Prof. Nebojsa Simin, B.Sc. in Physics
e-mail: nebsimin@eunet.rs

"Energy surplus" in pendulum and two-arm lever system

The two-stage oscillatory pendulum-lever system phenomenon has been out of interest of the official science up until recently. In physics, this system is actually still unknown or not studied. Science does not have an answer to a decade long pressure from a group of scientists, who have been trying to indicate to a potential importance of this two-stage oscillatory system as a possible unconventional source of energy. The researchers in question are from different parts of the world and they are connected by the Internet. Veljko Milkovic from Novi Sad (www.veljkomilkovic.com), who has invented, patented and constructed this mechanical device, was the first to start studying the two-stage pendulum-lever oscillatory system, at the end of the last century. Soon he formed a research group and started publishing results of the research; first in a book and then on the Internet.

At least one if not a greater number of experiments that Veljko Milkovic has conducted, obviously and undoubtedly indicates that the energy invested to maintain the oscillations of the pendulum is multiplied, which defies the conservation of energy law. All these experiments lack two things: a) the exact verification of the hypothesis and b) a complete interpretation of the phenomenon. In other words, it lacks the very thing without which a science as physics stays helpless. Previous attempts to, if nothing else, get the exact confirmation of the given hypothesis did not give a satisfying result. As far as I know, a few researchers have so far claimed to exactly have established a coefficient of useful action to be higher than 1 on their models, but those results have not been confirmed so far. The official science does not say a thing. Reports by amateur researchers do not bind anyone given the fact that they have been made in an unconventional way. They do not have the standard scientific form and it is not clear why anyone should believe them. Prestigious scientific journals do not accept works on this topic, in fear of a theoretically not based founded hypothesis, which means that at a certain moment the fundamental law of conservation of energy has been breached.

The entire case requires an exceptional approach. The usual scientific way has not given neither positive nor negative result. Some of the reasons have already been stated above. The fact is that the mechanical device in question is extremely complex, from the mathematical point of view, at least at first glance. It is possible that such attempts exist. Broader scientific public knows nothing about that because, since these works have been unsuccessful, they could not be published, and the free ideas exchange practically does not exist among the scientists. Amateur researchers rely solely on experiment, but they cannot reach scientific institutions which would probably know how to bring the work to an end. The mechanical structure itself is not complicated, but for exact measurement, relatively complex equipment is needed. Rigidness of scientific institutions is not surprising, because the same type of behavior has been noted many times in the history of research.

Once again, I emphasize the fact that science so far has not been capable to neither confirm nor contest, by presenting arguments, the hypothesis, which is derived from the invention of Milkovic. This hypothesis has been confirmed both verbally and in written by several scientists in Serbia, Poland, and America, but we have not gone much further. It is

necessary for the same hypothesis to be confirmed by some relevant scientific institutions. In that case, the opportunity would arise to examine the entire case from the beginning, starting with its creation. And, it was created as a consequence of obviousness. This "obviousness" is most distinct in the experiment with a series of small dynamo machines.

I shall describe that experiment in brief here. A two-arm lever puts in motion about ten small dynamo machines, which produce direct current (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IHln0xczRk8). Ten light bulbs alternately turn on and off. In order to achieve the same thing with a single bulb, a strong squeeze of human hand is necessary. Oscillation of the two-arm lever is maintained with physical pendulum. The bearing of physical pendulum is placed at the end of the left or right arm of the lever. Oscillations of the two-arm lever and physical pendulum are reciprocally dependant. In order to maintain constant amplitude of the physical pendulum the insignificant work of a human hand is needed. Namely, a relatively short and gentle pressure of the hand on the pendulum is necessary. This pressure is much weaker than in the case of, for example, children's swing. That is what the "obviousness" means. Of course, for someone who has not seen it with his or her own eyes, all of this does not have to sound too convincing. However, that is the very essence of my proposition. The entire case should be examined scientifically, given the fact that this is not an ordinary invention. Potential significance of this invention for the entire humanity is immeasurable, given the fact that this is a completely new type of unconventional energy source.

This is not the idea that defies the conservation of energy law. If it was the case, a serious researcher would first have to ask himself where the mistake is, before making any further steps in making the physical model. The question asked is not why the machine conceived in such a way cannot work as a *perpetuum mobile*. On the contrary. The question is why that is still possible, given the fact that energy conversion efficiency of the existing machine is obviously higher than one. The raised question is whether it is possible that our own eyes are deceiving us. Therefore, I believe that a special approach is necessary in further questioning of the described mechanism. The experimental machine can be made in a relatively modestly equipped workshop in not more than in a few days or weeks, but the point is to do it publicly and in a scientific institution which is qualified enough, which would bind the institution to make further steps towards the final answer. In that way the mission of amateur researchers could be brought to an end, to their disappointment or to the general satisfaction. Unless this is done, decades could pass by before we all together conclude that so much time has been wasted in vain and that the great mistake that was the result of such an unreasonable stall could have easily been avoided.

Novi Sad, Serbia
July 01, 2009