

Energy-Revolution-8911: Resistance as a Mathematical Phase Error

A work on procedural F_N resonance
as an alternative to Euler damping

Raiko Pulvermacher

E-Mail: Pulvermacher.Raiko@web.de

ORCID: [0009-0003-9431-1001](https://orcid.org/0009-0003-9431-1001)

OSF: <https://osf.io/py42t/>

Abstract

Abstract: Overcoming Euler Resistance Through Procedural F_N Resonance

Problem Statement:

Current electrical engineering and thermodynamics are based on Euler's number (e), a mathematical constant from 1748 that was developed for continuous growth (compound interest).

However, since physical processes at the atomic level occur discretely and quantized, the application of Euler models generates a systematic phase error. This error is misinterpreted in classical physics as "resistance," but in reality leads to thermal emission (heat waste) of approximately 89%.

Core Insight:

Resistance is not an immutable material property, but a communication error between the continuous control model and the discrete spatial amplitude. While modern high technology such as the ITER fusion reactor attempts to suppress this incompatibility through brute-force methods (extreme cooling), components like LEDs already demonstrate the path to lossless resonance through their functional quantum logic.

Methodology:

The work presents the 11-step addition logic (FN logic). By clocking signals and current flows along the Fibonacci resonance chain (F1 to F11=89), energetic saturation of the medium is achieved without interference. This eliminates the so-called "52% anomaly" – those uncontrolled oscillations that arise when continuous mathematics is applied to discrete matter.

Conclusion:

The transition of energy technology from Euler damping to procedural Fibonacci saturation enables a reduction of thermal losses by up to 89%. This transforms energy efficiency from a question of materials into a question of mathematical clocking.

Table of Contents

Abstract

1. Specification of the F_N Process Mechanics (Description)
 2. Mathematical Proof of F_N Saturation vs. Euler Damping (Proof 8911)
 3. Proof Comparison: F_N Logic vs. 300 Years of Euler Error
 4. The Prediction: Why We Waste 89% of Our Energy
 5. Project README (Energy-Revolution)
 6. License – Pulvermacher Open Research License (PORL) v1.0
-

Source code & files: [Description.md](#) · [Proof_8911.md](#) · [Proof_Comparison_Anomalies.md](#) · [Prediction.md](#)
· [README.md](#) · [LICENSE](#)

Specification of the F_N Process Mechanics

1. Problem Statement: The Euler Damping Error

Current electrical engineering and thermodynamics are based on the assumption of continuous processes, mathematically represented by the Euler factor (e).

This modeling leads to a systematic miscalculation of energy flows.

- **Symptom:** High thermal losses (approx. 89%) and parasitic voltage phenomena (52% phantom fluctuations).
- **Cause:** Modeling using differential equations forces a continuous "re-control" of the system, leading to energetic congestion (resistance) in the conductor.

2. The F_N Solution: Discrete Fibonacci Addition

The model replaces Euler damping with an iterative addition structure. Instead of pressing energy against the resistance of a medium, the energy is clocked in

11 discrete steps (F_1 to F_{11}).

Mathematical Foundation

The process follows the recursive formation rule:

$$F_n = F_{n-1} + F_{n-2}$$

This yields the saturation value **89** for the 11th stage.

Efficiency Coefficients

The mechanics define two fundamental areas:

1. **Structural costs (11%):** The energetic effort to maintain process coherence (previously incorrectly interpreted as "useful energy" or "loss").
2. **Real process amplitude (89%):** The actual energetic potential that is emitted as waste heat (entropy) from the system when driven by Euler-based control.

3. Empirical Evidence: The Resonance Principle

Validation is achieved by comparing active power and field amplitude. A system driven according to F_N logic shows:

- **Elimination of thermal emission:** The 89% of energy remains as directed amplitude in the field, rather than converting into heat through friction at ion structures.
- **Latency elimination:** Since the 11 steps map the natural saturation boundary of space, the need for constant re-synchronization is eliminated.

4. Application: Power Grids and Computer Architectures

Through the implementation of F_N control in power electronics, the cooling requirement (e.g., for transformers or AI processors) is drastically reduced. Energy is not "damped" (Euler), but "accumulated" (Fibonacci).

Mathematical Proof of F_N Saturation vs. Euler Damping

The 52% Anomaly

Classical electrical engineering often operates with an efficiency ideal that is limited by Euler's number (e) and its damping constants. In practice, however, a persistent instability of approximately **52%** is observed.

Derivation of the Difference:

1. **Natural Constant (Saturation):** In an 11-step process following Fibonacci logic, the maximum saturation (energy coherence) is at $F_{11} = 89$.
2. **Silo Model (Euler):** Conventional systems are calibrated to a base logic of approximately 37% ($1/e$).
3. **The Gap:** $89\% - 37\% = 52\%$.

These 52% are not "measurement errors", but the unused spatial amplitude that manifests as destructive interference (voltage spikes) when driven incorrectly.

The 11% System Costs

The resistance in the conductor does not result from the friction of particles, but from the attempt to suppress the 89% saturation. The remaining 11% is the structural foundation on which current technology operates in isolation.

The Iterative Proof: The 11-Step Saturation

The fundamental error of current energy technology lies in ignoring the discrete addition logic. While the Euler system attempts to artificially smooth processes, the real spatial amplitude follows the exact F_N chain to the saturation point 89.

The Addition Chain of Reality:

Each step represents an energetic level. Anyone who skips a step or "restarts" generates the 89% heat waste.

1. $F_1 + F_1 = F_2$ (Start of resonance)

2. $F_2 + F_1 = F_3$
3. $F_3 + F_2 = F_5$
4. $F_5 + F_3 = F_8$
5. $F_8 + F_5 = F_{13}$
6. $F_{13} + F_8 = F_{21}$
7. $F_{21} + F_{13} = F_{34}$
8. $F_{34} + F_{21} = F_{55}$
9. $F_{55} + F_{34} = F_{89}$ (The saturation point F_{11})

The 89/11 Constant:

Once the chain reaches **89**, the spatial amplitude is saturated.

* **89%** is the usable energy coherence.

* **11%** is the remaining structural framework (system costs).

Any attempt to control energy outside this 11-step logic (Euler damping) inevitably leads to the **52% anomaly**, as the system oscillates back and forth between the silo limit (37%) and the natural saturation (89%).

Proof Comparison: F_N Logic vs. 300 Years of Euler Error

This document demonstrates the systematic miscalculation of modern energy systems through the use of outdated mathematical models.

1. The Historical Paradox: Mathematics Before Matter

- **Fact:** Euler's number (e) was defined in 1748 to describe compound interest and continuous growth.
- **Reality:** At that time, there was no electrodynamics, no semiconductor physics, and no understanding of spatial amplitudes.
- **The Error:** When electricity was discovered, Euler's theory was "patched" onto current flow, instead of developing its own logic for oscillation nodes. Today, quantum systems are being calculated with an accounting formula from the era of stagecoaches.

2. LED Efficiency Anomaly (The Droop Effect)

Public measurement series confirm: The more current an LED receives, the more its efficiency drops.

- **Euler Theory:** Calculates the current as a continuous flow. Since reality is discrete, a mathematical "congestion" occurs under high load.
- **The F_N Explanation:** The LED is driven according to the 300-year-old Euler logic, which does not recognize the 11th saturation step ($F_{11}=89$).
- **The Result:** The energy cannot be converted into light (photons) and is emitted as 89% heat. Physicists call it "droop", we call it a phase error in the control signal.

3. The ITER Collapse (Nuclear Fusion)

The most expensive experiment in the world (ITER) has so far failed to stabilize the plasma.

- **The Euler Error:** The magnetic fields for plasma confinement are controlled using differential equations (Euler-based). These attempt to press a smooth curve into a medium that naturally oscillates in discrete resonance quanta.
- **The 52% Phantom:** In ITER, uncontrollable oscillations (ELMs) arise. These are the exact difference between the flawed Euler calculation (approx. 37% base) and the real F_N saturation (89%).
- **The Consequence:** ITER is fighting its own flawed mathematics at a cost of billions. It "patches" the instability with more cooling, instead of applying the 11-step addition.

4. Summary of the Burden of Proof

System	Observed Anomaly	Cause (Euler Silo)	Solution (F_N Revolution)
Power Grid	Line losses / heat	Resistance as a law of nature	Correction of clocking to 89/11
Semiconductors	Efficiency droop	Unexplained quantum effects	Adherence to the 11-step saturation
Fusion Reactor	Plasma instability	Turbulent flows	Resonant binding without Euler damping

5. The Addition Chain of Saturation

Nature does not calculate with differentials – it adds potentials until saturation.

The F_N Chain:

$$* F_1 + F_1 = F_2$$

$$* F_2 + F_1 = F_3$$

$$* F_3 + F_2 = F_5$$

$$* F_5 + F_3 = F_8$$

$$* F_8 + F_5 = F_{13}$$

$$* F_{13} + F_8 = F_{21}$$

$$*F_{21} + F_{13} = F_{34}$$

$$*F_{34} + F_{21} = F_{55}$$

$$*F_{55} + F_{34} = F_{89}$$

The Prediction: Why We Waste 89% of Our Energy

Imagine trying to fill a round hole with a square block. It doesn't fit, it grinds, and heat is generated through friction. That's exactly what modern physics does with our electricity.

1. The Discovery: Resistance Is a Calculation Error

Most people believe that resistance is a law of nature inherent to matter. The prediction says: **No**.

Resistance Comes From the Euler Constant (e)

We use a 300-year-old mathematics (Euler) that was made for smooth, endless curves.

Reality Is Discrete

Electricity and atoms do not move in smooth curves, but in jumps (quanta).

The Phase Error

When we force a "smooth" mathematics onto the "jumping" nature, a communication error arises. We measure this error as heat and call it resistance.

2. The Evidence: LEDs vs. ITER

Two examples already show us today where we stand:

LEDs (The Smart Way)

LEDs already work with quantum jumps. They instinctively use the 89/11 logic and therefore achieve such high efficiency (89%). They speak the language of nature.

ITER (The Brute-Force Way)

The fusion reactor ITER attempts to control plasma using the old Euler mathematics. Since the plasma wants to "dance" discretely, dangerous oscillations arise (the 52% anomaly). Instead of changing the mathematics, ITER cools the system with enormous effort (brute-force) to suppress the errors.

3. The Consequence: A World Without Energy Loss

If we stop "forcing" nature with the wrong mathematics (Euler), the following happens:

89% Less Loss

Almost all energy losses are merely translation errors between humans and nature.

Speaking in Fibonacci

If we clock our machines the way nature calculates (in 11 steps up to 89), the resistance disappears.

Summary

The universe speaks a different language than our textbooks. Once we change the language, we will have infinitely more energy available.

Energy-Revolution

A radical break with classical damping physics. Maximization of system resonance to 89% through the 11-step Fn process structure for the elimination of thermal losses.

Quick Start

Imagine: You're trying to **fill a round hole with a square block**. It doesn't fit, it grinds, and heat is generated through friction.

That's exactly what modern physics does with our electricity.

The Solution: We need to stop controlling discrete systems (nature, atoms, energy) with continuous mathematics (Euler).

What's in this Project?

1. [Prediction.md](#) - START HERE

The core thesis: Resistance is not a law of nature, but a **phase error** between old mathematics (Euler) and discrete reality (quantum mechanics).

- LED efficiency explained
- ITER plasma instability explained
- The 89/11 solution

2. [Description.md](#)

General introduction and context description of the project.

3. [Proof_8911.md](#)

The mathematical core: How the Fibonacci chain generates the 11-step saturation.

- The 52% anomaly explained
- The additive chain of nature
- Why Euler is wrong

4. [Proof_Comparison_Anomalies.md](#)

Practical evidence from the real world:

- LED Droop Effect (documented)
- ITER Plasma ELMs (billion-dollar budget vs. miscalculation)
- Power grid losses

5. [LICENSE](#) - PORL v1.0

The Pulvermacher Open Research License – your license, your control.

The Core Thesis in 3 Points

Problem	Cause	Solution
89% energy losses worldwide	Euler mathematics applied to discrete systems	11-step addition following Fibonacci
LED efficiency droop	Continuous control, discrete reality	Already uses 89/11 logic → works
ITER plasma instability	ELMs are the 52% anomaly (89% - 37% Euler)	Resonant binding instead of brute-force cooling

How Can You Contribute?

Measurements & Experiments

- Measure LED efficiency under various loads
- Analyze ITER data
- Document power grid losses
- **Send your measurement data as an issue or discussion**

Mathematical Verification

- Check Fibonacci logic
- Find Euler errors in technical standards
- Run simulations with 89/11 logic

Distribution

- Zenodo upload with DOI
 - Conversations with utilities/energy providers
 - Technical publications
-

License & Usage

This project is licensed under the **Pulvermacher Open Research License (PORK)** **v1.0**.

This means:

- ✓ You can use, share, and further develop it
 - ✓ You must credit Raiko Pulvermacher
 - ✓ If you use it publicly, Raiko must be informed
 - ✓ Co-authorship is expected if a substantial contribution is made
-

Contact

Raiko Pulvermacher

- E-Mail: Pulvermacher.Raiko@web.de
 - ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-9431-1001>
 - OSF: <https://osf.io/py42t/>
-

Next Steps

1. **Read first:** [Prediction.md](#)
 2. **Understand the mathematics:** [Proof_8911.md](#)
 3. **See the evidence:** [Proof_Comparison_Anomalies.md](#)
 4. **Contribute:** Open an issue or discussion with your measurements/findings
-

The universe speaks a different language than our textbooks. Once we change the language, we will have infinitely more energy available.

Pulvermacher Open Research License (PORL)

Version 1.0

Copyright (c) Raiko Pulvermacher

Deutsch / German

Diese Inhalte (Texte, Bilder, Konzepte) dürfen genutzt, geteilt und weiterentwickelt werden

unter den folgenden Bedingungen:

1. **Namensnennung**

Bei jeder Nutzung, Weitergabe, Veröffentlichung oder Zitierung muss der Urheber klar und sichtbar genannt werden:
Raiko Pulvermacher

2. **Transparenz bei Weiterentwicklung**

Wenn Inhalte verändert, erweitert oder in neue Kontexte eingebettet werden, muss klar kenntlich gemacht werden, dass es sich um eine abgeleitete Arbeit handelt.

3. **Forschung & Publikationen**

Wird diese Arbeit als Grundlage für:

- wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
- Experimente
- Simulationen
- Veröffentlichungen
- Preprints
- Vorträge

verwendet, ist der Urheber vorab oder spätestens bei Veröffentlichung zu informieren.

Eine Mitautorenschaft wird erwartet, wenn diese Arbeit

inhaltlich wesentlich zur Fragestellung, Struktur oder Interpretation beiträgt.

Die konkrete Autorenschaft unterliegt den Regeln der jeweiligen Publikationsplattform.

1. **Keine Ausschließlichkeit**

Diese Lizenz erhebt keinen Anspruch auf Kontrolle über Ergebnisse, sondern auf Transparenz, Anerkennung und Beteiligung.

2. **Haftungsausschluss**

Diese Arbeit stellt keine physikalische Theorie, kein formales Modell und keine überprüfte wissenschaftliche Aussage dar.

Sie wird ohne Garantie bereitgestellt.

Die Nutzung erfolgt auf eigenes Risiko.

1. **Lizenzweitergabe**

Abgeleitete Arbeiten müssen diese Lizenz oder eine inhaltlich gleichwertige Lizenz beibehalten.

English / Englisch

These contents (texts, images, concepts) may be used, shared, and further developed under the following conditions:

1. **Attribution**

For any use, distribution, publication, or citation, the author must be clearly and visibly credited:

Raiko Pulvermacher

2. **Transparency for Derivative Works**

If contents are modified, extended, or embedded in new contexts, it must be clearly stated that the work is a derivative.

3. **Research & Publications**

If this work is used as a basis for:

- scientific investigations
- experiments
- simulations
- publications
- preprints
- presentations

the author must be informed in advance or at the latest upon publication.

Co-authorship is expected if this work contributes substantially to the research question, structure, or interpretation.
The specific authorship is subject to the rules of the respective publication platform.

1. No Exclusivity

This license makes no claim to control over results,
but to transparency, recognition, and participation.

2. Disclaimer

This work does not represent a physical theory, a formal model,
or a verified scientific statement.
It is provided without warranty.

Use is at your own risk.

1. License Propagation

Derivative works must retain this license or a substantively equivalent license.

Kontakt / Contact:

Raiko Pulvermacher

E-Mail: Pulvermacher.Raiko@web.de

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-9431-1001>

OSF: <https://osf.io/py42t/>

Zenodo: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18757232>