

Lab Update

Six Papers, One Public Correction, and a 35-Year Rabbit Hole



DR. PAUL WILHELM

JUL 18, 2026 PAID



This one is for the people who pay for this publication, and it starts with an apology.

The last paid-exclusive post went out in April. Since then: silence on the paid tier. If you are one of the readers funding this research with real money, that silence wasn't fair, and I won't dress it up as strategy. The honest version is that the lab ate every hour I had, and publishing lost the fight.

The work didn't stop, though. It compounded. Below the line is everything that happened since April: six finished papers and where they're headed, the uncomfortable audit of my most-read paper, and

the literature rabbit hole that will define this publication's August. This is the process report I owe you.

Six papers, refereed until they bled

Since April I finished six research papers. Not drafts. Each one was written, then pushed through adversarial review rounds built to be nastier than any journal referee I have ever faced, then revised until the review came back with zero blocking findings. Five came back needing only minor fixes. One got sent back hard and had to be restructured around a single load-bearing objection. All six now sit camera-ready in the release queue.

What's actually in that queue:

- The follow-up to my paper 'The Deleted Degrees of Freedom' — the convergence record. Independent lines of work keep landing on the same deleted structure, and the follow-up documents that pattern properly instead of letting it live in my head.
- A paper on a wave mode that standard electromagnetism says cannot exist. This one is the next launch anchor, and I think it's the strongest thing I've written.
- The opening chapter of the larger theoretical framework I've been assembling for years. First of a series.
- Two shorter, more speculative pieces that will list quietly on the research page. Not everything deserves a launch; some things just deserve to exist in public.
- And a corrections document for 'The Deleted Degrees of Freedom' itself. That one gets its own section, because it's the part I'm oddly proudest of.

The rollout starts after the summer, staggered so each paper gets the attention it earns. Paid subscribers see previews here first.



Join Dr. Paul Wilhelm's subscriber chat

Available in the Substack app and on web

[Join chat](#)

The audit I didn't want to run

In April, a sharp reader on X caught an attribution error in the DDoF paper. I fixed the downstream post and thanked him. Then I did the thing I'd been avoiding: I went back and audited the entire paper the way a hostile referee would.

The result is twenty-four documented corrections. Attribution slips. Historical timelines I stated more confidently than the record supports. Algebraic scope claims that needed tightening. None of them break the paper's core result — the 16-component structure and the question of what was deleted from it stands — but every one of them is real, and all of them go public in a dedicated errata document that publishes before any new paper launches.

Why tell you this in detail? Because the paid tier's whole premise is process over polish. Anyone can show you results. You're paying to watch how the work is actually done, including the part where I mark my own homework in red ink. A researcher who never publishes corrections isn't error-free. He's just not looking.

The rabbit hole: 35 years of data nobody wants to own

Here is where the quiet months actually went.

In March 1989, Martin Fleischmann and Stanley Pons announced anomalous heat from palladium electrolysis, and “cold fusion” became the fastest way to end a physics career. I opened that literature this summer expecting to close it again within a weekend.

I’m still reading.

Let me pre-empt the obvious before it lands in the comments: this is not a free-energy pitch. Nothing in that literature violates thermodynamics, and anyone promising you overunity is selling something. The claim I’m actually testing is narrower and far more uncomfortable. The theory we used to dismiss those experiments keeps 6 of electromagnetism’s 16 components. You cannot cleanly rule out an anomaly with a theory that may not even represent it.

August on this Substack will be dedicated to exactly this question, in public, at full length. Free readers get the argument. You get the process layer underneath it: how I read a calorimetry paper without fooling myself, which claims from 35 years of experiments survive contact with the primary sources and which evaporate, and the working literature map as it grows. One example of the kind of detail that changes the picture: the reported heat clusters above a measurable palladium loading threshold, roughly 0.85 — and the famous null replications ran below it. That detail almost never makes it into the takedowns, and it’s exactly the kind of thing the paid layer exists to dig out.

[Share Advanced Rediscovery](#)

What your money is doing

The paid tier funds the months where nothing publishes and everything compounds. Six papers are about to start rolling out. The corrections document goes first. August belongs to the anomalies.

If you stayed subscribed through the silence: thank you, genuinely. You're not funding a content schedule. You're funding a lab that occasionally surfaces.

More soon — and this time I mean weeks, not months.

[Leave a comment](#)