

NONLINEAR DYNAMICS SUPERSEDES...

What does it take to convince...

0:00 20:50

Listen now

What does it take to convince you 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 all oscillating waveforms if allowed to “get away with it”. 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 (lightbulb) 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. — 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***.

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.

At that point in your analysis, 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!