

What are the alternative ways to obtain electrical energy?

The most efficient way, as I see it, of producing a maximum of gain for a minimum of cost, is through conversion into real power of fully reactive power in which the maximum of capacitive reactance of a leading current of 90 degrees displacement and the maximum of inductive reactance of a lagging current of minus 90 degrees of displacement both occur, simultaneously, as the result of an extremely meager input of real power (on the order of excruciatingly meager watts of input power). Their mutual displacement from each other amounts to 180 degrees since minus 90 degrees is equal to +270 and the difference between +270 and +90, or: 270 minus 90, is 180. The gain is on the order of gazillions to one in theory. A proportional gain of anything less than a gazillion and greater than unity, when made manifest by a physical build embodying this theory, is enough to warrant our attention.

To give you an example of how stupid it would be to expect to make a fortune off of the widespread commercialization of this suggestion of mine is to consider the plight of President Dwight D. Eisenhower when he made his Farewell Address to the nation on the eve of his departure when he said, "Beware of the military-industrial-complex". He was referring to Exxon Oil who had put pressure on Eisenhower to put pressure on the premiere of Canada to suppress a group of scientists who were preparing to go to market with their invention which produced somewhere in the vicinity of an electrical gain of between 5 and 15 to one plus refrigeration for free. Eisenhower, thus, became fully informed from his own experience of how a cartel of a commercialized military, or a militarized commerce, can strangle free-enterprise using the commander-in-chief of the mightiest nation on Earth.

The suppression did not stop there, because this group of scientists tried a second time to take their invention to market. *{Why shouldn't they? They spent millions of dollars to develop it!}* A month before the next president of the United States, John F. Kennedy, was to meet with these scientists, Kennedy was killed, and these scientists gave up.

Despite this ominous warning, and to continue with an explanation of my suggestion, up-above...

This satisfies the passive sign convention's definition of the generation of power (not its consumption). And since this is a mathematical entity resulting from the subtraction between two differing reactances, the result remains reactive. It is not real.

Hence, it is not farfetched for physicists and electrical engineers to claim that "free energy" (whenever it manifests in this format) does not exist. They're not lying. But neither are they telling us the whole truth since their livelihood depends upon their administration of reactive power whenever they're managing the power grid. Without their adroit management, things would either blow up or brown out or black out altogether.

They are lying whenever they admit this much, that: free energy exists in the form of reactive power but deny that it is useful. They know better!

There are at least four methods of converting reactive power into real power that I know of and I am not an electrical engineer. These four methods are...

1. Simple resistance. A resistive heating element will convert reactive power of any displacement into real power by producing heat which can be useful for boiling water to rotate a steam turbine and, hence, rotate a rotary electric generator. We may then tell all of the *hawks* who insist on obtaining low-cost plutonium (resulting as a byproduct of the nuclear power industry) to forget about amassing more nuclear warheads to cap ICBMs. Besides, why defend a way of life with a mighty nuclear arsenal if that way of life amounts to a privilege to access wealth through a distribution system which favors the few at the expense of the many who are forced to

do without? Buckminster Fuller claimed that we can easily support 10 billion people on this planet with a bounteous life if it were not for our faulty distribution system. I agree.

2. Full bridge rectification via a square arrangement of four diodes.
3. Cross-winding a pair of coils will add the +90 degrees of leading current of one coil to the -90 lagging current of the other coil (and vice versa) to produce a zero degrees of displacement between them both since it will be the magnetic field of the lagging current and the (di-)electric field of the leading current which are being blended. And these fields result from the electrical reactance of their respective inductive and capacitive components. Although the components produce these fields, it is these fields which drives the circuitry of these components — not the components, themselves.
4. Tesla's patent for adding AC to DC may be a coded message in the form of patent protection in which certain components must be substituted to explain why he protected a concept with an innocuous patent. On the surface, it appears to be a useless patent. In other words, the batteries in his patent are replaced with diodes, his light bulbs represent any kind of load (especially, inductive), and his externalized voltage sine wave source represents *any* wave shape which is already occurring within an oscillating circuit. Thus, I suspect that he was protecting a method of converting reactive power *of any wave shape* into a DC flatline with nearly 100% accuracy if the externalized voltage source is kept relatively very small (this is also to help prevent suppression of the reactances which I describe, up-above). For instance, the methods for obtaining electrical energy, which I describe above, will produce triangular waves. They did not possess digital technology, back then, of PWM, namely: pulse width modulation, in which a sample wave is utilized to digitally convert into the wave shape of our choice. So, Tesla came up with a method which is pretty close to an efficiency of 100%. The patent, for this invention of his, is: *Method of obtaining direct from alternating currents*; US 413353 A; Pub. Oct. 22, 1889; Filed June 12, 1889. Illustration → <http://vinyasi.info/ne?startCircuit=acplusdc.txt>



Ignoring the two deviations (on the right) from his patent (on the far-left), we see how elegant Tesla's patent is if we also allow for a translation from its obvious layout into something else (as I allude to, up-above). This is why I am so drawn to electrical engineering. Because there is always another way to attack a problem to succeed at getting a response that works. This is reflected in the mathematics which simulators use to describe their circuit simulations. In other words, there are an infinite variety of methods to achieve, let's say, the number 3. We may subtract one from four, or multiply one and a half by two, etc.

So, to take a lesson from this example, I will suggest that the only way we will ever see "free energy" circuits prevail is when it becomes a grassroots effort on the part of anyone who is technically gifted in crafting electrical devices to build this theory into a physical manifestation and share the result with a few of their neighbors.

Ideally, a "free energy" power supply should be built into every appliance so that we may dismantle the power grid and never again pay for power except as a one-time cost which is incurred up-front upon the purchase of each appliance. Because, how cheap is it to fully react an input of one milliwatt or less?

Output of one theoretical example...

