

Dear Professor Bailetti,

Please allow me to take a moment of your time to thank you for helping me identify a blind spot that existed in virtually all our technology introductions to date - why this blind spot held us back and how you helped us to correct it.

You were absolutely right when you suggested that I lead my presentation with the statement, "*this is not a perpetual motion machine.*" I was always very reluctant to follow this approach since I felt it would be akin to telling someone "not to think of pink elephants" which was indeed what a Toronto Star article did to us in 2008 when we returned from demonstrating the technology at MIT. The Star asked the simple question, "is it perpetual motion?" My first and greatest fault has always been naively assuming that no one in their right mind would take this notion seriously since it had always seemed like a ridiculous suggestion to me personally. Even though Dr. Zahn at MIT was satisfied that the technology was not perpetual motion technology – the damage was already done to his reputation and to ours. We have been struggling uphill against it ever since and now I understand the general hostility and avoidance we command when we approach people.

Of course in my mind any person capable of rational thought would realize rather quickly that this is not a perpetual motion machine because:

1. If you unplug the prime mover it stops.
2. Bearing friction still exists in the system.
3. Core losses (eddy currents and hysteresis) still exist in the system.
4. Windage losses still exist in the system.
5. Wind losses still exist in the system.
6. The system produces noise.
7. The system produces heat etc.
8. Our generator reverses a torque but its magnitude is very small compared to that supplied and required by the prime mover.

My second and equally faulty assumption was that any reasonable person would take these simple facts into account when suggesting that this is perpetual motion technology and they would reject the notion out of hand but what I didn't realize was that the "notion of perpetual motion" throws all reason right out the window.

The Toronto Star knew this and used it to manipulate their readers and to sell the story at Dr. Zahn's and our expense. Often the emotional response created is more suited to a Pavlovian Dog experiment than an innovation introduction but by this time the damage is already done and the person has already tuned out ("thinking about what groceries to buy for dinner") or is busy devising counter arguments as you suggested to me in our presentation. Then the whole presentation goes off the rails – time and time again.

It never dawned on me to inform the listener as to why the technology was not perpetual motion technology and immediately follow it up with how the technology is not perpetual motion technology. How it reverses one form of loss but every other form of loss still exists and why this prevents it from fitting into the perpetual motion guidelines Now I have the tools to be able to remove the elephant from the room before it crushes our opportunity as it has done previously including our presentation a Lead to Win.

A more obscure category is a perpetual motion machine of the third kind, usually (but not always) defined as one that completely eliminates friction and other dissipative forces, to maintain motion forever (due to its mass inertia). Third in this case refers solely to the position in the above classification scheme, not the third law of thermodynamics. Although it is impossible to make such a machine, as dissipation can never be 100% eliminated in a mechanical system, it is nevertheless possible to get very close to this ideal (see examples in the Low Friction section). Even if such a machine could be built, it would not serve as a source of energy but merely a perpetual energy storage device. A frictionless flywheel, for example, would eventually slow down and stop if its kinetic energy were tapped for useful work, and we would get no more energy out than the amount that was initially put in to spin up the flywheel.

http://seanenergy.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=53&Itemid=56

We were vehemently instructed by Tony and David to not delve into the specifics of our innovations but to simply follow the, Customer Value Proposition, Competition, Partner Value guidelines. I can now see that I ought to have included some latitude for audience emotional reaction.

I used the new How and Why approach when we presented the technology to the Institute for Transportation Advancement (ITAQ) with great success this past Friday. Not only did every engineer agree that our technology was not a perpetual motion machine but they also had the tools to counter the argument if it ever came up in the future. ITAQ is now very willing to be an advocate for our technology to their existing and future customers and any threat of embarrassment to them is now removed.

I do not believe I could have connected the dots without your “brave” and “mean” comments. As I mentioned to Tony previously, your “mean prick” comments helped to burst a bubble of false assumption on my part and provided us with the new presentation format to diffuse false assumptions from forming in our audience.

Now I start all presentations with, “this is NOT a perpetual motion and here is why...”

Sincerely
Thane

Thane C Heins
President
Potential Difference Inc.