

Re-Examining Relativistically Referenced Observations inspired by reading Dr. Wilhelm's treatment of Heaviside's Emasculation of Maxwellian Physics on page 24 of Wilhelm's text.

The quote, of Dr. Wilhelm, which inspired this post:

“In the interpretation developed by later scalar wave theorists, the bidirectional structure of these wave pairs implies the simultaneous presence of time-forward and time reversed components — though Whittaker’s original treatment is purely mathematical and does not make this physical claim.”¹

I’ve said this before. But it is worth repeating why I think that time-reversal is a mathematical artistry which does not actually occur for all referenced observers. But it does appear for a limited domain of observers. This is why Micro-Cap 12 gives a narrow point of view when it indirectly declares that a transient surge reverses time throughout the duration of its surge.²

This derivation can be calculated by dividing power by energy or energy by power and interpreting that time has traveled forward if the sign of the calculated result is positive or infer that time has reversed itself if the sign of the result is negative.

The problem is how we define time and what we ascertain to be the correct reference for time whenever analyzing a circuit.

We categorically treat time as a fourth dimension and, thus, append it to the three minimal spatial dimensions of the Cartesian coordinate system. And we assume that our unitarian assessment of time will always apply to all referenced oscillations. Yet, this is not true since every type of energetic oscillation is its own reference for time. Hence, real powered oscillations are one type of measurement of time while imaginary (reactive) oscillations are another type of temporal assessment demanding a separate consideration apart from the real powered oscillation which spawns it. This means that a Fourier analysis of a complicated composition of multiple oscillations demands a consideration which is sensitive to these temporal complexities.

¹ [Deleted Degrees of Freedom](#), pg. 24, by [Dr. Paul Wilhelm](#).

² [The Relativity of Energy and the Reversal of Time is a Shift in Perspective](#), by Vinyasi; redirected shortcut: <https://is.gd/abstractrelativity>

Time, as we conceive of it (composed of one reference imposed by the observer's clock) is an artistry of convenience. It makes all of our math work out nice and neat so long as our circuit under analysis is a "stable" circuit whose inputs equal its outputs. But the reality of unstable circuits is far more complicated. The math *seems* to work. But when we assess what has happened, that is when we overly simplify our analysis into an opinion which is inferior to reality.

How do we define a temporal measurement? We set up a standardization by choosing a frequency geared to an atomic clock which is not moving with reference to the observer.

But a "free energy" circuit is an unstable circuit characterized by its infection by at least one parasitic frequency. This parasitic frequency is slightly faster than whatever frequency initiated the controlled oscillations which were intended of a free energy circuit-design.

By reducing the amplitude of the intended frequency to drastically become superseded by the escalating amplitude of the parasitic frequency ensures that the overall (net) mathematical conclusion can only be one thing: that time has reversed.

Of course, it hasn't. But for all practical intents, it has. That's the conclusion which an electronic simulator arrives at since that is also what any savvy engineer will also deduce even though it's not exactly true.

The truth is that the escalating amplitude of the parasitic frequency effectively transfers the referencing frequency from whatever oscillation initiated the empowerment of the circuit due to the adherence of the simulator, and its engineering authors, to the Law of Conservation.

But from whose reference is this Conservation upheld? This is where the confusion lies in that not all points of view may serve as a Conservative reference.

Only the point of view of the input oscillation is Conservative. Yet, this point of view is ignored by the human observer who is taking his measurements of what is happening to the parasitic oscillation whose escalating amplitude causes the dwindling amplitude of the input oscillation to slowly disappear into obscurity.

The parasitic oscillation is riding piggy-back on top of the initial oscillation and is not Conservative since its temporal reference is located outside of the initial oscillation which spawns it. This exteriorization of the parasitic oscillation is due to other factors all of which are non-Conservative, such as: the frequency of the parasitic oscillation, and the capacitive and inductive impedances which shaped this parasite into existence.

These reactive impedances are not Conservative since they are not composed of energy. Instead, they are composed of potentials: the potentials of electrical reactance. Hence, the parasitic frequency which they spawn and the escalating amplitude echoing back and forth

between, and constrained within, the domain of these impedances exists independent of the Conservable oscillation which spawned this parasite.

Only the point of view of the initiating energy is tangible and relevant. It sees its energy traveling forward in time but geared to the escalating amplitude of the parasitic oscillation which has become the new reference for Conservability replacing the initial frequency of insignificant amplitude.

This spawns the delusion that time has reversed itself in order to satisfy the mathematics of Conservation within the context of this transference of an oscillating reference. Yet, it hasn't. Either the energy is Conserved and time has reversed itself or else time has not reversed itself and the energy has not been Conserved, and all of this paradox is consequential to our over-simplification of the situation.

This is a consequence of the instability of the energy within a parasitized "free energy" circuit. Not only is this type of circuit unstable, but more importantly our measured observations of this type of circuit are also suspect due to their inherent complexities. Standard physics assumes that this type of circuit will never come under the radar of conventional engineering. So, the correct procedure for taking non-fallible measurements is never implemented. This causes standard opinions for free energy circuits to be consistently erroneous which encourages engineers to ignore this type of circuit by never designing it in the first place.