

What is Free Energy?

14th August 2022

It *certainly* is not a lie.

We've been lied to in the worst possible way imaginable.

The easiest lie is to ask the wrong question. This belies our ignorance and the impossibility of achieving any worthwhile result. I can think of two lies we ask ourselves right off the top of my head...

1. What is a Perpetual Motion Machine, and...
2. What is the Conservation of Energy.

We expect that all perpetual motion is governed by our “official” definition of perpetual motion machines, which is: no energy IN results in some, or lots of, energy OUT. What a sham! ¹ And we're the perpetrators of this sham!

You gotta have some energy IN. So, what's the deal? Why do we insist on asking the wrong questions? It only makes us appear to be very stupid.

This segues into the 2nd wrong assumption, that... Energy IN has to equal energy OUT. This one is easy to dismantle...

All devices have reactance. Even a piece of wire reacts to the energy which enters into it due to its insulation acts as a capacitor and its length acts as an inductor.

And all of electrical reactance has to possess a reactive OUT which is different from its input of energy which stimulates its reactive outcome. It may be less than its input, or it may be greater. But it must be different, because reactance is NOT energy.

Reactance is composed of: frequency enumerated by a quantity of cycles of oscillation, multiplied against the definition of a cycle of oscillation (represented by a conceptual circle of time, namely: two times Pi radians), and either inductance or capacitance depending upon whether the reactance is the outcome of a coil of wire or of a capacitor.

What seals this lie, by tidying it up, is that we are told by people who are knowledgeable (ie, professionals) that reactance is useless. This is true. But part of an electrical engineer's job description is to readily be able to convert from useful energy into useless reactance as well as the inverse relation of converting useless reactance into useful energy.

The simplest example of one of these conversions is to use a resistive heating element to boil water to run a steam turbine and rotate an electric generator to do away with all nuclear reactors and their plutonium byproduct and, thus, avoid amassing any more nuclear warheads since boiling water is all we demand from our nuclear reactors in the first place!

Conversion in the opposite direction, from energy into reactance, has already been covered with a simple piece of wire mentioned, above, as an example.

So, there you have it! Free energy has been with us since the days of Oliver Heaviside and his accurate analysis of the trans-Atlantic telegraph cable problem of the 1800s along with the set of solutions which evolved out of his solution. ² His solution was to mix iron dust into the formation of

1 amasci.com/freenrg/jones.txt

2 [Oliver Heaviside Discovered a Practical Substitute for Super-Conductance at Room Temperature \(researchgate.net\)](http://www.researchgate.net/publication/236111111)

the rubbery insulation prior to using it to seal the copper cable. His solution was superseded by wrapping the copper core with highly magnetic permalloy tape before sealing it with a very thick layer of insulation.

All of these evolutionary embodiments were preserving the magnetic field which deteriorates at a vastly accelerated pace by comparison to the (di-)electric field. These solutions effectively make it possible to send messages, and the power which propels these messages, across any length of transmission wire without distortion which is effectively the same as having no appreciable resistance since it is resistance which is responsible for creating a phase shifting distortion in the first place.

Now do you understand the layperson's colloquialism known as "free energy" (not the several scientific usages of this term, such as: Gibbs free energy)?

Thermodynamics doesn't cover everything. Entropy does not rule the universe in a perversely monopolistic fashion.

In short, we've been lied to and worst of all: we help spread these lies as gossip along a rumor mill compounded by all of us.

Think about it... We're idiots to never question authority without thinking it through first!

P.S. – As an afterthought, my next complaint isn't exactly a lie so much as I can think of an alternative explanation for black holes and avoid any reference to physics at the same time. It is...

That negative resistance is an equally viable alternative explanation for a black hole in as much as its current reverses itself and moves towards an area of higher voltage rather than the normal resistance which moves *away* from areas of higher voltage and, thus, refutes the ideology that voltage is a sort of pressure which pushes current along.

Voltage neither pushes, nor does it pull, current for this is another misunderstanding resulting from a misunderstanding of Ohm's Law.

Ohm's Law is not a question of voltage times current equals power. No.

The use of current in the Ohm's Law equation is a shorthand notation to simplify the work of the technician who wants to measure a change in voltage. But this use of the term of "current" within a context of Ohm's Law obfuscates what Ohm's Law is describing. It is describing that: voltage times voltage is divided by resistance to equal power. One voltage represents applied voltage. This is electrostatic. The other voltage represents reactive voltage which is responding to impedance, both resistive impedance and reactive impedance. This response, on the part of reactive voltage, measures a change in voltage over time due to impedances of various sorts. This is what current is symbolically replacing. It is a mathematical artifice – nothing more; nothing less.

This is why voltage and so-called current are like two dancers who individually decide on what dance they will perform without any consideration as to what dance will its partner perform, because reactive voltage can never equal applied voltage. They must always be not equal to each other. In other words: energy IN cannot equal reactance OUT.

Voltage and current are the consequence of two distinct forces, the electromotive force and the magnetomotive force, which are not interdependent. Only electricity is dependent upon both of these forces which serve as the ingredients of electricity within a context of time.

The electromotive force is free to do as it jolly well pleases and the magnetomotive force does, likewise, dependent (only) upon the circuit which is hosting them.

If the polarity of both coincide, then we have real power consumption.

If the polarity of both are diametrically opposed to each other, than we have the generation of reactive power, also known as: free energy.

Their coincidence occurs under fruitful conditions, such as: whenever a resistor translates any phase separation (which may occur between them) into a unity of power factor, such as: within the context of my suggestion, up-above, to replace all of our nuclear reactors and do away with our nuclear armaments.

By the way, these armaments don't protect us against any threat except the assumed right of the privileged few (who possess much) to maintain a class distinction separating themselves from the underprivileged many (who have next to nothing). There'd be nothing to protect if we shared our technological savvy with everyone and no need for any armies much less any need for nuclear armaments.

On the other hand, the complete opposition between these two forces (the electromotive versus the magnetomotive) occurs whenever the lagging current of an inductively reactive coil of wire is maximum at an angular phase displacement (from a unity power factor) of -90° and its leading current of capacitive reactance is maximum at an angular phase displacement of $+90^\circ$. The simultaneous union of both of these contrary orientations of polarity results in zero Watts but with the benefit of the unlimited generation of reactive power given sufficient time to amass this wealth confined within a circuit of suitable design.

This accumulation is unavoidably exponential due to the inherent lossless, i.e.: useless, condition of reactive power in which reactive power cannot be spent – much less lost – to its environment since reactive power is a non-physical entity.

Gee... Sounds like quantum physics if I didn't know any better!

This exponential growth does not avoid thermodynamic laws since reactive power is not energy and can hardly be grouped in the same category along with energy. This is due to reactance existing within the complex domain of imaginary numbers whose existence cannot be proven with any materialistic experiment. Imaginary numbers are a mathematical premise suggested, centuries ago, to solve certain problems which could not be solved, otherwise. Electrical engineering does not question their viability for modeling reactive power. Nonetheless, their non-existential nature belies an existence we can only imagine without any proof to back it up.

It's no small wonder that physics and mainstream science declares "free energy" to be a scam!

This unlimited growth, over time, is indicated by a triangular wave form of reactive output in contradistinction to the A/C sine wave, or D/C flat wave, input. This triangular output connotes the non-saturation of a coil of wire. Without the ability to saturate itself, a coil can do nothing else other than escalate the amplitude and frequency of its triangular wave.

This makes free energy unlimited. Without limitations to the access of electrical power, poor people could no longer exist in our world if they should ever gain access to this knowledge. But that will only happen if we stop lying!