

Revisiting Konzen, Douglas L.

IT IS POSSIBLE TO HAVE AN ABUNDANCE OF UNLIMITED
WORK FROM A LIMITED SUPPLY OF ENERGY !!



VINYASI

AUG 06, 2026

You know you're doing something right when the input voltage is far less than the outcome!

Seriously ...

Input voltage gets in the way of overunity.

This is why I mean to suggest that Lewis Carroll's "Alice in Wonderland" and his "Through the Looking Glass" fictional novels have an intrinsic bias inverting our conventional expectations since overunity is a realm of inverse reality which is not subject to conventional wisdom or popular expertise.

And this is also why the nomenclature of Rodolph Steiner is appropriate to borrow his term of: "counter-space" and reduce our emphasis on using the engineer's terminology of "negative impedance" since the latter carries with it certain expectations of usage that we may be violating whenever we apply it to overunity conditions. This shift of emphasis should allow us to detach the linear relationship of work from any fixed energy usage so as to suggest that any benefit of work can be the result without violating any law of physics.

This is how we supersede Conservation of Energy by ignoring it for it is not relevant for the accomplishment of work. It is merely relevant for calculating an energetic expenditure supplied by a cost of energetic input. But it is not relevant for improving the efficiency of the

accomplishment of work since this is determined — not by accountability, but — by applying the geometry of electrical reactance to leverage a greater volume of work from a lesser volume of energy.

Every investment broker/banker/realtor knows the power of leveraging money to perform more work than what a more straightforward purchase could accomplish by itself.

We are doing the same thing (here) with work's relationship to energy just as brokers accomplish with their ability to stretch the investment potential of their available funds so as to increase their profits without incurring any greater cost or liability.

We do this by leveraging the power of *extreme phase disjunction* in which power factor is not permitted to correct for a phase displacement of one-half cycle between voltage and current. In fact, we *encourage* this vast separation between the phases of voltage versus current so as to detach the conventional strict relationship which is normally associated with the energetic cost to perform a fixed quantity of work.

Thus, overunity is not defined as being: "More energy OUTPUT than INPUT", but rather "A greater performance of work for a decreased cost of energy".


What we're doing, here, with this deemphasis of an older style of perspective, is to reorient ourselves towards what is important: how much work gets accomplished — since that's all that has ever mattered. The source of our supplemental energy is not important since we shouldn't care where it comes from so long as we don't have to pay for it nor carry any liability for its use.

Additional energy should come from wherever it needs to come from so as to satisfy the requirements of our work. We don't need to concern ourselves with this since this additional energy is not included in our

energetic input. This supplemental energy could come from any combination of:


1. The recycling of energy from a prior moment of its usage (this is the easiest acquisition of abundant work), or ...
 2. The extraction of energy from our natural or manmade environment (called: harvesting or theft, respectively), or ...
 3. The requisition of energy from the flexibility afforded us by the counter-spatial relationship of the phase displacement of voltage from the phase displacement of current by one-half cycle of oscillation.
 - a. This flexibility makes it possible for energy to regeneratively accumulate by refusing to allow itself to become absorbed into caps or coils.
 - b. This refusal is a direct consequence of this style of energy-management convinces caps and coils that they are already saturated with energy and cannot absorb any more than what they already possess *regardless of how little energy that may already be!*
 - i. To be effective, this refusal must happen right away or else we will be prevented from any subsequent instigation of this technique.
 - c. This refusal to allow an interactive/reactive absorption, or discharge, of energy has the distinct consequence of denying a corresponding time-lag. This results in an alternative style of interaction involving the reflection and/or refraction of energy through caps and coils without their direct interaction with this energy.
 - d. This interactive refusal bypasses entropic loss and, this, also bypasses the Law of the Conservation of Energy.
-

Schematic:



Three Earth Batteries each contributing 7.9V paired to three ground rods. This is the most efficient method of maintaining/regulating overunity which I've ever seen. All credit goes to Jim Murray and Paul Babcock for inspiring me/us to achieve their concept of bouncing energy back and forth through resistive loads regardless of the likenesses or discrepancies between our methods for achieving similar results.

Outcome:



This displays the output for three thousand seconds of runtime. The zero-voltage status of the “dead battery pack” of a RAV4 EV from 2002 slightly elevates this outcome above the target for supplying the motor controller with adequate energy to accelerate at full throttle. Anything else, such as: 50A for cruising, can readily be supplied by the battery pack if it has sufficient charge. Otherwise, adjustments of one sort or another would have to accommodate a variable motor load.

Download this circuit simulation from [my website](#) or from my [Google Docs](#) account.
