



A Physics Professor #2



By Robert J Distinti B.S. EE
46 Rutland Ave.
Fairfield Ct 06825.
(203) 331-9696

This document contains a conversation between a professor of physics and myself. The professor chose to remain anonymous and thus his name has been removed.

The topic of the conversation is the Paradox 2 Generator.

Each letter is placed at the beginning of a chapter. The subchapters are then used to respond to each of the points made in the letter. The **Blue** text at the beginning of each subchapter highlights the portion of the letter that is being discussed.

Paradox 2 Experiment



1 THE LETTER..... 3
1.1 WE RESPONDED TO MESSAGE AS WHOLE 3
2 THE SECOND LETTER 5
3 CONCLUSION 6



Paradox 2 Experiment



1 The Letter

Robert,

Sorry but 100 μV is so easily generated by thermocouple junctions (whenever two different types of metal are in contact, a voltage is generated, which is dependent on the temperature at the junction.) that it isn't worth considering very seriously. Thus with many different types of wire in the circuit; brass, copper, etc. ; I'm pretty surprised that you don't have a much larger DC offset in any signal. The friction of the brushes certainly raises the temperature at some of the contacts above that at others. Also, problems such as stray capacitance that is not fully discharged, RF pickup in the wires from AM radio broadcasts that an RC filter coupled into the oscilloscope, etc. can also easily generate such tiny stray DC voltages. You might think carefully about the actual DC offset specs of all of your equipment and how well shielded the experiment is from RF noise, including the scope itself. I spend many long hours trying to reduce DC offsets and noise in various signals. However, I wouldn't dare claim that I had observed a violation of classical E&M with equipment like that.

By the way, classical E&M is not actually the accepted theory in physics; it is called quantum electrodynamics, or "QED", and differs from classical E&M in many important ways. However, for most situations, including, I suspect, yours, classical E&M will explain anything you could easily observe with simple electrical equipment and an oscilloscope.

[Name withheld]
Department of Physics and Astronomy
XXXXXX College

1.1 We responded to message as whole

If everything you said is true, then the device would develop power even if the magnets were removed; however it doesn't produce an output when the magnets are removed. Running the device without magnets is



a critical test to verify that stray and unintentional effects (such as you describe) are not the cause of the output signal.

Some of the stray effects that you cite would even produce power when the device is not on; the output is substantially zero when the device is off.

Some of the stray effects that you cite (Such as RF noise) are rejected by the low-pass filter (1Hz) and the low impedance load (which works with the inductance of the leads to form a second low-pass filter).

Other points:

- **All thermoelectric junctions are balanced; therefore, thermoelectric effects substantially cancel.**
- **QED does not explain this system either (Also, I have no faith in a science (such as QED) that relies on things traveling back from the future in order to make the science match experiment); Time travel represents a paradox which means that QED is not a real science (see our [Rules of Nature](#)).**

Don't underestimate this experiment because it looks simple. Remember what Edison said: "To Invent, you need a good imagination and a pile of junk."

Also, because of your letter, we added a new chapter to the PDF document to show that 100uV is the proper scale for systems of low velocity, small magnets, and single (or double) loops of wire.

I think you need to look at our documents a bit closer.

Regards,

Robert J Distinti



2 The Second Letter

There was no response



Paradox 2 Experiment



3 Conclusion

None



Paradox 2 Experiment