

NONLINEAR DYNAMICS SUPERSEDES...

What does it take to convince...

0:00 20:50

Listen now

What does it take to convince non-believers that free energy, not overunity (nor underunity), is not supported by the Conservation of Energy within the context of oscillations?

In other words, Conservation of Energy would violate oscillating waveforms if allowed to enforce itself. This is not the case or else all oscillations would cease to exist in perpetuity.



VINYASI

SEP 07, 2026

Conservation of Energy is a Law all of the time in a purely D/C circuit. Some elements, such as: resistive loads (lightbulbs) will sustain a consistent consumption of positive watts while other elements, such as: batteries, will sustain a consistent production of negative watts. But overall, across the entire geometry (topography) of a circuit, it will tally a total wattage of zero watts all of the time. This confirms that Conservation has not been violated all of the time for a D/C circuit.

But this description only holds true for a D/C circuit. For any other type of circuit, there are contingencies which must be elaborated since Conservation is not so straight forward as it is with a D/C circuit, because it gets complicated!

An A/C circuit is a special class of oscillations in which the waves are sinusoidal. My circuits are usually not sinusoidal. Once in a while, they will rarely be sinusoidal. But most of the time, they are jerky chaotic waveforms that are anything but smooth, curvaceous sine waves. Hence, my circuits will frequently be classified as being oscillatory which is a much broader category encompassing the alternations of A/C plus everything else which is not sinusoidal.

But if we consider an oscillating waveform — including alternations, then this class of waveforms cannot support Conservation of Energy except as a mathematical fiction. Because if Conservation were true — all of the time — for an oscillating waveform, then the definition of an oscillation would be violated and all oscillations would cease to exist ***retroactively and for all of eternity***.

This is true since, by the default condition of an oscillatory definition, each half-cycle of an oscillation *must* violate Conservation.

You probably want an explanation at this point, because I may be exploiting your innocence when (in reality) I am exploiting your ignorance. So, let's continue with this assault upon conventional reasoning.

What will happen — during any one half-cycle of oscillation — will be that all of the wattage of a circuit will be inclined away from the oscilloscope's midline (its baseline) of zero watts in either a positive or a negative direction. This is the inherent nature of an oscillation and cannot be violated without dematerializing all oscillations.

During the subsequent half-cycle of oscillation, whatever was negative watts will become positive watts of exactly the same absolute magnitude during the subsequent half-cycle of oscillation. Likewise, whatever was exhibiting positive watts will switch to exhibit negative watts of the exact same absolute magnitude during the subsequent half-cycle of oscillation.

The only way that Conservation can be upheld — in this situation — is as a mathematical fiction.

Choose any half-cycle of oscillation to serve as your starting point for the purposes of analysis, and designate the beginning of that half-cycle as the beginning of a full cycle, and the endpoint of the subsequent half-cycle will then become the termination of the full cycle of your analysis.

At that point, the termination of that full cycle will mathematically zero out all wattages to zero watts in contrast to the start of that full cycle — but only as a mathematical fiction (for the purposes of analysis).

Conservation of Energy is not a Law of Nature. It is a requirement which is self-imposed by physicists and engineers during the course of their analysis of energetic systems.

Hence, it is a mathematical fiction, ie. a thought experiment (as Einstein would phrase it). Gee, sounds very similar to what I do with simulators. ;-)

Look up > > > Isolated systems on Wikipedia.

Quotes from that article:

> An isolated system obeys the conservation law that its total energy–mass stays constant. Most often, in thermodynamics,

mass and energy are treated as separately conserved.

Because of the requirement of enclosure, and the near ubiquity of gravity, strictly and ideally isolated systems do not actually occur in experiments or in nature. Though very useful, they are strictly hypothetical.[1][2][3]

Classical thermodynamics is usually presented as postulating the existence of isolated systems. It is also usually presented as the fruit of experience. Obviously, no experience has been reported of an ideally isolated system.

It is, however, the fruit of experience that some physical systems, including isolated ones, do seem to reach their own states of internal thermodynamic equilibrium. Classical thermodynamics postulates the existence of systems in their own states of internal thermodynamic equilibrium. This postulate is a very useful idealization.

The concept of an isolated system can serve as a useful model approximating many real-world situations. It is an acceptable idealization used in constructing mathematical models of certain natural phenomena; e.g., the planets in the Solar System, and the proton and electron in a hydrogen atom are often treated as isolated systems. *But, from time to time, a hydrogen atom will interact with electromagnetic radiation and go to an excited state.*