

Electrical Discernment of Difference of Electromagnetic Light and Component Flow Topology

Copyright @ Feb. 20th. 2017 - Paris S. Miles Brenden

It was considered as to how to tell apart the difference of a prior to later stage of the operational amplifiers under the context of the question as to if any two operational amplifiers differed when part of the same circuit or when separated and apart; and that of the direction of the flow of end consequence of either and neither before and after; with a further question in mind: *“For a given operational amplifier for either of two inverting and non-inverting operational amplifiers of either that of before or after; how to make the difference?”* It was known; *“One was indivisible as one.”*

The resolution was found under consideration that if there were a return subsequent subtlety of electrical flow; that the prior had to come latter; and hence the two parts had to remain apart and disconnected for each either such consideration; and hence the proper determination of the difference was found as that of inseparability so given by difference of one preceding either one of two when it was understood that these two do difference by that of later or prior exceptionality of no two crossings; hence it was concluded that for that of the later stage there had to remain separation of paths and hence isolation of output from input was as simple as an earlier delimit of monodirectional flow as interior terminus; acting ahead of effect; as was the consequence of testing each of three such alternatives in the order so given by that of the following inspiration:

- 1.). The operational amplifier inverting inputs both connected to that of a common drive pathway for alternating and direct current impedance relationships for assumption of similarity of balance.
- 2.). The operational amplifier common signal connected to signal insertion of the driving; under assumption of commonality of response to driving for earlier consideration of harmonic balance.
- 3.). The signal insertion point was tested after both either common input and output; with only consideration of purity of signal fidelity so incurrent by one lead and separation of for isolation.

Neither of any of these three inclusive worked nor operated as desired; for mixed results of each were inconclusive as for the following reason; then hence understood. As configurations apart:

A.). It was understood that under any of these the return pathway was a full pathway of negative to negative; which is a direct current offset; as was tested; for one full pathway around either.

B.). The ground so connected under assumption of ohmic independence as a result of a return direct current pathway resulted in the same outcome as above for that of either was only same.

Hence; it was understood that neither of these three would operate conclusively; as only that which remained of any of these was however inconclusive; true, and remained as the only of exception of truth of the operational amplifier design in cascade or order as one; because the terminus as considered would only remain apart if there were instead one other of these three.

It was then known that as the capacitor under the buffer return was a blockade for voltage; that only one remaining open and disconnected pathway could remain; hence for the earliest first question: *“What is the proper configuration: That of the stage to stage as apart or as a bridge from stage to stage was the proper configuration; and what was the difference between these?”*

It was understood that separability of earlier component design for these under return pathway was then only delimited by that of inseparability of difference of earlier and hence no such latter, as either were the 'same' under the context of being within a similarity of parallelism. Hence; it was known that only difference was to be found by that of separability of either configuration so.