against the input of voltage and/or the input of current. But the opposite perspective is also true, namely: that the input voltage or input current is impedance against the production of reactive power coming from the circuit.

More criticisms…

The term reactive power is a contradiction in terms as power is a measure of the rate at which energy is converted to some other form such as electrical energy to heat or kinetic energy. This is referred to as true power and is measured in watts.

Reactive Volt Amps or VARs dissipates NO POWER. In a purely inductive circuit the current drawn is lagging its supply voltage by 90 degrees ie the phase angle is 90 degrees. It's Power Factor is the cosine of 90 degrees ie 0.

Now True Power is Volts x Current x Cos phase angle

ZERO POWER meaning that purely reactive VA cannot dissipate power and in addition can only load up an electrical system with WATTLESS CURRENT. Please forget this BS about free energy from Reactive Volt Amps If it was possible it would have been 150 years ago

Sorry to rain on your parade as you say in US.

My response…

Are you referring to zero power factor? Because that makes sense. What about negative unity power factor? That's the definition of a generator according to the passive sign convention.

But it does not have to exclusively occur within a generator. Because any time capacitive reactance and inductive reactance combine simultaneously results in 180° displacement between them which manifests negative unity power factor and the generation of power.

More criticisms and my response...

"The term reactive power is a contradiction in terms as power is a measure of the rate at which energy is converted to some other form…"

I don't think it's a contradiction in terms if we interpret the situation differently than the way you were trained to interpret it.

Reactive power is a measure of the rate at which potential energy is converted from capacitance or inductance or both at the same time into potential energy in the case of each taken separately or kinetic energy when both conversions occur simultaneously.

And when both conversions occur simultaneously, they are both diverted from alignment from zero power factor by an angular displacement of 90 degrees. This puts their conversion of capacitance and inductance (into kinetic energy) at right angles to a power factor of one which destroys the sine waveform by tweaking its peaks and troughs into an extreme displacement from the nice curvature of sine waves. This results in triangular wave shapes which are indicative of the non-saturation of current.

This condition of the non-saturation of current can result in a constantly escalating amplitude of power since there is no longer any inductive impedance (back EMF) to diminish the power level. This can be a sudden explosion of gain or it can be a smooth hyperbola.

In either case, it is an exponential growth rate since the more capacitive reactance results from the initial value of capacitance (when measured over a period of time), then there is a stronger electric field of capacitance from which to grow and produce more capacitive reactance. The same can be said of inductive reactance. This is not surprising since reactive power is lossless and can only accumulate.

Since this is an accumulation of the "cloning" of reactive power into more reactive power, it can be said that there is no overunity.

The "appearance" of overunity is a measure of the rate per unit of time at which the reactive power is cloning itself. Hence, it is wrong to analyze this situation as: "more energy OUT than IN". The more

accurate way to interpret this is to say that…

One minus (the input divided by the output) equals a fraction less than one whenever the input is less than the output due to the recycling of reactive power. The apparent overunity comes about whenever this fraction begins to exhibit a proportion which is very close to unity with very little margin of error. In other words, a gainful output which is 100 times greater than the input is a fraction of 99%. But a gainful output which is a million times greater than the input is a fraction of 99.9999%. Thus, unity may be impossible or difficult to achieve since this would imply an infinite growth per finite duration? Yet, it is not impossible to achieve anything less than an infinite rate of growth of the reactive method of generating power by the simultaneous conversion of capacitance and inductance into capacitive reactance and inductive reactance.