Can real power input be supplemented with reactive power output derived from the chemical bonds which hold the atoms (of a circuit) together up to the limit of their tolerance before disintegration takes place?

> "I think you can only get energy from chemical bonds by breaking them." — Colin Watters[1]

Sorry about this rhetorical question, but consuming the materials which lead to a reaction ties us to an endless cycle of spending money for a reactive process which we could be recycling. Thus, the cost of energy could be no more than the initial cost of an energetic appliance upon its purchase since the cost of stimulating it with a catalytic response is freely available at environmental levels which was sufficient to empower crystal radio sets 100 years ago.

Your comment is the way most people are taught to think so as to exclude the only rational explanation for so-called "free energy" and overunity (an output which is greater than its input).

I hold that reactive power output does not arise from its conversion from real power input. Instead, they are two different species of power arising from two distinct sources.

Real power input comes from outside the circuit.

Reactive power output comes from inside the circuit: from its chemical bonds, such as: the valence electronvolts within copper atoms, and more significantly from the bonds which holds dielectric materials together.

Under the presumption that Conservation of Energy is an All-Encompassing Law rather than a conditional rule of thumb, we desperately feed our circuits all of their load requirements plus extra to cover losses and inefficiencies. This leads to suppression of the over-reactance of Foster's Reactance Theorem in which positive impedances frequently become negative impedances under conditions of input starvation and restricting real power input to merely one terminal so as to force current to exit the circuit the only way possible: through the same terminal through which it entered. This inverts the polarity of current relative to voltage by one-half cycle which is the passive sign conventional definition for the generation of power.

I, like a lot of other people, would like to know: from where does free energy arise if it is a valid entity?

Normally, we assume that the only way to bump reactive power out of a copper atom is to push real power through a copper wire.

But, what if reactive power can erupt under the two conditions (stated above) in theoretically vast quantities hampered only by the physical constraints of our circuitry?

Simulators don't lie. It's true that they are hampered by policies which are written into their software to uphold our belief in conventional wisdom. And they are also hampered by internal inefficiencies of computational errors.

But all of these shortcomings pale by comparison to the inherent ability for a simulated circuit to produce overunity.

And it doesn't stop there…

When science provides examples of what I've described, above, …

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324978006_Low_Frequency_Oscillations_in_Indian_Grid

… then what if I'm right?

---

1 https://www.quora.com/Is-there-any-type-of-semi-perpetual-motion-machine-in-which-you-put-little-energy-into-the-system-and-it-actually-works/answer/Colin-Watters-4

“I think you can only get energy from chemical bonds by breaking them.”

We don’t *break* a battery by borrowing its voltage via the prevention of the expenditure of its amp-hours by blocking its flow of current. Instead, we get to reuse its voltage over and over again so long as we get our requirement for current from somewhere else.

This is how I initially taught myself various overunity techniques the hard way: by trial and error on a few different simulators. I learned to separate voltage from current within a circuit and treat my attempts at their magnification as two separate processes. This is the only successful method, I can think of, for solving the technical problem of how to design the simulation of a circuit that will produce more power than it takes to run it.

This makes it possible to encourage impedance, rather than assume it to be our enemy, wherever I need to amplify voltage. And if I magnetically couple a pair of relatively enlarged coils in this area to a pair of much smaller coils in another area (wherein impedance is discouraged by using heavier gauge winding wire), then an elevated current will automatically manifest in the smaller coils practically for free!

And if I short out these smaller coils to themselves, then voltage will become zero within these smaller coils without endangering the amplification of overall power. They will still manifest enlarged values of current …

Saksit Jirawattinachote's post in 100 Watt Light Bulb Challenge

So, ultimately, it’s not the simulator’s fault if it is hampered by shortcomings so much as it is *our* shortcoming if we allow ourselves to think about this topic using tunnel vision by assuming it can’t be done.

I’m a “can do” person. I don’t like listening to all of the excuses for *not* struggling with a technical problem on the presumption that I don’t know what I’m doing until I find out otherwise.

That was my approach six years ago. Now, I know better. I can struggle with a few tools of experience in my tool chest instead of going at this problem without a clue.