

Testing John Bedini's "[Simple North Pole Motor](#)" (2002).

The Bedini Technology is Endorsed by Dr Peter Lindemann DSc

Stated: 4,000 RPM @ 22ma (is it possible with the [given specs](#)?)

Actual: 2,085 RPM @ 86ma, 12v Battery (139 Hz/4 poles)



(The coil in front is to read the frequency)

Differences to date:

- 1) These magnets are 1/8" bigger right now-- tried smaller Neo and Ceramic magnets.
- 2) I tried using several skate bearings with steel, aluminum, and brass rods.
The VCR flywheel technique produced less friction.

Conclusions

There is no reason to accept the claims made by John Bedini and Dr Peter Lindemann DSc for the free energy technology of Mr Bedini. What was purported to be a real experiment, that demonstrated Mr Bedini's technology, when replicated exactly, shows no exotic physics. In fact, the motor draws 5 times the current, and runs at half the stated speed. The most charitable explanation is that neither of these two men understand how to take proper scientific measurements, and made an error in their power analysis.

Here is a list of parts that are in Bedini's diagram, and the parts used for this replication

Parts	This Motor	John Bedini's Diagram
Diode	1N914	1N914
Coil Core	Welding rods	Welding rods
Main Coil Gauge	23ga	23ga
Trigger Coil Gauge	26ga	26ga
Transistor	MPS8099	MPS8099
Coil Width	1"	1"
Coil Length	1.5"	1.5"
# of turns on Coil	560	450 to 800
Resistor	Best in this one at 270 ohms	Default 680 ohms
Rotor Size	2.5"	2.5"
Magnets	6/8 Ceramic Round	Unknown thickness -5/8 x 5/8
Bearings	Vcr Flywheel type mount	Skate bearings?
Rotor Weight	~1/4 lb	Unknown

Open Letter to KeelyNet - From Dr Peter Lindemann DSc

As you know, I have been working with John Bedini for the last two and a half years. When I first started to visit John at his shop, I thought that I knew a lot about the "free energy" field, and that John and I were equally qualified in the field. In my early interactions with John, he was always open and generous in his sharing of knowledge, but I always had this sense of a perceived "undertone" of superiority, that sort of pissed me off. I learned to overlook it. At the end of the summer of 2001, John nearly insisted that I come down to his shop, so he could help me build a working model of my own to test. So, in mid-September of 2001 (just after the 9/11 event) I spent a week in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho and went to John's shop every day. He let me design the motor, then, he let me know why what I designed wouldn't work.

.....John was always friendly and patient as I made every mistake imaginable. When I was done, what worked is what John had said in the first place! I learned over the years of experimentation that John and I were in general agreement about the theoretical behavior of the energy, but that John was LIGHT-YEARS beyond me in understanding how to engineer machines and circuits that actually made the theory WORK!

.....The apparent efficiency of this test is COP>60! Even John and I question the math when it is this high. Never the less, we have run dozens of these tests with the COP>20. Different batteries behave differently with different charger configurations.....I have witnessed scores of tests that demonstrate COP>1 systems that were designed and built by John. I have independently re-run dozens of these tests back at my home with my own test models. John's systems work, it's as simple as that.

Jerry, I am telling you this because I think you should recognize by now that there have been MULTIPLE, independent verifications of John's discoveries, and that it is TRUE, and VERY GOOD NEWS! It has taken a huge effort to understand how the energy behaves in these circuits..... Others may have failed, but we have not failed. I am reminded of the fact that learned professors were filling chalk boards with equations "proving" that heavier-than-air flight was impossible more than two years AFTER the Wright Brothers' flight at Kitty Hawk. In that scenario, the score turned out: Bike Mechanics – 1, College Professors – 0.